

MIT Open Access Articles

Public perceptions of autonomous vehicle safety: An international comparison

The MIT Faculty has made this article openly available. **Please share** how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

Citation: Moody, Joanna et al. "Public perceptions of autonomous vehicle safety: An international comparison." *Safety Science* 121 (January 2020): 634-650 © 2019 Elsevier Ltd

As Published: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2019.07.022>

Publisher: Elsevier BV

Persistent URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/127651>

Version: Author's final manuscript: final author's manuscript post peer review, without publisher's formatting or copy editing

Terms of use: Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License



1 **PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF AUTONOMOUS VEHICLE SAFETY:**
2 **AN INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON**

3
4 Joanna Moody, Nathaniel Bailey, and Jinhua Zhao

5
6 **HIGHLIGHTS**

- 7 • Perceptions of AV safety were surveyed across 41,932 individuals in 51 countries
8 • Young, high-income, employed, and highly-educated males are the most optimistic about
9 AV safety
10 • Western European countries are aware of AV technology, but are pessimistic about its
11 safety
12 • Conversely, developing countries in Asia are the most optimistic about current and future
13 AV safety
14 • AV safety optimism in risk-taking individuals and developing countries may reduce
15 global disparity in road safety

16
17 **ABSTRACT**

18 Autonomous vehicles (AV) are envisioned to reduce road fatalities by switching control of safety-
19 critical tasks from humans to machines. Realizing safety benefits on the ground depends on
20 technological advancement as well as the scale and rate of AV adoption, which are influenced by
21 public perceptions. Employing multilevel structural equation modeling, this paper explores
22 differences in perceptions of AV safety across 33,958 individuals in 51 countries. At the individual
23 level, young males report higher perceptions of current AV safety and predict fewer years until
24 AVs are safe enough for them to use. Since young males are more likely to undertake risky driving
25 behavior, their positivity towards AV safety could lead to more rapid manifestations of safety
26 benefits. Urban, fully employed individuals with higher incomes and education levels also report
27 fewer years until AVs are safe to use. The multilevel model identifies country-level effects after
28 controlling for individual characteristics. Developed countries with greater motorization rates and
29 lower road death rates tend to have greater awareness of AVs but are more pessimistic about their
30 present and future safety. Individuals in developing countries that face greater road safety
31 challenges, particularly involving 2- and 3-wheeled vehicles, predict fewer years until AVs will
32 be safe enough for them to use. Higher AV safety perception among the most risk-taking road
33 users and in developing countries coincide with sociodemographic groups and geographic areas
34 facing the greatest road safety challenges and most in need of improvement, highlighting a
35 potential opportunity to reduce the global disparity in road safety.

36
37 *Keywords:* autonomous vehicles, perceptions of safety, public opinion, international comparison,
38 multilevel structural equation modeling, developing countries

39
40 Citation: Joanna Moody, Nathaniel Bailey and Jinhua Zhao (2019). Public Perceptions of
41 Autonomous Vehicle Safety: An International Comparison, Safety Science.

1. INTRODUCTION

Greater road safety is one of the key potential benefits of autonomous vehicles (AVs) because these systems assume control of safety critical tasks, the type often prone to human error (NHTSA, 2017). Several studies suggest that the potential for improved safety is a key determinant of the general public's willingness to use AVs (Casley, Jardim, & Quartulli, 2013; Howard & Dai, 2014). Therefore, perceptions of AV safety may help determine the extent to which people will accept and use AVs and the rate at which their safety benefits may be realized on the road. However, these findings largely come from data collected in a handful of developed countries¹ and therefore may fail to generalize to developing countries, where road safety is significantly worse. Thus, current literature largely fails to account for how perceptions of AV safety differ across individuals and countries and how those differences may impact the rate and scale of AV adoption.

This study examines perceptions of AV safety across a diverse sample of individuals from a wide variety of countries. Using data from an international survey, this paper explores how awareness of AV technology and perceptions and predictions of AV safety differ across 41,932 individuals in 51 countries. In particular, we investigate what sociodemographic groups (across all countries) demonstrate the most positive current perception and future predictions of AV safety. Controlling for these individual characteristics, we also isolate country-level effects independent of the individuals in those countries and use correlational analysis to understand how country-level factors such as income, car use, and road safety relate to observed variation in country effects on AV safety perceptions.

In this paper, we begin with a literature review of public perceptions of autonomous vehicle safety, with a focus on international comparisons and studies of perceptions of AV safety. Next, we present our methodological approach, providing an overview of our survey, sample, key variables, and modeling framework. We then present the results of our study, including trends across individuals and across countries. Finally, we discuss how the varying perceptions of AV safety demonstrated in our survey may contribute to different rates of AV adoption across countries and, in turn, how this may interact with the existing global road safety disparity between developing and developed countries.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW: PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF AUTONOMOUS VEHICLES

There is a wealth of research investigating what factors correspond with increased interest in AVs, more positive attitudes regarding the technology, and higher willingness to adopt, use, and buy it. Many studies have identified young adults and men as two demographics that hold more positive attitudes towards autonomous vehicle technology (Nielsen & Haustein, 2018; Anania, et al., 2018; Hulse, Xie & Galea, 2018; Lee, et al., 2017). In particular, young people and men have been shown to agree more strongly that AVs will improve safety (Nielsen & Haustein, 2018), have fewer concerns about vehicle safety (Kyriakidis, Happee & de Winter, 2015; Schoettle & Sivak, 2014), and have increased willingness to use the technology (Smith & Caiazza, 2017; Payre, Cestac, & Delhomme, 2014). These same demographics are linked to risky driving behavior (Turner & McClure, 2003) and risky pedestrian behavior (Holland & Hill, 2007; Rosenbloom, 2009) that correlate with increased collision risk and thus worse road safety outcomes. Because of this link,

¹ Throughout this study, we use the labels developed and developing according to the country classifications published by the United Nations (2017).

1 Hulse, Xie, and Galea (2018) make the claim that the positivity towards AVs among young males
2 could lead to more rapid manifestations of road safety benefits should they quickly adopt AVs
3 once the technology is introduced.

4
5 In addition to young adults and men, college educated people and people living in urban areas have
6 also been found to have more positive attitudes towards AVs, including increased willingness to
7 use the technology (Smith & Caiazza, 2017; Schoettle & Sivak, 2014) and increased perceptions
8 of safety (Schoettle & Sivak, 2014; Nielsen & Haustein, 2018). A study by Sanbonmatsu et al.
9 (2018) found that increased knowledge of AVs correlates with higher agreement that they would
10 be unsafe both due to technological limitations and lack of operator familiarity; however, self-
11 reported perceived knowledge of AVs had a negative association with these same beliefs.

12
13 Furthermore, several studies have identified underlying attitudinal factors that also explain these
14 perceptions (e.g., Tussyadiah, Zach, & Wang, 2017; Nees, 2016; Choi & Ji, 2015). One
15 particularly relevant study in Denmark identified three classes of respondents based on reported
16 attitudes: enthusiasts, skeptics, and an indifferent group in between with higher car stress.
17 Enthusiasts were significantly more likely than others to have university education, try new
18 technologies earlier in the adoption curve, live in the Copenhagen region, and be male and
19 young. Among the expected advantages of AVs, safety showed the largest gap between skeptic
20 and enthusiast respondents; while 56.8% of enthusiasts reported a belief that self-driving cars
21 would increase safety, only 7.4% of skeptics and 20.7% of indifferent people believed the same
22 (Nielsen & Haustein, 2018).

23 24 **2.1 International Comparisons**

25 Surveys conducted across multiple countries have indicated that public perceptions of AVs and
26 the sociodemographics that predict them vary widely among different nations. Haboucha et al.
27 (2017) found that gender played a significant role in predicting interest in AVs in Israel—with
28 men more interested than women—while there was no significant gender difference in the U.S.;
29 The authors attributed this finding to cultural differences between the two countries. Anania et al.
30 (2018) found that Indian women reported higher willingness to ride in AVs compared to Indian
31 men, while in the U.S. the reverse was true.

32
33 A study with respondents from Germany, China, Japan, and the U.S. found significant differences
34 among attitudes towards automated driving in these four countries (Sommer, 2013). Autonomous
35 driving was considered scary by 42% of respondents from Japan but by 66% from the U.S.; 43%
36 of Japanese respondents reported belief that the technology will function reliably compared to 74%
37 in China; and only 37% of respondents in Japan predicted that automated driving will be a part of
38 everyday life by 2028, while 65% in China believed the same thing. A study conducted in the U.S.,
39 U.K., and Australia in 2014 also found significant differences in attitudes; respondents in the U.S.
40 reported very positive views of AVs, but also greater concern for riding in AVs compared with
41 respondents in other countries (Schoettle & Sivak, 2014).

42
43 While many studies, such as those above, compare average attitudes towards AVs among a small
44 set of countries, very few examine trends among many various countries around the world. A
45 correlational analysis across 40 countries (each with at least 25 responses) showed weak but
46 positive relations between the country-level rates of traffic deaths (regularized by the number of

1 vehicles and the number of individuals) and worries about the safety and reliability of AV
2 technology (Kyriakidis, Happee & de Winter, 2015). A follow-up study involving 7,188
3 respondents across 43 countries used principal component analysis to generate a general
4 acceptance score indicating an individual's positivity towards AV technology, and found that
5 country mean general acceptance score correlated negatively with country GDP per capita and
6 motor vehicle density and correlated positively with road traffic death rate (Nordhoff et al. 2018).
7 These studies give conflicting indications about countries where road safety is a larger issue, with
8 one finding these countries may have more concerns about safety and the other finding that they
9 have higher general acceptance of AV technology. Additionally, these simple correlations did not
10 control for sample representativeness or other potential sociodemographic effects. Another survey
11 with 5,500 participants across 27 cities in 10 countries found that 58% of all respondents reported
12 they were likely or very likely to take a ride in a fully self-driving car, but this ranged by country
13 from 36% in Japan to 85% in India (Lang, et al., 2016). Despite noting this variation in mean
14 responses by country, this study focuses on the relations between individual sociodemographics
15 and perceptions of AV safety, leaving it an open question as to how much of this variation is a
16 result of differing societal or cultural attitudes at the country level.

17 **2.2 Perceptions of Safety**

18 While technology and road infrastructure will dictate the actual safety of AV systems, public
19 perception of safety is significant in understanding how travel behavior may respond to the
20 introduction of AVs on roads around the world. Knowledge of direct relations between safety
21 perceptions and willingness to change travel behavior can shed light upon the potential safety
22 benefits that may be realized through AVs (NHTSA, 2017).

23
24 Several studies have identified that the same sociodemographic factors correlated with increased
25 perceptions of AV safety are also associated with increased intention to adopt AV technology
26 (Smith & Caiazza, 2017; Payre, Cestac & Delhomme, 2014; Hulse, Xie & Galea, 2018).
27 Furthermore, research has suggested that perceptions of safety are associated with interest in and
28 intended use of AVs, meaning an understanding of perceptions of safety is useful in understanding
29 the potential future adoption of the technology. In one survey conducted in the U.S. in 2013, 59.5%
30 of respondents indicated that the safety of AVs had a positive influence on their desire to purchase
31 the technology and 82% of respondents indicated that safety was the most influential appeal of
32 AVs, ahead of cost (Casley, Jardim & Quartulli, 2013). However, other studies have found much
33 smaller proportions of people who rate safety as a primary motivation for interest in AV
34 technology, such as 17% among American adults (Smith & Caiazza, 2017) or 31% across an
35 international sample (Lang, et al., 2016). Just as there is evidence that positive perceptions of AV
36 safety might motivate its use, concerns about safety may also be a major driver of lack of interest
37 in AVs across countries. Among respondents in an international sample who indicated they were
38 unlikely to take a ride in a fully self-driving vehicle, 50% did not feel safe if the car was driving
39 itself, 45% expressed desire to be in control of the vehicle at all times, and 23% would be
40 concerned the car could be hacked (Lang, et al., 2016). Kyriakidis, Happee, and de Winter (2015)
41 found that 64.5% of respondents agreed that automated driving worries them because of safety and
42 reliability concerns. Thus, the literature suggests that safety perceptions are a major barrier to AV
43 adoption, but may also be a motivator for adoption among certain groups.

44 A growing body of literature indicates that safety perceptions (of AVs as well as conventional
45 modes) lead travelers to shift mode choice and other travel behavior. A stated preference study in
46

1 Israel found that perceived risk of road crashes is directly related to intention to shift travel towards
2 public transit (Elias & Shiftan, 2012), indicating that travelers are willing to change travel behavior
3 to reduce immediate personal safety risk. Several studies have corroborated this effect in the AV-
4 specific context. For individuals who rode in an AV under controlled conditions, experiential
5 feelings of safety during the ride were found to significantly predict increased behavioral intention
6 to use, buy, and recommend AVs, as well as willingness to take further rides in AVs (Xu et al.,
7 2018). Several other studies have found that attitudes towards AV safety prior to actual use
8 significantly influence intention to adopt and use AVs. One study found that an attitudinal factor
9 of contextual acceptability of AVs, including attitudes towards safety, correlated positively with
10 intention to use AVs, intention to buy the technology, and willingness to pay for the technology
11 (Payre, Cestac & Delhomme, 2014). A recent study found that perceived safety risk was a
12 significant contributor to feelings of trust towards AV technology, and that this trust was the
13 strongest contributor towards intention to use and purchase AVs in the future (Zhang et al., 2019).
14 These studies suggest that individual perceptions of safety may play a large role in shaping the
15 adoption and use of AVs in the future, and are therefore important in understanding the
16 technology's resulting safety impacts.

17

18 **2.3 Our Contribution**

19 While significant research has explored what factors contribute to an individual's perception of
20 AVs, much of these findings are limited to homogeneous samples in a single region or (developed)
21 country. Existing international comparisons have been limited to descriptive statistics and bivariate
22 correlations that often fail to account for multivariate relations among individual
23 sociodemographics, public perceptions, and travel behavior (Lang, et al., 2016; Kyriakidis, Happee
24 & de Winter, 2015; Sommer, 2013). Furthermore, existing international comparisons often fail to
25 control for individual-level factors that make up the samples of each country. This severely limits
26 the ability to draw conclusions about differences between countries due to factors other than
27 differences in the sociodemographics of the people that live in them. This study builds on existing
28 literature by providing an international comparison of perceptions of AV safety across a sample of
29 unprecedented size and country coverage. This wealth of data allows us to employ a rigorous
30 multilevel structural equation modeling technique that carefully apportions sample variance to
31 individuals and countries. We can thereby explore how much of observed differences in levels of
32 AV awareness as well as current perceptions and future predictions of AV safety are attributable
33 to individuals vs. to country contexts.

34

35 This study has two main research aims. At the individual level, we are interested in what types of
36 people (across all countries) are the most aware of AVs and are the most positive in terms of their
37 current perception of AV safety as well as their predictions for when AVs will be safe enough for
38 them to use in the future. This individual level analysis leverages our sample's greater global
39 coverage and our model's multivariate approach to corroborate and extend existing literature on
40 public perception of AV safety. At the country level, we demonstrate for the first time in published
41 literature that small, but significant country-to-country variance in perceptions of AV safety exist
42 even after controlling for the characteristics of the individuals in those countries. Having isolated
43 these country effects (no longer confounded by individual characteristics), we examine how
44 national indicators of wealth, income inequality, motorization, and road safety conditions are
45 associated with country-level perceptions and predictions of AV safety. With these results, we
46 discuss how more optimistic perceptions of AV safety across countries may lower attitudinal

1 barriers to rapid AV adoption in those countries that might benefit most from the road safety
2 improvements promised by AV technology.

3 4 5 **3. METHODS**

6 7 **3.1 Survey Design and Respondent Recruitment**

8 A 20-question survey was administered by Dalia Research via mobile phones to participants in 51
9 countries during the two-month period from December 2016 through January 2017.² Mobile phone
10 based data collection provides unprecedented global coverage. Worldwide, more people now have
11 access to the internet through mobile devices than through desktop computers, particularly in low-
12 and middle-income countries (Statistica.com, n.d.). Therefore, we are able to collect an
13 international sample that includes respondents from a much broader range of countries, (with a
14 much less developed country bias, than previous studies).

15
16 Sample respondents were recruited through a variety of ad-exchanges, demand-side platforms
17 (DSPs), apps and mobile websites. While browsing content on their mobile device, individuals
18 would be prompted to take a short survey. Respondents who completed the survey were rewarded
19 in the form of virtual currencies, prepaid credits, access to premium content, and other rewards
20 depending on the specific recruitment channel.

21
22 Since respondents are recruited within apps, attention spans may be short and this may raise
23 concerns over data quality. Dalia Research pre-screens respondents and assigns each a
24 trustworthiness score based on criteria such as answer consistency, consistency with passive device
25 data, checks against location data, attentiveness check, and speeding. Each individual is rated
26 based on average performance across all criteria and this score is dynamically updated as users
27 complete additional surveys. Only high-quality, verified users were asked to voluntarily complete
28 our survey.

29 30 **3.2 Sample**

31 The initial sample consisted of 41,932 voluntary survey participants from 51 countries. Quota
32 sampling was used to ensure reasonable sample representativeness for age and gender for each of
33 the 51 countries based on population statistics, adjusted to match the internet-connected population
34 (Moody, 2019). Therefore, any inference on our sample can only extend to internet-connected,
35 mobile-phone users in each of the countries surveyed. For this study, 7,947 respondents who did
36 not report either their monthly household income or education level (two key covariates in our
37 model) were removed from analysis. This left a final sample size of 33,958 respondents from 51
38 countries, with within-country sample sizes varying from 170 to 928.³

² The study reported in this paper was approved by the Committee on the Use of Humans as Experimental Subjects at the [the name of Institution redacted] prior to any recruitment or data collection – protocol #1610719971. Electronic informed consent was obtained from all participants.

³ Removing these observations could result in a loss of sample representativeness at the country-level if the missingness of key covariates is systematic across certain types of individuals. However all results presented in this study were also calculated for the full sample of 41,932 individuals (including observations with missing values for monthly household income or education level) and there were no substantial changes to any of the conclusions we present here.

1 Due to the hierarchical nature of the data—with individuals nested within countries—we must
2 consider sample representativeness not only of individuals, but also of countries (Lucas, 2014). In
3 this study, data was collected primarily for inference at the individual-level. As a consequence, the
4 51 countries are a simple convenience sample and are not intended to be representative of all
5 countries in the world. In particular, our sample contains none of the 34 countries designated as
6 “low income” by the World Bank (2018). Therefore, any inference across countries applies only
7 to the specific high- and middle-income countries included in our sample, and we caution against
8 any generalization to a wider population of countries.

10 **3.3 Data**

11 For each individual, the survey collected sociodemographic information, including age, gender,
12 employment status, educational attainment, monthly household income, the population of the city
13 or town in which they reside, and whether or not they own a car. In addition, each individual was
14 asked three questions related to autonomous vehicles (nominally defined as Level 5 automation or
15 “fully self-driving cars”).

17 First, individuals were asked to report their familiarity with autonomous vehicles, answering the
18 question “Have you seen, heard, or read anything about self-driving cars?” with one of three
19 ordered choices—“No”, “Yes, a bit”, and “Yes, a lot.” Individuals were then asked their
20 perceptions of current AV safety: “How safe do you think self-driving cars are, as of now?”
21 Responses were recorded on a 1-4 scale from “not safe at all” to “very safe.” Finally, for those
22 who indicated that they do not yet think AVs are “very safe,” a follow-up question asked “how
23 soon, if at all, do you think self-driving cars will be safe enough for you to consider using one?”
24 Respondents were provided with ranges of years, which were coded into a quasi-continuous
25 variable by the midpoint of each range.⁴ Respondents that reported AVs as “very safe” in the
26 previous question were coded as 0 years, which assumes that they already feel self-driving cars
27 are safe enough to use. Note that this question does not ask about the time until AV technology
28 reaches an objective safety threshold, but rather about the time until it satisfies an individual’s
29 personal requirements of safety such that they would use it for their own transportation. Survey
30 respondents’ personal requirements of safety may naturally depend on the current road safety
31 environment in which they live as well as their own risk-taking behavior.

33 To complement the individual level survey data, country-level covariates were gathered from
34 various sources. As a proxy for national wealth, gross domestic product (GDP) per capita adjusted
35 for purchasing power parity was collected (World Bank, International Comparison Program
36 Database, n.d.). We also obtained the Gini index⁵ for each country as a proxy for income inequality
37 (World Bank Development Research Group, n.d.). We additionally controlled for the motorization
38 rate (total vehicles in use per 1000 people) by country from the International Organization of Motor
39 Vehicle Manufacturers (OICA, 2015). Finally, we explored whether current national road safety
40 conditions influence average country perceptions of AV safety. We used the World Health
41 Organization’s road safety statistics, including the road traffic death rate (per 100,000 population)

⁴ Responses coded in number of years: “< 2 years” = 1, “2-5 years” = 3.5, “5-10 years” = 7.5, “10-20 years” = 15 years, “greater than 20 years” = 25, “never” = 50. For those who already thought that AVs are safe, responses were coded as 0 years.

⁵ Given significant sparseness in the Gini index for any given year, this variable was derived by taking the most recent estimate available within 2010-2015 for each country.

1 and the percentage of road deaths by type of road user (driver or passenger of 4-wheeled motor
2 vehicle, driver or passenger of 2-wheeled motor vehicle, or pedestrian) (WHO, n.d.).

3 4 **3.4 Analytic Plan**

5 Given the hierarchical nature of the data—with 33,958 individuals nested within 51 countries—
6 we adopt a multilevel modeling approach that enables the study of complex relations among
7 variables while allowing individuals within countries to share common cultural and social
8 characteristics modeled as correlated regression error terms (Muthén & Asparouhov, 2009;
9 Muthén, 1994). We estimate a multilevel structural equation model (MSEM) to explore what
10 characteristics of individuals predict awareness of AV technology (ordinal), current perceptions,
11 of AV safety (ordinal) and future predictions of AV safety (quasi-continuous) (Figure 1). We
12 assume that individual characteristics precede awareness of AV technology as well as perceptions
13 and predictions of the safety of fully autonomous vehicles (which are a relatively new
14 phenomenon). We allow for the three outcomes to be correlated due to our expectation that
15 awareness of AV technology may be related to current perceptions and future predictions of AV
16 safety (Figure 1).


17
18 At the individual level, all sociodemographics are country-mean centered to remove any country
19 level variance from the estimation of the individual-level path coefficients (Enders & Tofighi,
20 2007; Asparouhov & Muthén, 2007). We estimate fixed slopes for these individual
21 sociodemographic characteristics across all 51 countries. Therefore, our model does not capture
22 differences across countries in the association of any given sociodemographic and perceptions of
23 AV safety; instead it measures the average association of individual sociodemographics and
24 perceptions of AV safety across all countries. This simplification is made for model tractability,
25 but still allows us to identify global trends in individual-level perceptions of AV safety that remain
26 significant above potential country-to-country variation.

27
28 A post-hoc power analysis using Monte Carlo simulation suggests that our sample size of 51
29 countries is too limited to support a multivariate exploration of the factors that contribute to
30 country-level variation. Therefore, we estimate a completely saturated model, with only the
31 random intercepts for the three outcomes and their covariances, at the country-level. These
32 country-level intercepts estimate the effect of being from a specific country on individual
33 perceptions of AVs, after controlling for individual sociodemographics. Although our model
34 cannot explain the cause of these country-level effects, it allows us to isolate them from individual-
35 level effects.

36
37 The model is estimated using Bayesian estimation in Mplus version 8.1 using a seed value of 200
38 and no preset starting values (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2019). We implemented diffuse (non-
39 informative) priors for all model parameters, relying on the default settings of the software
40 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2019). For the ordinal outcomes, the default probit link function is used.
41 Four Markov chains were implemented for each parameter and distinct starting values were
42 provided for each of the chains. To assess chain convergence, the Gelman and Rubin (1992a,
43 1992b) convergence diagnostic was implemented as described in the Mplus user manual with a
44 stricter convergence criterion of 0.01 rather than the default setting of 0.05. An initial burn-in phase
45 of 100,000 iterations was specified, with a fixed a fixed number of postburn-in iterations of
46 100,000. The Gelman and Rubin diagnostic indicated that convergence was obtained with these

1 fixed iterations for each of the four chains. The trace plots for each model parameter were also
 2 visually inspected. For each of the model parameters, all chains appeared to converge, being
 3 visually stacked with a constant mean and variance in the postburn-in portion of the chain. To
 4 ensure that convergence was obtained and that local convergence was not an issue, we estimated
 5 the model again but with the number of burn-in and postburn-in iterations doubled (400,000
 6 iterations in total). Again the Gelman and Rubin convergence diagnostic indicated convergence
 7 was obtained and the visual inspection of trace plots was consistent with that finding. Percent of
 8 relative deviation was calculated to examine how similar (or different) parameter estimates are
 9 across these two analyses using the formula: [(estimate from initial model) – (estimate from
 10 expanded model)/(estimate from initial model)] x 100. We found that results were almost identical
 11 with relative deviation levels no more than 1% for all parameters. Note that all applicable points
 12 on the WAMBS-checklist (Depaoli and van de Schoot, 2017) were addressed and the results from
 13 this checklist can be downloaded as supplementary material from
 14 <https://github.com/jcmoody6/intl-av-safety> along with the Mplus output code from the analysis.
 15

16 **Figure 1. Analytic Path Diagram for the Individual-level of the MSEM**



17
 18 *Figure Note:* Blue circle indicates random intercept estimated at the country-level. Variances and covariances of all
 19 exogenous (independent) variables and disturbance terms for all endogenous (dependent) variables are estimated,
 20 but not pictured.
 21

1 **4. RESULTS**


2
3 **4.1 Descriptive Statistics**

4 Looking at the raw data across the 33,958 respondents in our 51 countries, we see significant
5 variance in reported levels of AV awareness, current perceptions of AV safety, and predictions of
6 when AVs will be safe enough to use (see Figure 2). The majority of respondents across all
7 countries (55.9%) reported that they were “a bit” aware of AVs (Figure 2a), which somewhat
8 parallels findings from other international surveys which found that 49.9-52.2% of respondents
9 had heard of the Google Driverless Car before (de Winter, et al., 2015; Kyriakidis, Happee, & de
10 Winter, 2015).

11
12 Across the entire international sample, we find that most current perceptions of AV safety are
13 moderate, with 34% of respondents across all countries reporting that AVs are “somewhat safe”
14 (Figure 2b). Only 10.4% of respondents across all countries think AVs are “very safe” and only
15 6.8% think AVs are “not at all safe.” In the reported number of years until AVs will be safe enough
16 to use (Figure 2c), the mean response across all individuals in the sample is 9.8 years (2026-2027).
17 These numbers are in line with or slightly more optimistic than the results of other international
18 studies in which the majority of respondents believed that fully automated vehicles would be able
19 to drive on public roads by 2030 (Kyriakidis, Happee, & de Winter, 2015; de Winter, et al., 2015;
20 Underwood, 2014; Sommer, 2013).

21
22 The variations in awareness of AV technology, current perceptions of AV safety, and reported
23 number of years until AVs are safe enough to use that we see in our international sample (Figure
24 2) can result from differences in both individual perceptions and country effects. In the next
25 section, we use multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM) to apportion the observed sample
26 variance across these two sources.

1 **Figure 2. Raw Percentages of Individual Responses by Category for the Three Study Questions**



2
3 *Figure Note:* “NA” = “not sure” or not answered

4 **4.2 Structural Equation Model**

5 We estimate the multilevel structural equation model (MSEM) shown in Figure 1, using individual
6 sociodemographics to predict awareness of AV technology, current perceptions of AV safety, and
7 the reported number of years until AVs are safe enough to use. The MSEM framework allows us
8 to assess the overall “goodness of fit” of our model. Using Bayesian Posterior Predictive Checking
9 using chi-square, we find that there is no statistically significant difference between the observed
10 and replicated chi-square values with a 95% confidence interval = [-16.579, 39.188], $p = .217$.
11 This suggests that our model adequately reproduces the covariance matrix implied by the sample
12 data.

13
14 **4.2.1 Intraclass Correlation Coefficients**

15 Adopting the multilevel modeling structure allows us to determine what percentage of observed
16 variance in each of our outcome variables is attributable to individuals or to countries (the
17 intraclass correlation coefficient or ICC). Overall, we find that most of the variance in awareness
18 of AV technology, current perceptions of AV safety, and future predictions of AV safety is
19 attributed to differences across individuals rather than countries. Our model suggests that 11.8%
20 of observed variance in AV awareness is attributable to country context, compared to 4.9% and
21 2.9% for current perceptions and future predictions of AV safety, respectively. These ICCs suggest
22 that, while country context does play a role in levels of AV awareness and perceptions and

1 predictions of AV safety, these perceptions are largely dictated by individual-level factors. This
2 finding should serve as a caution to researchers who simply compare mean sample responses
3 across countries without accounting for the vast majority of variance explained by the fact that
4 individuals are different across these countries.

5 6 *4.2.2 Relations among AV Awareness and Perceptions/Predictions of AV Safety*

7 Looking at the correlations among the outcome variables across individuals, we find that
8 awareness of AV technology is moderately correlated with current perceptions of AV safety
9 (0.387) and predicted number of years until AV safety (-0.258). This means that individuals who
10 are more aware of AV technology have higher current perceptions of AV safety and more
11 optimistic predictions of the number of years until AVs will be safe enough to use. This finding is
12 in line with previous research that suggests familiarity with, enthusiasm for, and perceived
13 knowledge about AV technology are all positively correlated with perceptions of safety and
14 willingness to adopt the technology sooner (Nielsen & Haustein, 2018; Kyriakidis, Happee, & de
15 Winter, 2015; Sanbonmatsu, et al., 2018). These results might suggest that increasing levels of
16 awareness and familiarity with AV technology could help mitigate concerns for AV safety,
17 reducing this potential attitudinal barrier to their rapid adoption.

18
19 We also find a substantial negative correlation between current perceptions of AV safety and
20 predicted number of years until AV safety (-0.545). These results are intuitive, suggesting that
21 individuals who have higher perceptions of current AV safety report a fewer number of years until
22 AVs are safe enough for them to use.

23 24 *4.2.3 Trends across Individuals*

25 At the individual level, we predict levels of AV awareness and current perceptions and future
26 predictions of AV awareness with sociodemographic factors to identify what types of people
27 (across all countries in our sample) are most optimistic of AVs. We find that those who are
28 younger, male, highly educated, fully employed, and who have higher than average household
29 incomes report higher awareness of AV technology, more favorable current perceptions of AV
30 safety, and a lower number of years until AVs will be safe enough to use (see

1 Table 1). Our results corroborate and extend previous research that finds young people, men, and
2 those with higher educational status are more optimistic about AV safety (Nielsen & Haustein,
3 2018; Schoettle & Sivak, 2014; Payre, Cestac, & Delhomme, 2014). Furthermore, we find that
4 individuals living in areas with greater population size report greater awareness of AV technology
5 and fewer years until AVs will be safe enough for them to use, but this variable is not significantly
6 predictive of current perceptions of AV safety. This finding partially corroborates previous
7 research findings that respondents in more urban areas have increased perceptions of safety
8 (Schoettle & Sivak, 2014; Smith & Caiazza, 2017; Nielsen & Haustein, 2018).

9
10 In addition, we find that individuals who currently own or lease a car (car owners) as well as
11 individuals who drive a car as their typical weekday mode (car users) have greater awareness of
12 AV technology and more optimistic perceptions of current and future AV safety.
13
14

1 **Table 1. Individual- (within-) level parameter estimates for the MSEM specified in Figure 1.**

Dependent Variable	Predictor	Unstandardized coefficient	95% Credibility Interval		Standardized coefficient
			Lower	Upper	
Awareness of AV technology (1-3; ordinal)	Age (yrs)	-0.005	-0.006	-0.004	-0.053
	Male (0/1)	0.287	0.262	0.311	0.138
	Full time employed (0/1)	* 0.014	-0.012	0.040	0.007
	Log(settlement size)	0.014	0.010	0.018	0.039
	Household income (\$100)	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.093
	Highly educated (0/1)	0.205	0.179	0.232	0.096
	Car owner (0/1)	0.166	0.133	0.199	0.076
Car user (0/1)	0.088	0.055	0.120	0.040	
Perception of AV safety (1-4; ordinal)	Age (yrs)	-0.004	-0.005	-0.003	-0.042
	Male (0/1)	0.182	0.156	0.208	0.089
	Full time employed (0/1)	0.055	0.027	0.082	0.027
	Log(settlement size)	* -0.001	-0.005	0.004	-0.003
	Household income (\$100)	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.060
	Highly educated (0/1)	0.104	0.076	0.132	0.050
	Car owner (0/1)	0.060	0.026	0.095	0.028
Car user (0/1)	0.027	-0.007	0.060	0.012	
Years until AVs are safe enough to use	Age (yrs)	0.058	0.044	0.072	0.052
	Male (0/1)	-1.173	-1.478	-0.868	-0.045
	Full time employed (0/1)	-1.223	-1.541	-0.906	-0.047
	Log(settlement size)	-0.140	-0.193	-0.086	-0.032
	Household income (\$100)	-0.017	-0.022	-0.012	-0.042
	Highly educated (0/1)	-1.446	-1.771	-1.120	-0.055
	Car owner (0/1)	-1.216	-1.618	-0.813	-0.045
Car user (0/1)	-0.697	-1.085	-0.308	-0.026	

2 *Note:* * = 95% credibility interval (CI) crosses zero
3 Variance explained: awareness (pseudo-R² = 0.064, 95% CI = [0.058, 0.069]), perception of AV safety (pseudo-R² =
4 0.021, 95% CI = [0.017, 0.025]), and years until AVs are safe enough to use (R² = 0.022, 95% CI = [0.018, 0.025]).
5

6 Taken together, these individual-level results suggest that the early adopters of AVs (across a
7 diverse array of countries) might be younger, male, higher income, more educated, and
8 potentially more urban. They are also likely to be current car owners and frequent users. These
9 findings generally corroborate findings from existing research, but extend them to individuals in
10 a much more diverse set of countries. Therefore, our international comparison provides stronger
11 evidence that these individual-level results hold as a global trend across many different types of
12 countries. However, these results should be caveated by the fact that the variance in awareness of
13 AV technology as well as current perceptions and future predictions of AV safety explained by
14 our model are low (see note for

1 Table 1). This suggests that other individual-level factors not captured in the survey—such as
2 attitudes—may contribute to an individual’s awareness of AV technology, current perceptions of
3 AV safety, and predictions of the number of years until AVs will be safe enough to use.


4 5 *4.2.4 Trends across Countries*

6 While we find that the majority of variance in AV awareness as well as current and future
7 predictions of AV safety is attributable to individual characteristics, small but statistically
8 significant differences do exist across countries after controlling for individual-level relations.
9 Figure 3 maps the random country-level intercepts for each outcome in the MSEM. These country-
10 level intercepts represent the effect of country context on an individual’s awareness and
11 perceptions of AVs (after accounting for individual-level factors). Table A in the Appendix gives
12 the full list of each outcome variable by country, and each country’s rank in each outcome variable.


13
14 From these results, we identify a few specific trends in country-level effects. A group of Western
15 European countries (Germany, Sweden, Austria, the UK, and the Netherlands) as well as Canada
16 report moderately above-average awareness of AVs, low perceptions of AVs’ current safety, and
17 the greatest number of years until AVs are safe enough to use. Meanwhile, developing countries
18 in Asia (including much of Southeast Asia, China, and India), along with Brazil, Portugal, and the
19 UAE, report high awareness of AVs and have high perceptions of current and future AV safety.
20 The seven Latin American countries in our sample besides Brazil all rank in the bottom nine of
21 awareness of AVs and have high perceptions of current safety and predict low-to-moderate number
22 of years until AVs are safe enough to use. Russia, Ukraine, and Turkey have very low perceptions
23 of current AV safety, though in our other outcomes of interest they do not exhibit significant
24 differences from many other countries (moderately below-average awareness and moderately
25 above-average years until AVs are safe). The US and Singapore, where the bulk of current
26 autonomous vehicle development and testing is being conducted, report high awareness of AVs,
27 yet ranked with many other countries around average in both current and future perceptions of AV
28 safety.

1 **Figure 3. Variation in country-intercepts for (a) AV awareness, (b) current perceptions of AV**
2 **safety, and (c) future predictions of years until AVs will be safe enough to use.**


(a) AV Awareness (country intercept)



(b) Current Perceptions of AV Safety (country intercept)



(c) Years until AVs are Safe Enough to Use (country intercept)



1 Next, we explore what national characteristics might help to explain the variation we see in our
 2 country intercepts. While the multilevel modeling approach that we have adopted could allow for
 3 specification of multiple regression relations at the country-level similar to how we treated the
 4 individual-level above, our small sample of 51 countries lacks sufficient statistical power to
 5 support such a multivariate approach. Therefore, we limit our investigation of trends across
 6 countries to bivariate correlations between our country intercepts and indicators of national wealth,
 7 income inequality, vehicle ownership and use, and road safety for the 51 countries in our sample
 8 (see **Error! Reference source not found.**).

9 **Table 2: Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Country Intercepts and Country Covariates**

	Awareness of AV	Current perception of AV safety	Years until AVs will be safe enough to use
GDP per capita, PPP	0.299	-0.240	0.276
Gini index	-0.292	0.403	-0.497
Passenger road km per capita	0.115	-0.048	0.064
Motorization rate	0.175	-0.290	0.382
Road death rate	0.010	0.353	-0.413
Percent of road deaths, 4-wheelers	0.188	-0.299	0.466
Percent of road deaths, 2/3-wheelers	0.294	0.202	-0.332
Percent of road deaths, pedestrians	-0.232	-0.085	-0.089

10
 11 We find that country-level awareness of autonomous vehicles is positively correlated with GDP
 12 per capita and negatively correlated with Gini index. This suggests that more economically
 13 developed countries report higher awareness than others. Countries with higher motorization rate
 14 (high car ownership) express somewhat greater awareness of autonomous vehicles, but have
 15 significantly more pessimistic views on current and future AV safety. Our results show that car
 16 usage (measured by passenger road km per capita) has the same directionality of effect on our
 17 outcomes as car ownership, but the magnitude of these relations is much smaller.

18
 19 Our correlation coefficients also indicate that national road safety conditions may be strongly tied
 20 to country-level perceptions of current and future AV safety. We find that having a greater road
 21 death rate correlates with higher perceptions of current AV safety and predictions of fewer years
 22 until they will be safe enough to use at the country-level. A greater percentage of road deaths made
 23 up of drivers and passengers of 4-wheeled vehicles correlates with greater awareness of AVs,
 24 worse perceptions of current AV safety, and less optimistic predictions of when AVs will be safe
 25 enough to use. While the percentage of road deaths made up of drivers and passengers 2- and 3-
 26 wheeled vehicles also correlates with greater AV awareness, it has the opposite relation with
 27 perceptions of safety. Countries with more road deaths from 2- and 3-wheeled vehicles have more
 28 positive perceptions of current AV safety and predict fewer years until they will be safe enough to
 29 use. The percentage of road deaths made up of pedestrians correlates negatively with country-level
 30 awareness of AVs and has only minor negative relations with perceptions of current AV safety
 31 and number of years until AVs will be safe enough to use. Taken together, these results suggest
 32 that individuals living in countries that face greater road safety challenges (particularly from 2-
 33 and 3-wheeled motor vehicles) are more optimistic of AV safety than similar individuals living in
 34 countries with better road safety conditions.

35
 36
 37

5. DISCUSSION

This study represents an unprecedented international comparison of perceptions of AV safety across 33,958 individuals in 51 countries. Employing multilevel structural equation modeling that simultaneously accounts for characteristics of both individuals and countries, we are able to break out differences in awareness of AV technology, current perceptions of AV safety, and future predictions of years until AVs will be safe enough to use into individual-level and country-level effects. We can then explore what types of individuals, across a diverse set of countries, are more aware of AVs and more optimistic of their safety now and in the future. We can also identify country-level variation in public perceptions of AVs after accounting for differences in individuals within these countries. We find that, while country-level differences do exist in awareness of AV technology as well as current perceptions and future predictions of AV safety, most of the variation is explained by differences in individual-level characteristics.

At the individual level, we investigate what sociodemographic groups (across all countries) have the most positive perceptions of AV safety currently and the earliest predictions of when AVs will be safe enough for them to use in the future. Our model corroborates and extends previous findings that young males are more optimistic towards AV safety; we find that young males (across all countries) are a key global demographic that report higher current perceptions of AV safety and fewer years until AVs are safe enough to use. Given that young males are also the demographic most linked to risky driving and pedestrian behavior (Turner & McClure, 2003; Holland & Hill, 2007; Rosenbloom, 2009), their positivity towards AV safety and early adoption of AVs once the technology is introduced could lead to more rapid manifestations of road safety benefits (Hulse, Xie, & Galea, 2018). Our model also corroborates and extends previous literature that finds urban and college-educated individuals have greater perceptions of AV safety. Our findings indicate that individuals who are fully employed, high income, and highly educated, who may have the means to be early adopters of AV technology when it becomes available, also have positive perceptions of AV safety that are linked to increased intention to purchase and use AVs in the future (Payre, Cestac, & Delhomme, 2014; Zhang et al., 2019).

Additionally, our multilevel structural equation model isolates country-to-country variation in public perceptions of AV safety from the variation attributable to the individuals who make up our country subsamples. These isolated country-level effects are a novel contribution to the literature, as previous studies have confounded country variation with individual characteristics. As a result, they potentially conflate differences arising from country populations with those attributable to social and cultural contexts.

Mapping these country-level effects, we identify trends in perceptions of AV safety across countries. We corroborate these trends with correlational analysis with country covariates, including indicators of national wealth, income inequality, car ownership and use, and current road safety conditions. We find that countries with higher motorization rates and lower road death rates tend to report worse perceptions of current and future AV safety. This indicates that developed countries, particularly Western Europe and Canada, are less optimistic of AV safety than developing countries, especially those in Latin America and Asia. We additionally identify differences among developing regions. Developing Asia and Brazil report extremely high awareness of AVs and extremely optimistic predictions of AV safety, while the rest of Latin America report extremely low awareness and slightly pessimistic predictions of AV safety.

1 We also observe relationships between several road safety indicators and country-level effect on
2 perceptions of AV safety. We find that individuals living in countries that face greater road safety
3 challenges are more optimistic of AV safety than similar individuals living in countries with better
4 road safety conditions. Higher road death rate, more road deaths attributable to drivers and
5 passengers of 2- and 3-wheeled vehicles, and fewer road deaths attributable to drivers and
6 passengers of 4-wheeled vehicles—collectively characteristic of many developing countries—all
7 correlate with more positive perceptions of AV.

8
9 One hypothesis to explain these relationships is that AV safety is perceived relative to the existing
10 safety context in each country. Individuals in developed countries with low road death rates may
11 feel that an AV would need to meet a high threshold of safety in order to be acceptable given
12 current road safety conditions. Individuals in developing countries face a much different road
13 safety context, with a larger share of 2- and 3-wheeled vehicles that more frequently violate traffic
14 laws and a much higher rate of road fatalities. In these situations, an AV may be safe enough to
15 use even if it does not meet the same safety standard that an individual in a developed country
16 would require of it. A recent study provides support for a slightly different hypothesis, finding that
17 most individuals in the U.S. believe AVs should only be allowed on the road once their driving is
18 safer than that individual’s own perceived driving ability (Nees, 2019). If this result holds in
19 international contexts, it is possible that individuals in countries with worse road safety conditions
20 have lower opinions of their own driving safety, likewise leading to beliefs that AVs may be safe
21 enough to use at a lower level of safety. Future research could test these different explanations for
22 our findings.

23
24 The finding that countries facing the greatest road safety challenges are also the most optimistic
25 of AV safety may be an important insight for policymakers grappling with a growing global
26 disparity in road safety. While deaths due to traffic accidents are a critical issue for national
27 governments across the globe (UN General Assembly, 2015), road users in low and middle-income
28 countries are particularly vulnerable. Road fatality rates in these developing countries are more
29 than twice that observed in high-income countries (WHO, 2015). Moreover, while road fatality
30 rates in high-income countries have been decreasing for decades, fatality rates in low and middle-
31 income countries remain on the rise (WHO, 2015). With the Sustainable Development Goals
32 including a global target to reduce road traffic deaths and injuries 50% by 2020 (UN General
33 Assembly, 2015), researchers and practitioners need to develop an understanding of how new
34 technologies, such as autonomous vehicles (AVs), could be leveraged to meet these global goals
35 and to address the existing disparity in road safety across countries.

36
37 In summary, these results suggest that optimistic public perceptions and predictions of AV safety
38 may drive early adoption of AV technology among risk-taking young males, particularly in
39 developing countries. If legal, economic, and political barriers to AV implementation are resolved
40 quickly and if AV technology is safer than the human drivers they replace on the roads, AVs could
41 improve road safety conditions in those countries that currently face the greatest road safety
42 challenges. Thus, this survey indicates that public perception may drive faster adoption of AVs
43 among the most risk-taking drivers in developing countries, which could in turn help to alleviate
44 the existing global road safety disparity.

5.1 Limitations and Future Work

This paper furthers understanding of what types of individuals have greater awareness of AV technology and more optimistic views of AV safety. This understanding may be used to better target informational campaigns and marketing interventions to the groups and regions of the world that may benefit most from the adoption of safer AV technologies. However, future research is needed to address a number of limitations of this initial study.

First, additional research may more clearly demonstrate whether stated perceptions of AV safety on surveys will materialize in actual adoption or use of these vehicles when they enter the market. Although stated preferences and survey responses do not necessarily match travel behavior, surveys remain a powerful and low-cost means to obtain initial observations. Understanding public perception can be particularly valuable when considering, as in the case of fully autonomous vehicles, the development of future technologies when human subject experiments in real-world conditions are not yet feasible.

Second, while there is significant theoretical basis for assuming that individual characteristics precede perceptions of fully autonomous vehicle technology, the directed relations presented in this paper are estimated from cross-sectional data. Future research using longitudinal data or instrumental variables could extend this understanding from correlational to causal and could further investigate the formation and dynamics of perceptions of AV safety over time.

Third, future research could identify other individual and country factors that contribute to an individual's awareness of AV technology and perceptions of AV safety. The low pseudo- R^2 values of our model at the individual-level suggest that much of the variation in public perceptions of AVs is not explained by simple sociodemographics (like age, gender, income, education, employment), and current travel behavior (like car ownership and use). Therefore, our study suggests there is significant value in continued exploration of how other aspects of travel behavior or individual's attitudes may contribute to perceptions of AV safety and intended use of these vehicles.

Finally, while our model results indicate that the vast majority of variation in awareness and perceptions of AVs is attributable to individual characteristics, we do find contextual effects across countries. While this study demonstrates clear trends in awareness of AVs as well as current perceptions and future predictions of AV safety across countries, we are limited to a bivariate exploration of the national factors contributing to these trends. In theory, the MSEM framework adopted here does allow for the specification of multivariate relations among variables at the country (as well as individual) level. However, in practice, our international sample includes only 51 countries, which post-hoc power analysis suggests is an insufficient sample size to detect statistically meaningful relations at the country level. While we are unable to use the MSEM framework to its fullest potential, research equipped with data from more countries (or cities) can build on the modeling framework that we present here to not only demonstrate, but also explain country-level trends in perceptions of AV safety.

1 REFERENCES

- 2 Anania, E. C., S. Rice, N. W. Walters, M. Pierce, S. R. Winter, and M. N. Milner. 2018. The
3 effects of positive and negative information on consumers' willingness to ride in a
4 driverless vehicle. *Transport Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2018.04.002>
- 5 Asparouhov, T. and B. Muthén. 2007. Constructing Covariates in Multilevel Regression. Mplus
6 Web Notes: No. 11. <https://www.statmodel.com/download/webnotes/webnote11.pdf>
- 7 Casley, S. V., A. S. Jardim, and A. M. A. Quartulli. 2013. *A Study of Public Acceptance of*
8 *Autonomous Cars*. Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA.
9 [http://www.wpi.edu/Pubs/E-project/Available/E-project-043013-](http://www.wpi.edu/Pubs/E-project/Available/E-project-043013-155601/unrestricted/A_Study_of_Public_Acceptance_of_Autonomous_Cars.pdf)
10 [155601/unrestricted/A_Study_of_Public_Acceptance_of_Autonomous_Cars.pdf](http://www.wpi.edu/Pubs/E-project/Available/E-project-043013-155601/unrestricted/A_Study_of_Public_Acceptance_of_Autonomous_Cars.pdf)
- 11 Choi, J. K., and Y.G. Ji. 2015. Investigating the importance of trust on adopting an autonomous
12 vehicle. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 31(10), 692-702.
- 13 de Winter, J. C. F., M. Kyriakidis, D. Dodou, and R. Happee. 2015. Using CrowdFlower to
14 study the relationship between self-reported violations and traffic accidents. Presented at
15 the 6th International Conference on Applied Human Factors and Ergonomics (AHFE), Las
16 Vegas.
- 17 Depaoli, S. and R. van de Schoot. 2017. Improving Transparency and Replication in Bayesian
18 Statistics: The WAMBS-Checklist. *Psychological Methods*, 22(2): 240-261.
19 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/met0000065>
- 20 Elias, W. and Y. Shiftan. 2012. The influence of individual's risk perception and attitudes on
21 travel behavior. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 46(8): 1241-1251.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2012.05.013>
- 23 Enders, C.K. and D. Tofghi. 2007. Centering Predictor Variables in Cross-Sectional Multilevel
24 Models: A New Look at an Old Issue. *Psychological Methods*, 12(2): 121-138.
25 <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.12.2.121>
- 26 Gelman, A and D. B. Rubin. 1992a. Inference from iterative simulation using multiple
27 sequences, *Statistical Science*, 7: 457-511.
- 28 Gelman, A. and D. B. Rubin. 1992b. A single series from the Gibbs sampler provides a false
29 sense of security. In J. M. Bernardo, J. O. Berger, A. P. Dawid, and A. F. M. Smith (eds.)
30 *Bayesian Statistics 4*, 625-631. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- 31 Haboucha, C.J., R. Ishaq, and Y. Shiftan. 2017. User preferences regarding autonomous
32 vehicles. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 78: 37-49.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2017.01.010>
- 34 Holland, C. and R. Hill. 2007. The effect of age, gender and driver status on pedestrians'
35 intentions to cross the road in risky situations. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 39(2):
36 224-237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2006.07.003>
- 37 Howard, D. and Dai, D., 2014. Public perceptions of self-driving cars: The case of Berkeley,
38 California. In *Transportation Research Board 93rd Annual Meeting*, 14(4502), 1-16.
- 39 Hulse, L. M., H. Xie, and E.R. Galea. 2018. Perceptions of autonomous vehicles: relationships
40 with road users, risk, gender and age. *Safety Science*, 102: 1-13.
- 41 International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers [OICA]. 2015. "World Vehicles in
42 use: All vehicles (including motorization rate)." [http://www.oica.net/category/vehicles-in-](http://www.oica.net/category/vehicles-in-use/)
43 [use/](http://www.oica.net/category/vehicles-in-use/) (accessed May 2018).
- 44 Kyriakidis, M., R. Happee, and J. C. F. de Winter. 2015. Public opinion on automated driving:
45 Results of an international questionnaire among 5000 respondents. *Transportation*

- 1 *Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 32: 137-140.
2 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2015.04.014>
- 3 Lang, N., M. Rübmann, A. Mei-Pochtler, T. Dauner, S. Komiya, X. Mosquet, and X. Doubara.
4 2016. *Self-Driving Vehicles, Robo-Taxis, and the Urban Mobility Revolution*. The Boston
5 Consulting Group and World Economic Forum. [http://www.auto-](http://www.auto-mat.ch/wAssets/docs/BCG-Self-Driving-Vehicles-Robo-Taxis-and-the-Urban-Mobility-Revolution.pdf)
6 [mat.ch/wAssets/docs/BCG-Self-Driving-Vehicles-Robo-Taxis-and-the-Urban-Mobility-](http://www.auto-mat.ch/wAssets/docs/BCG-Self-Driving-Vehicles-Robo-Taxis-and-the-Urban-Mobility-Revolution.pdf)
7 [Revolution.pdf](http://www.auto-mat.ch/wAssets/docs/BCG-Self-Driving-Vehicles-Robo-Taxis-and-the-Urban-Mobility-Revolution.pdf)
- 8 Lee, C., C. Ward, M. Raue, L. D'Ambrosio, and J.F. Coughlin. 2017, July. Age Differences in
9 Acceptance of Self-driving Cars: A Survey of Perceptions and Attitudes. In *International*
10 *Conference on Human Aspects of IT for the Aged Population* (pp. 3-13). Springer, Cham.
- 11 Lucas, S. R. 2014. An inconvenient dataset: bias and inappropriate inference with the multilevel
12 model. *Quality & Quantity*, 48(3): 1619–1649. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-013-9865-x>
- 13 Moody, J. 2019. *Measuring Car Pride and its Implications for Car Ownership and Use across*
14 *Individuals, Cities, and Countries*. [Doctoral dissertation] Massachusetts Institute of
15 Technology: Cambridge, MA.
- 16 Muthén, B. and T. Asparouhov. 2009. Beyond Multilevel Regression Modeling: Multilevel
17 Analysis in a General Latent Variable Framework. In *The Handbook of Advanced*
18 *Multilevel Analysis*, (J. Hox and J. K. Roberts, eds.), Taylor and Francis.
- 19 Muthén B. 1994. Multilevel Covariance Structure Analysis. *Sociological Methods & Research*,
20 22: 376-398.
- 21 Muthén B. and L. Muthén. 1998-2019. *Mplus User's Guide*, Version 8. Muthén & Muthén, Los
22 Angeles, CA.
- 23 National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA]. 2017. *Automated Driving Systems*
24 *2.0: A Vision for Safety*. U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.
25 <https://www.nhtsa.gov/manufacturers/automated-driving-systems>
- 26 Nees, M. A. 2016, September. Acceptance of self-driving cars: an examination of idealized
27 versus realistic portrayals with a self-driving car acceptance scale. In *Proceedings of the*
28 *Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting* (Vol. 60, No. 1, pp. 1449-1453).
29 Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.
- 30 Nees, M.A., 2019. Safer than the average human driver (who is less safe than me)? Examining a
31 popular safety benchmark for self-driving cars. *Journal of Safety Research*, 69, pp.61-68.
- 32 Nielsen, T. A. S. and S. Haustein. 2018. On sceptics and enthusiasts: What are the expectations
33 towards self-driving cars? *Transport Policy*, 66: 49-55.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2018.03.004>
- 35 Nordhoff, S., J. de Winter, M. Kyriakidis, B. van Arem, and R. Happee. 2018. Acceptance of
36 Driverless Vehicles: Results from a Large Cross-National Questionnaire Study. *Journal of*
37 *Advanced Transportation*, 2018.
- 38 Payre, W., J. Cestac, and P. Delhomme. 2014. Intention to use a fully automated car: attitudes
39 and a priori acceptability. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and*
40 *Behaviour*, 27: 252-263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2014.04.009>
- 41 Rosenbloom, T. 2009. Crossing at a red light: behavior of individuals and groups.
42 *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 12(5): 389-394.
43 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2009.05.002>
- 44 Sanbonmatsu, D.M., D.L. Strayer, Z. Yu, F. Biondi, and J.M. Cooper. 2018. Cognitive
45 underpinnings of beliefs and confidence in beliefs about fully automated vehicles.

1 *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 55: 114-122.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2018.02.029>

3 Schoettle, B. and M. Sivak. 2014. *A survey of public opinion about autonomous and self-driving*
4 *vehicles in the U.S., U.K., and Australia*. Report No. UMTRI-2014-21. University of
5 Michigan Transport Research Institute.
6 <https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/108384>

7 Smith, A. and T. Caiazza. 2017. *Automation in everyday life*. Pew Research Center, Washington,
8 D.C. [http://www.pewinternet.org/2017/10/04/americans-attitudes-toward-driverless-](http://www.pewinternet.org/2017/10/04/americans-attitudes-toward-driverless-vehicles/)
9 [vehicles/](http://www.pewinternet.org/2017/10/04/americans-attitudes-toward-driverless-vehicles/)

10 Sommer, K. 2013. *Mobility Study 2013*. Continental AG, Hanover, Germany.
11 [https://www.continental-corporation.com/en/press/initiatives-surveys/continental-mobility-](https://www.continental-corporation.com/en/press/initiatives-surveys/continental-mobility-studies/mobility-study-2013)
12 [studies/mobility-study-2013](https://www.continental-corporation.com/en/press/initiatives-surveys/continental-mobility-studies/mobility-study-2013)

13 Statistica.com. “Percentage of all global web pages served to mobile phones from 2009 to
14 2018”. [https://www.statista.com/statistics/241462/global-mobile-phone-website-traffic-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/241462/global-mobile-phone-website-traffic-share/)
15 [share/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/241462/global-mobile-phone-website-traffic-share/)

16 Turner, C. and R. McClure. 2003. Age and gender differences in risk-taking behaviour as an
17 explanation for high incidence of motor vehicle crashes as a driver in young males. *Injury*
18 *Control and Safety Promotion*, 10(3): 123-130. <https://doi.org/10.1076/icsp.10.3.123.14560>

19 Tussyadiah, I. P., F. J. Zach, and J. Wang. 2017. Attitudes Toward Autonomous on Demand
20 Mobility System: The Case of Self-Driving Taxi. In *Information and Communication*
21 *Technologies in Tourism 2017* (pp. 755-766). Springer, Cham

22 United Nations. 2017. Statistical Annex: Country Classification. In *World Economic Situation*
23 *and Prospects*.

24 United Nations General Assembly. 2015. *Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for*
25 *Sustainable Development*. <http://www.refworld.org/docid/57b6e3e44.html>

26 Underwood, S. E. 2014. Automated vehicles forecast vehicle symposium opinion survey.
27 Presented at the Automated Vehicles Symposium, San Francisco, CA.

28 World Bank, Development Research Group. n.d. “GINI index (World Bank estimate).” World
29 Bank Open Data. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI> (accessed May 2018).

30 World Bank, International Comparison Program database. n.d. “GDP per capita, PPP (constant
31 2011 international \$).” World Bank Open Data.
32 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.KD> (accessed May 2018)

33 World Health Organization [WHO]. 2015. *Global Status Report on Road Safety 2015*. World
34 Health Organization Press, Geneva.

35 World Health Organization [WHO]. n.d. “Road traffic deaths. Data by country” Global Health
36 Observatory data repository. Last updated May 16, 2018.
37 <http://apps.who.int/gho/data/node.main.A997?lang=en>

38 World Health Organization [WHO]. n.d. “Reported distribution of road traffic deaths by type of
39 road user. Data by country” Global Health Observatory data repository. Last updated
40 February 25, 2016. <http://apps.who.int/gho/data/node.main.A998?lang=en>

41 Xu, Z., Zhang, K., Min, H., Wang, Z., Zhao, X. and Liu, P., 2018. What drives people to accept
42 automated vehicles? Findings from a field experiment. *Transportation Research Part C:*
43 *Emerging Technologies*, 95, pp.320-334.

44 Zhang, T., Tao, D., Qu, X., Zhang, X., Lin, R. and Zhang, W., 2019. The roles of initial trust and
45 perceived risk in public’s acceptance of automated vehicles. *Transportation Research Part*
46 *C: Emerging Technologies*, 98, pp.207-220.

47

1 **APPENDIX**

2
3
4
5

Table A. Estimated Country Intercepts and Country Rank for AV Awareness, Current Perceptions of AV Safety and Future Predictions of Years Until AVs will be Safe Enough to Use

Country	Awareness		Current Perceptions of AV Safety		Years Until AVs will be Safe Enough to Use	
	Intercept	Rank	Intercept	Rank	Intercept	Rank
Vietnam	0.638	1	0.142	8	7.959	46
India	0.541	2	0.406	2	7.947	47
Brazil	0.459	3	0.406	2	5.565	51
United Arab Emirates	0.44	4	0.163	6	7.246	49
USA	0.403	5	-0.135	37	11.822	19
Portugal	0.389	6	0.213	5	8.649	39
Thailand	0.377	7	0.111	12	7.69	48
Switzerland	0.372	8	-0.04	28	10.903	22
Singapore	0.364	9	-0.099	35	10.197	28
South Korea	0.357	10	-0.166	42	8.726	38
Japan	0.354	11	0.031	21	8.603	41
China	0.351	12	-0.009	25	8.406	44
Israel	0.291	13	-0.02	27	9.808	29
Malaysia	0.271	14	0.075	17	7.068	50
Kenya	0.263	15	0.034	20	12.557	9
Netherlands	0.241	16	-0.076	32	14.728	1
Norway	0.2	17	0.093	15	12.385	12
Belgium	0.181	18	-0.002	24	10.702	25
Italy	0.178	19	-0.248	47	10.226	27
Morocco	0.172	20	-0.125	36	12.385	12
Australia	0.165	21	-0.05	30	12.485	10
UK	0.16	22	-0.223	46	14.264	2
Sweden	0.146	23	-0.192	44	13.656	6
Algeria	0.134	24	0.039	19	12.252	14
South Africa	0.124	25	-0.019	26	11.909	16
Austria	0.11	26	-0.292	49	13.69	5
Greece	0.108	28	0.259	3	9.194	35
Ireland	0.108	28	-0.175	43	11.828	18
Denmark	0.098	29	0.007	23	12.388	11
Canada	0.094	30	-0.165	41	13.842	4
Hong Kong	0.084	31	-0.076	32	11.253	21
Germany	0.065	32	-0.149	38	14.237	3
Philippines	0.063	33	-0.043	29	10.413	26
Bahrain	0.043	34	-0.083	34	10.869	24
Saudi Arabia	0.018	35	0.012	22	9.444	32
Pakistan	-0.041	36	-0.154	39	11.474	20
Egypt	-0.11	37	0.042	18	9.438	33
France	-0.138	38	-0.162	40	10.902	23
Ukraine	-0.143	39	-0.467	51	13.203	7
Spain	-0.146	40	0.158	7	8.909	36
Turkey	-0.153	41	-0.256	48	11.83	17
Russia	-0.161	42	-0.315	50	11.932	15
Mexico	-0.465	43	0.081	16	8.469	43
Argentina	-0.48	44	0.14	9	9.594	31
Indonesia	-0.486	45	-0.051	31	9.326	34
Colombia	-0.525	46	0.231	4	8.625	40
Venezuela	-0.541	47	0.119	10	8.539	42

Country	Awareness		Current Perceptions of AV Safety		Years Until AVs will be Safe Enough to Use	
	Intercept	Rank	Intercept	Rank	Intercept	Rank
Chile	-0.566	48	0.1	13	8.744	37
Poland	-0.616	49	-0.195	45	12.785	8
Peru	-0.659	50	0.112	11	8.392	45
Ecuador	-0.764	51	0.099	14	9.795	30

APPENDIX B. INTERNATIONAL SURVEY

This Appendix includes the full international survey as administered. This survey represents a collaboration among multiple researchers as part of the MIT Energy Initiative Mobility of the Future study and only a subset of the questions are analyzed for the purpose of this thesis. In addition to the sociodemographic information collected in the survey, the Dalia research system profiles of each respondent also include age, gender, education level (as low, medium, or high), urban vs. rural, and location information—country code, city name, latitude and longitude.

For ease of legibility of this appendix, the questions have been broken up into sections, but these headings were not displayed to respondents. Furthermore, the order of questions as they appear here may not directly match that experienced by respondents. Do to the mobile- phone based platform, all questions were presented in multiple choice format. Questions with circular radio buttons allow only one response category to be selected. Questions with square radio buttons allow multiple responses to be selected. Shaded blocks are used here to indicate questions that are displayed only for some respondents (based on their answers to previous questions). Simple instructions, registration on the Dalia platform (for new respondents), and a consent question preceded all the questions outline here.

Sociodemographics

Which best describes the place where you live?

- Countryside^[L]_[SEP]
- Town with fewer than 1,000 people^[L]_[SEP]
- Town with 1,000 - 50,000 people^[L]_[SEP]
- City with 50,000 - 250,000 people^[L]_[SEP]
- City with 250,000 - 1 million people
- City with 1 million - 5 million people
- City with 5 million - 10 million people
- City with more than 10 million people

What is your household's monthly income after taxes?

[Ranges were specified in U.S. dollars, but were automatically converted into local currency for respondents based on current market exchange rates and rounded to the nearest whole number.]

- Under 250^[L]_[SEP]
- 250 - 500^[L]_[SEP]
- 500 - 1,000^[L]_[SEP]
- 1,000 - 2,000^[L]_[SEP]
- 2,000 - 3,000^[L]_[SEP]

- 1 ○ 3,000 - 4,000
- 2 ○ 4,000 - 6,000
- 3 ○ 6,000 - 8,000
- 4 ○ 8,000 - 10,000
- 5 ○ 10,000 - 12,000
- 6 ○ 12,000 - 15,000
- 7 ○ More than 15,000
- 8 ○ Prefer not to say

9 Which of the following categories best describes your employment status?

- 10 ○ In school, university or practical training
- 11 ○ Employed, working 1 to 29 hours per week
- 12 ○ Employed, working 30 or more hours per week
- 13 ○ Self-employed / Freelancer / Entrepreneur / Employer
- 14 ○ Not employed, currently looking for work
- 15 ○ Not employed, currently NOT looking for work
- 16 ○ Disabled / not able to work
- 17 ○ Retired
- 18 ○ None of the above

19 While in school, university or practical training, are you...?

- 20 ○ ...not employed, currently NOT looking for work
- 21 ○ ...not employed, currently looking for work
- 22 ○ ...employed

23

Mobility Patterns

25 Do you own a car? ('Own' includes cars that are on long-term lease / financing plans)

- 26 ○ No, I don't
- 27 ○ No, but I have regular access to one
- 28 ○ Yes, I do

29 Which of the following do you take to get to work / school / other regular journey on a weekday?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Car: driver | <input type="checkbox"/> Tram |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Car: passenger | <input type="checkbox"/> Train |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle | <input type="checkbox"/> Underground / metro / subway |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Electric bicycle | <input type="checkbox"/> Other public transport |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Motorbike/scooter | <input type="checkbox"/> Taxi or other hired vehicle |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Boat / ferry | <input type="checkbox"/> Rickshaw |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Walking | <input type="checkbox"/> Other private vehicle |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bus or minibus | |

30 How many hours do you spend on transportation / commuting / trips per week- day?

- 31 ○ Less than 30 minutes
- 32 ○ 30 minutes - 1 hour
- 33 ○ 1-2hours
- 34 ○ 2-3hours

- 1 ○ 3-4hours
- 2 ○ More than 4 hours
- 3 What would roughly be the value (purchase price) of the next car you buy / lease? [Ranges were
- 4 again specified in U.S. dollars, but were automatically converted into local currency.] ^[L]_[SEP]
- 5 ○ Under 5,000^[L]_[SEP]
- 6 ○ 5,000 - 10,000^[L]_[SEP]
- 7 ○ 10,000 - 20,000^[L]_[SEP]
- 8 ○ 20,000 - 30,000
- 9 ○ 30,000 - 40,000^[L]_[SEP]
- 10 ○ 40,000 - 50,000^[L]_[SEP]
- 11 ○ 50,000 - 60,000^[L]_[SEP]
- 12 ○ 60,000 - 70,000^[L]_[SEP]
- 13 ○ 70,000 - 80,000^[L]_[SEP]
- 14 ○ More than 80,000
- 15 ○ No idea
- 16 Among your peers, what proportion of them do you think drive regularly? ^[L]_[SEP]
- 17 ○ All / Almost all
- 18 ○ Most of them^[L]_[SEP]
- 19 ○ Some of them
- 20 ○ Few of them ^[L]_[SEP]
- 21 ○ None / Almost none ^[L]_[SEP]
- 22

If the respondent owns or has regular access to a car:

On days when you drive, how many miles do you drive typically?

- None / not applicable^[L]_[SEP]
- Up to 10mi (16km)^[L]_[SEP]
- More than 10mi (16km) and up to 50mi (80km)
- More than 50 mi (80km) and up to 100mi (160km)
- More than 100 mi (160 km)

Where are your car(s) usually parked overnight?

- In a private garage^[L]_[SEP]
- In a public garage^[L]_[SEP]
- In a driveway^[L]_[SEP]
- Other off-street parking^[L]_[SEP]
- On the street / some other public location

For which of the following reasons do you use a car instead of other transport options? Please select all that apply.

- I don't have access to public transportation
- The public transportation isn't good enough
- I prefer to be independent^[L]_[SEP]

- I like owning something valuable
- It is more comfortable / relaxing
- I need it for long-distance travel
- I need it for transporting equipment and heavy objects
- I need it to drive my kids
- I prefer the privacy
- I can control my own schedule
- It is faster
- It is safer
- It is cheaper
- None of the above

1
2

Policy Support

4 If the government decides to improve overall transportation conditions in your location, which of
5 the following policies would you support? Please select up to three.

- 6 Build additional roads
- 7 Discourage the use of private automobiles in the city center
- 8 Expand bike lanes
- 9 Expand public transportation services (bus/train)
- 10 Improve pedestrian facilities (sidewalks, street crossings etc.)
- 11 Introduce car-free pedestrian zones in the city center
- 12 Lower public transportation fares
- 13 Prioritize public bus lanes and/or bus rapid transit
- 14 Provide clean energy-based public transportation options
- 15 Provide more parking spaces
- 16 Subsidize clean energy vehicles

17

Car Pride and Car Dependence

19 Which of these statements reflect your feelings about driving / using a car (now or in the future)?
20 Select all that apply

- 21 Driving meets my self esteem or personal image.
- 22 I would be ashamed if future financial circumstances prevented me from driving.
- 23 If more people saw me in / with my car, I would drive more.
- 24 I gain respect from my peers because I drive a car.
- 25 I would feel better about myself if I drove less.
- 26 A car is a sign of social status.
- 27 My lifestyle is dependent on having a car.
- 28 I don't have time to think about how I travel; I just get in my car and go.
- 29 I would like to reduce my car use, but there are no practical alternatives.
- 30 I am actively trying to use my car less.
- 31 I am not interested in reducing my car use.
- 32 I need a car for my job/work.
- 33 None of the above

1 Which of these statements reflect your feelings about owning a car (now or in the future)? Select
2 all that apply

- 3 Having a car is connected with my social image.
- 4 Others would see me as more successful if I owned a better car or more cars.
- 5 I have achieved in life and therefore I deserve to own a good car.
- 6 I feel proud of owning a car.
- 7 I have a sense of accomplishment after buying a car.
- 8 If I could, I would prefer not to own a car now or in the future.
- 9 None of the above

10

11 **Electric Vehicles**

12 Which of the following is true of your experience with electric vehicles? Select all that apply.

- 13 I know someone who has one
- 14 I have seen one in person.
- 15 I have seen an image of one
- 16 I have been in one
- 17 I own one.
- 18 None of these

19 Next time you buy / lease a car, how likely are you to buy an all-electric car?

- 20 Very likely
- 21 Somewhat likely
- 22 Not very likely
- 23 Not at all likely

24 If you were to buy an electric vehicle, what would be the minimum acceptable range for you on a
25 full charge?

- 26 10 mi (16 km)
- 27 50 mi (80 km)
- 28 100 mi (160 km)
- 29 200 mi (320 km)
- 30 300 mi (480 km)
- 31 More than 300 mi (480 km)
- 32 Don't know

33

34 **Autonomous Vehicles**

35 Have you seen, heard or read anything about self-driving cars?

- 36 Yes, a lot
- 37 Yes, a bit
- 38 No

39 How safe do you think self-driving cars are, as of now?

- 40 Very safe
- 41 Somewhat safe
- 42 Not very safe

- 1 ○ Not safe at all
- 2 ○ Not sure

3

If the respondent does not select “very safe” above:

How soon, if at all, do you think self-driving cars will be safe enough for you to consider using one?

- Within the next 2 years
- Within the next 5 years
- Within the next 10 years
- Within the next 20 years
- More than 20 years
- Never (50)
- Don't know

4