

OCT 25 1973

29340

UM-HSRI-AL-73-7

1971 and 1973 ASAP SURVEYS: WASHTENAW AND JACKSON  
COUNTY VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

Marion M. Chapman  
Arthur C. Wolfe

October 1973

Final Report

Prepared for

Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program  
Washtenaw County Health Department  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

by

Highway Safety Research Institute  
The University of Michigan  
Huron Parkway & Baxter Rd.  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

1. Report No. UM-HSRI-AL-73-7	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle 1971 and 1973 ASAP Surveys: Washtenaw and Jackson County Voluntary Organizations		5. Report Date October 1973	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) Marion M. Chapman, Arthur C. Wolfe		8. Performing Organization Report No. UM-HSRI-AL-73-7	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Highway Safety Research Institute The University of Michigan Huron Parkway & Baxter Road Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105		10. Work Unit No	
		11. Contract or Grant No FH-11-7535	
		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program Washtenaw County Health Department Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
		15. Supplementary Notes	
16. Abstract <p>Two surveys of voluntary organizations were conducted in Washtenaw County and Jackson County, Michigan, in 1971 and 1973. The surveys were one element of the evaluation procedures for the Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program (WCASAP). Jackson County was chosen as a comparison county because of its similarity to Washtenaw County and its lack of an ASAP-like program. In 1971, 13 service clubs in Washtenaw provided 370 completed questionnaires and 13 matching clubs in Jackson provided 420 questionnaires. In 1973, nine Washtenaw clubs provided 232 questionnaires and eight Jackson clubs provided 320 questionnaires.</p> <p>In conclusion, no significant changes occurred among Washtenaw County service club members with respect to their knowledge about the role of alcohol in highway crashes and about drinking-driving laws, or their attitudes about drinking &amp; driving, or their self-reported driving-after-drinking behavior. The preliminary objective of informing service club members about the existence of WCASAP activities was achieved, although the unusually high level of educational achievement &amp; civic interest generally found in service club members undoubtedly facilitated that task.</p>			
17. Key Words		18. Distribution Statement	
19. Security Classif (of this report)	20. Security Classif.(of this page)	21. No of Pages	22. Price

## NOTICES

Sponsorship. This report was prepared for the Washtenaw County (Michigan) Board of Commissioners under an agreement dated November 4, 1970 between the Board and The University of Michigan.

This report forms part of the Highway Safety Research Institute's evaluation of the Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program (ASAP). The Board is prime contractor to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, under Contract Number FH-11-7535 for the Washtenaw County ASAP. The program is administered by the Washtenaw County Health Department, James Henderson, Program Director.

Contracts and grants to The University of Michigan for the support of sponsored research by the Highway Safety Research Institute are administered through the Office of the Vice-President for Research.

The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Washtenaw County.

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability of its contents or use thereof.

## PREFACE

The Highway Safety Research Institute has undertaken a number of activities pertaining to its evaluation of the Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program, including roadside surveys, surveys of the general public and selected target groups, and collection and analysis of crash, arrest, and recidivism data.

These activities and their findings are described in separately bound reports consistent with the reporting structure of the sponsoring agencies. This structure enables the reader interested in a single topic to access the relevant report conveniently. However, the individual reports in this series largely do not contain comparative data derived from separate evaluative activities. Such comparisons, when appropriate, will be found in the summary report cited below.

Reports in this series which are completed, in process, or planned for the Fall 1973 are listed below:

1. Washtenaw County 1971, 1972 and 1973 BAC Roadside Survey, UM-HSRI-AL-73-6.
2. 1971 and 1973 ASAP Surveys: Washtenaw and Jackson County Voluntary Organizations, UM-HSRI-AL-73-7.
3. 1971 and 1973 ASAP Surveys: Washtenaw County Physicians, UM-HSRI-AL-73-8.
4. 1971 and 1973 ASAP Surveys: Washtenaw County General Public, UM-HSRI-AL-73-9.
5. 1971 and 1973 ASAP Surveys: Washtenaw County Attorneys, UM-HSRI-AL-73-10.
6. 1971 and 1973 ASAP Surveys: Washtenaw County Law Enforcement Agencies, UM-HSRI-AL-73-11.
7. 1971 and 1973 ASAP Surveys: Washtenaw County High School Students, UM-HSRI-AL-73-12.
8. Analysis of Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program Police Countermeasure Activity, UM-HSRI-AL-73.13.
9. Analysis of Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program Judicial, Referral and Diagnostic Activity, UM-HSRI-AL-73-14.

10. Analysis of Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program Treatment Countermeasures, UM-HSRI-AL-73-15.
11. Analysis of Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program Crash, Criterion Measures, UM-HSRI-AL-73-16.
12. Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program Evaluation Summary, UM-HSRI-AL-73-17.

The cooperation of many service clubs both in Washtenaw County and in Jackson County was an essential factor in making the present study possible. We express our appreciation to the members of those groups who completed questionnaires for the 1971 and 1973 surveys.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Notices	ii
Preface	iii
1. Summary and Conclusions	1
2. Purpose and Methodology	5
3. Analysis of Results	6
3.1 Knowledge of the Role of Alcohol in Accidents	6
3.2 Knowledge of ASAP Countermeasures and Related Activities	9
3.3 Drinking and Driving Behavior	11
3.4 Attitudes Toward Drunk Driving Countermeasures	11
Appendix--Codebook with Marginals for 1971 and 1973 ASAP Surveys: Washtenaw and Jackson County Voluntary Organizations	

## 1. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In 1971 and 1973, service clubs in Washtenaw and Jackson\* counties were surveyed for the purpose of obtaining data for evaluation of the effectiveness of the Washtenaw Alcohol Safety Action Program public information and education campaign. In 1973, 13 service clubs in Washtenaw and 13 matching clubs in Jackson participated in the survey. In 1971, nine clubs in Washtenaw and eight in Jackson participated. The surveys were conducted by self-administered questionnaires which were completed by members in attendance at a meeting of each club. Washtenaw clubs provided 370 completed questionnaires in 1971 and 232 in 1973, while Jackson clubs provided 420 in 1971 and 320 in 1973.

Club members from both counties in both years tended to be male, over the age of 45 and to hold at least one college degree. Washtenaw club respondents, however, were more likely to have pursued post graduate study. In 1973, 46% indicated post graduate work compared with 32% of the Jackson respondents.

In regard to knowledge of the role of alcohol in accidents, the proportion of respondents in both counties who estimated correctly the number of traffic fatalities in the previous year in their county increased from 1971 to 1973, but Jackson respondents in both years were more likely to be correct than Washtenaw respondents. Majorities of respondents each year thought that over half of all fatal traffic crashes involve alcohol and majorities in both years felt that social drinkers rather than problem drinkers were more responsible for such crashes.

More than half the respondents in both counties in 1973 estimated that two drinks or fewer were the maximum that a 150-pound

---

\*Jackson County, Michigan, was selected as a comparison county because it did not have an ASAP-like program and was similar to Washtenaw County in area, rural/urban land use, and road miles, Jackson County is contiguous with Washtenaw County.

person could consume in one hour prior to driving and still be a safe driver. In 1971, the majority of respondents had made higher estimates of the limit of drinks for safe driving. Respondents in 1973, however, were more likely to underestimate the accident risk following consumption of six and nine drinks compared with 1971.

The majority of respondents in both years underestimated the maximum number of drinks a 150-pound person could consume in one hour before reaching the presumptive minimum BAC for Impaired driving. An analysis of the personal drinking limits, which were calculated for each respondent in 1973 based on his reported body weight, showed that most respondents underestimated their own drinking limit for safe and legal driving at .05 and .07 BAC, respectively. Respondents were also found to have underestimated their personal accident risk following consumption of six and nine drinks. Thus, although estimates of drinking limits for safe driving were too low, there was no demonstrated awareness of the increased accident risk following consumption of higher numbers of drinks.

In April 1972, the presumptive minimum BACs for Driving Under the Influence of Liquor (DUIL) and for the lesser included offense of Impaired driving were reduced from .15 to .10 and from .10 to .08 respectively. In 1971, only 7% of Washtenaw and 11% of Jackson respondents knew that the presumptive minimum for Impaired driving was .10, and even fewer (3% in Washtenaw and 5% in Jackson) knew the reduced minimum in 1973 was .08. With regard to the presumptive minimum BAC for DUIL, 12% of Washtenaw and 11% of Jackson respondents gave the correct answer of .10 in 1973. Two-fifths to one-half of respondents in both counties in both years gave answers which were not nearly correct. The remainder made estimates which were either correct or nearly correct numbers but had missing or misplaced decimals.

In regard to knowledge of ASAP countermeasures and related activities, Washtenaw service club respondents were more informed about the ASAP activities than the Jackson club respondents. Washtenaw club respondents were most likely to have heard about



the roadside breathtesting surveys (60%) and the special alcohol education classes for convicted drunk drivers (57%), and 44% had heard of four or more of the eight listed countermeasures, compared with 18% of the Jackson County respondents. Washtenaw club respondents were also more aware of ASAP activities than the general public surveyed in Washtenaw County in 1973. No more than one-third of the general public had heard of each of the activities, and only 20% had heard of four or more.

In terms of their own reported driving-after-drinking behavior, service club members in both counties reported more involvement than the Washtenaw County general public. There was little change in 1973 from the 1971 findings that roughly three-quarters of service club members had driven after drinking some alcohol in the previous year and 27% to 30% had driven after drinking too much alcohol in the previous year. There is then, no evidence to support a conclusion that the public information campaign effectively reduced driving-after-drinking behavior among Washtenaw County service club respondents.

There were few changes in attitudes about countermeasure activities. In both years, majorities of respondents in both counties disagreed that "too much fuss was being made about the dangers of drinking and driving". Most felt that stronger punishment of convicted drunk drivers would be effective but that problem drinkers convicted of drunk driving should be placed in treatment programs rather than given severe penalties.

A majority of Washtenaw respondents in both surveys supported the use of Antabuse<sup>(R)</sup> \* with problem drinkers convicted of drunk driving, but a significance\*\* decrease in support from 40% to 31% was found among Jackson respondents.

Support for enabling police to conduct random road checks and require breath tests increased significantly in Washtenaw

---

\*Antabuse is the registered brand name of the drug disulfiram produced by Ayerst Laboratories.

\*\*In the present report, all tests of significance are one-tailed and assume a 95% confidence level.

from 58% in 1971 to 68% in 1973. But fewer than half the respondents either year agreed that police should patrol private parties. There was continued majority support for requiring breath tests from persons involved in highway crashes if they appeared to have been drinking. Support by majorities was also found in both years for having bartenders and private hosts limit the alcohol consumption of customers or guests who must drive home. A majority of respondents also felt that bars should provide breathtesting devices for customers who wish to use them.

In conclusion, no significant changes occurred among Washtenaw County service club members with respect to their knowledge about the role of alcohol in highway crashes and about drinking-driving laws, or their attitudes about drinking and driving, or their self-reported driving-after-drinking behavior. The preliminary objective of informing service club members about the existence of WCASAP activities was achieved, although the unusually high level of educational achievement and civic interest generally found in service club members undoubtedly facilitated that task.

## 2. PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

Evaluation of the ASAP public information and education campaign was conducted by pre- and post campaign surveys of key groups within the Washtenaw County population and a household survey of residents throughout the County. Service clubs were one of the targets of the campaign and the present report consists of the analysis of data collected for evaluation of the impact of the campaign on those groups. In addition to service clubs in Washtenaw County, matching clubs in Jackson County, Michigan, which did not have an ASAP, were surveyed for comparison with Washtenaw County clubs.

The objectives of the campaign with regard to service clubs were to increase knowledge and concern about the drinking driving problem and to develop a base of support for the ASAP counter-measures directed to the problem. A speakers bureau was established early in the operational phase of the campaign and acted as the primary vehicle for achieving those objectives. In all, approximately 30 Washtenaw County clubs with a total membership of 900 were addressed. Other elements of the campaign which were designed to impact the general public and specific professional groups, such as attorneys and physicians, were expected to find some service club members in the audience. Such persons were expected to be particularly responsive both as a result of their demonstrated civic interest and as a result of interest generated by ASAP presentations to their clubs.

The surveys were conducted by mailed self-administered questionnaires which were completed in meetings of selected service clubs. In 1971, 13 clubs in Washtenaw County and 13 clubs in Jackson County participated, providing a total of 370 questionnaires from Washtenaw and 425 questionnaires from Jackson. In 1973, nine Washtenaw and eight Jackson clubs provided 232 Washtenaw and 320 Jackson County questionnaires.

Respondents in both surveys were most likely to be male, over the age of 45, and to hold at least one college degree. Washtenaw County respondents differed from Jackson respondents only on the basis of education. Forty-one percent in 1971 and 46% in 1973 had pursued at least some post graduate study, compared with 29% and 32% of the Jackson respondents in 1971 and 1973 respectively.

### 3. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

#### 3.1 KNOWLEDGE OF THE ROLE OF ALCOHOL IN ACCIDENTS

A significant increase was found in the proportion of respondents in both counties who knew how many persons had been killed in traffic crashes in their county during the previous year. Given a range of 10-49 for "correct" Jackson responses, and 50-99 for "correct" Washtenaw responses, 46% of the Washtenaw responses were correct in 1973 and 32% in 1971, and 61% of the Jackson responses were correct in 1971 and 46% in 1973.\* It was noteworthy from the point of view of a realistic assessment of the problem of traffic fatalities, that in 1973 only 3% of the Washtenaw respondents gave answers higher than 1000, compared with 28% in 1971. In terms of campaign evaluation, however, no effect can be attributed to the ASAP activity in Washtenaw County. The increase in correct answers in Jackson was actually slightly greater than in Washtenaw (15% vs. 14%), and there was no effort to educate Jackson residents specifically about traffic fatality statistics.

There were no statistically significant changes in the estimates made by respondents of the proportion of fatal crashes which are alcohol-related. The majority in both counties in both surveys thought that 50% to 80% of such crashes are alcohol-related. Majorities in both surveys also felt that social drinkers rather than problem drinkers were more likely to be involved in those crashes.

Respondents in 1973 were most likely to think that two or fewer drinks were as many as a 150-pound person could have before driving and still be a safe driver. The trend in both counties was toward lower estimates of the maximum number of drinks for

---

\*The exact number of fatalities are shown below for each county by year.

	<u>1970</u>	<u>1972</u>
Washtenaw County	78	69
Jackson County	29	38

safe driving. In 1971, 29% in Washtenaw and 30% in Jackson had thought that three or more drinks were safe, compared with 15% and 20% respectively in 1973. Although there was little change in the proportion of respondents in both counties who correctly estimated that a 150-pound person who consumes six drinks in one hour will be 6-10 times more likely to have an accident than if he had not been drinking (approximately one-third were correct), the tendency of 1971 respondents to overestimate the accident risk was reversed, with 45% in Washtenaw and 43% in Jackson in 1973 underestimating the accident risk following consumption of six drinks in one hour. With only minimal differences between counties, a similar tendency to underestimate was found in responses to the question of how many times the risk of accident would increase following consumption of nine drinks in one hour by a 150-pound person. The proportion in both counties who correctly estimated the increased accident risk at 50-100 times decreased from approximately 25% in 1971 to 15% in 1973. Three-fourths of both counties in 1973 made estimates lower than 50, compared with two-thirds in 1971.

Respondents were asked also to estimate the number of drinks which a 150-pound person could consume before reaching a blood alcohol concentration high enough to be presumed to be an impaired driver by Michigan law. In 1971, when the presumptive minimum BAC for impaired driving was .10, 19% in Washtenaw and 15% in Jackson correctly thought that four drinks would be the limit, and the majority of respondents in both counties made lower estimates. In 1973, when the presumptive minimum BAC for impaired driving was reduced to .08, 35-40% correctly estimated the limit of drinks at three. Again, however, the majority of respondents made lower estimates.

A ratio was calculated for each respondent based on the answer given to the question of how many drinks a person could consume in one hour and still be a safe driver and the answer given to the question of how many drinks a person could consume in one hour before reaching the .10 BAC. For example, a respondent who thought his limit for safe driving was three drinks and for legal driving was five drinks would have a ratio of 3/5.

Analysis of the distributions of those ratios showed that the majority of Washtenaw and Jackson respondents in each survey thought that the maximum number of drinks for safe driving was fewer than the maximum number of drinks before impaired driving. But approximately two-fifths of all respondents in both surveys had ratios of unity or higher.

Three ratios were also obtained for each respondent in 1973 using as numerators his answers to the question of the number of safe driving drinks, the number of pre-impaired driving drinks and the number of pre-DUIL drinks and as denominators the correct answers for each respondent which were calculated by finding the number of drinks which he could consume to reach .05, .07 and .10 BAC based on his reported body weight. Ratios were thus obtained for perceived vs. calculated safe driving drinks, perceived vs. calculated pre-impaired driving drinks, and perceived vs. calculated pre-DUIL drinks. Analysis of the distributions of these three sets of ratios showed that a majority of respondents in both counties underestimated their real maximum limits in all three conditions.

Ratios were also calculated for 1973 respondents based on the responses to the questions of increased accident risk following consumption of six and nine drinks and the actual risk to each respondent which was found by determining the respondent's BAC at six and nine drinks based on his body weight and then determining the accident risks at those BAC's from the statistical findings of the Borkenstein study in Grand Rapids.\* Again, the majority of respondents in both counties were found to have underestimated the accident risk to themselves following six and nine drinks.

In 1972, the presumptive minimum BACs for Driving Under the Influence of Liquor (DUIL) and for the lesser included offense of Impaired driving in Michigan were reduced from .15 to .10 and from .10 to .08 respectively. Respondents in both surveys were asked

---

\*R.F. Borkenstein, et.al. The Role of the Drinking Driver in Traffic Accidents. Department of Police Administration, Indiana University, 1964.

to state the presumptive minimum for impaired driving and in 1973, also the minimum for DUIL. The table below shows the percentages of respondents who gave the correct answer for impaired driving of .10 in 1971 and .08 in 1973, and the correct answer for DUIL of .15 in 1971 and .10 in 1973. Additional percentages are shown for 1971 answers of .10 or .15 for impaired driving and for 1973 answers of .15 for DUIL to illustrate the extent of confusion about the minimums. The percentage of answers not nearly correct (which exclude answers which were correct or nearly correct in number but had misplaced decimals) are shown to inform the reader that two-fifths to one-half of the respondents were very confused about the minimums.

ESTIMATES OF PRESUMPTIVE MINIMUM BAC FOR IMPAIRED DRIVING AND DUIL IN MICHIGAN (IN PERCENT BY COUNTY AND YEAR)

	<u>Washtenaw</u> <u>County</u>		<u>Jackson</u> <u>County</u>	
	<u>1971</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1973</u>
Impaired Driving				
.08	--	3	--	5
.10	7	--	11	--
.10 or .15	22	21	22	13
Not nearly correct	40	41	46	52
DUIL				
.10	--	12	--	11
.15	--	10	--	8
Not nearly correct	--	48	--	53

3.2 KNOWLEDGE OF ASAP COUNTERMEASURES AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

In 1973 more than half (59%) of the service club members surveyed in Washtenaw County had heard of the local Alcohol Safety Action Program. The table below shows the percentage of Washtenaw respondents who were aware of each of eight listed countermeasures and activities in the local program. Jackson County service club members were asked the same questions except that the frame of reference given for the countermeasure activity was "several counties" in Michigan, rather than Washtenaw County. The countermeasure most frequently recognized by Jackson



respondents (47%) was increased DUI arrests, which had been publicized in many newspapers throughout the state but which related to statewide statistics and not Washtenaw County specifically. Approximately one-third of Jackson members also were aware of a local public information and education campaign, perhaps as a result of the cover letters sent to the clubs as part of the present survey activities. All other countermeasures were recognized by less than one-third of the Jackson respondents.

AWARENESS OF ASAP COUNTERMEASURES AND ACTIVITIES  
BY WASHTENAW VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

<u>Countermeasures and Activities</u>	<u>%</u>
Roadside breathtesting surveys	60
Special alcohol education classes	57
Increased DUI arrests	49
The use of Antabuse by convicted drunk drivers who were problem drinkers	45
Local public information and education campaign	43
Counseling in couple's clubs	34
Special ASAP probation officers	27
Special ASAP police patrols	23

In contrast Washtenaw respondents were very well informed, particularly with regard to the roadside surveys which were conducted annually during the three-year period of ASAP in the County. Each survey was intentionally publicized in local newspapers throughout the county just prior to its beginning and apparently drew much interest from service club members. Perhaps the finding that a higher proportion of service club members reported having driven after drinking than the general public surveyed in Washtenaw County may explain some of their interest in the roadside breathtesting surveys. The second most frequently recognized countermeasure, special alcohol education classes for convicted drunk drivers, may have been remembered from the presentations by ASAP speakers who were directly affiliated with those classes as instructors.

Washtenaw service club members were more informed than the Washtenaw County general public surveyed in 1973. The special alcohol education classes were the most frequently recognized by the Washtenaw general public, but the proportion who had heard of those classes was only 33% of the total sample. An analysis of cumulative positive responses to the countermeasures questions showed that only 20% of the Washtenaw County general public were aware of half or more of the eight countermeasures, compared with 44% of the service club members.

### 3.3 DRINKING AND DRIVING BEHAVIOR

There is no evidence that the campaign effectively reduced the incidence of service club members themselves driving after drinking. There was little change in the proportion of service club respondents in either county who reported that they had driven after drinking some alcohol in the previous year. In Washtenaw, 77% in 1971 and 74% in 1973 had driven after drinking at least once in the previous year, compared with 72% in 1971 and 75% in 1973 in Jackson. Compared with the general public surveyed in 1973 in Washtenaw County, 61% of whom reported some driving-after-drinking behavior, service club members in either county were more highly involved in the behavior. In 1973, 23% of Washtenaw and 28% of Jackson respondents had driven after drinking 25 or more times in the previous year, compared with 15% of the Washtenaw County general public.

There was also no change between surveys in the proportion of respondents who reported having driven after drinking too much in the previous year. In 1971, 29% of the Washtenaw and 27% of the Jackson respondents had reported driving after drinking too much at least once, compared to 30% and 27% respectively in 1973. One-fourth of the Washtenaw County general public in 1973 reported having driven after drinking too much at least occasionally during the previous year.

### 3.4 ATTITUDES TOWARD DRUNK DRIVING COUNTERMEASURES

Respondents were asked to indicate their opinion about each of several statements by checking "agree strongly", "tend to agree", "tend to disagree", or "disagree strongly". In 1971, 89%

of Washtenaw and 88% of Jackson club respondents at least tended to disagree that "too much fuss is being made about the dangers of drinking and driving". There was little change in 1973, with 87% of Washtenaw and 86% disagreeing with the statement.

Approximately three-fourths of the respondents in both counties in both 1971 and 1973 agreed that stronger punishment of drunk drivers would help to reduce the problem. The proportion of respondents who agreed that problem drinkers who were convicted of drunk driving should be placed on probation and into a counseling or treatment program rather than given severe penalties changed little in Washtenaw from 88% in 1971 to 82% in 1973, and in Jackson from 82% in 1971 to 74% in 1973. Thus, a majority in both counties agreed with the value of stronger punishment for drunk drivers in general, but preferred counseling for problem drinkers convicted of drunk driving.

A negligible change was found in the proportion of Washtenaw respondents who agreed that "persons convicted of drunk driving should be required to take pills which cause them to be sick if they drink alcohol" (50% in 1971 and 52% in 1973). But a significant decrease was found in the Jackson respondents who were of that opinion (40% in 1971 and 31% in 1973). In 1973, 81% of the Washtenaw respondents agreed that the government should be involved in medical and psychological treatment programs for drunk drivers compared with 74% in Jackson. This represented a slight increase in Washtenaw from 73% in 1971 and a slight decrease in Jackson from 77%. In 1973, 67% of Washtenaw and 65% of Jackson respondents disagreed with the statement "that no matter how much effort is invested, there is not likely to be much effect on the drunk driver problem". There were no data on this question for comparison with 1971.

More than three-fourths of each county in 1973 agreed that most drunk drivers are not apprehended by the police. Half or fewer of both counties felt that police should patrol private parties, but more than half in each county agreed that police should carry out random road checks to catch drivers who have drunk too much and should be able to require anyone who is stopped to take an alcohol breath test. In Washtenaw, the

proportion who agreed with random road checks increased significantly from 58% in 1971 to 68% in 1973. Over 90% in both counties agreed that breath tests to determine blood alcohol concentration should be required whenever a driver who appears to have been drinking is involved in a highway crash. The proportion of Washtenaw respondents who agreed that breathtesting devices should be provided in bars increased slightly from 71% in 1971 to 77% in 1973, compared with 65% of Jackson respondents in 1971 and 67% in 1973. In 1973, 68% of Washtenaw members agreed that bartenders should limit the number of drinks they will serve to customers who plan to drive, compared with 64% of the Jackson members. There was a small increase from 93% in 1971 to 97% in 1973, in the proportion of Washtenaw respondents who agreed that a good host at a party will try to see that his guests who must drive home do not drink too much and a similarly small increase from 92% in 1971 to 96% in 1973 among Jackson respondents.

APPENDIX

CODEBOOK WITH MARGINALS FOR 1971 AND 1973 ASAP SURVEYS:  
WASHTENAW AND JACKSON COUNTY VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

## INTRODUCTION

The following codebook with marginals contains the results of two surveys of voluntary organizations in Washtenaw County and Jackson County, Michigan, in 1971 and 1973. The surveys were conducted as one element of the evaluation procedures for the Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program (WCASAP).

The abbreviations of WC and JC have been used throughout the codebook to identify results from Washtenaw County and Jackson County respectively. Results from the 1971 survey are presented in parentheses and the results from the 1973 survey are free-standing. In 1971, 420 completed questionnaires were received from Washtenaw clubs and 370 questionnaires were received from Jackson clubs. In 1973, Washtenaw clubs provided 232 questionnaires and Jackson clubs provided 320.

The results for categorical variables are presented as percentages. Percentiles were calculated for numeric variables and the tenth, thirtieth, fiftieth, seventieth and nintieth percentiles are presented. In most cases, column percentages add to 100, but for multiple response variables, the percentages are based on dividing the number of mentions of a category by the number of respondents, and thus usually add to more than 100. Numbers preceded by an asterisk (\*) are actual frequencies. Missing data were excluded from all percentage and percentile calculations and are presented as frequencies.

When responses have been placed in an "other" category, the substantive content of these responses has been listed following the "other" heading.

## INDEX TO VARIABLES

<u>Variable Number</u>	<u>Variable Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Data Set Number (15)	1
2	County	1
3	Respondent ID Number	1
4	Group	1
50	Sex	12
51	Age	12
52	Age-6	13
53	Age-8	13
54	Weight	13
55	Education	13
	<b>ALCOHOL AND ACCIDENTS</b>	
5	County Fatalities	2
6	County Fatalities-8	2
7	Alcohol Fatalities %	2
8	Alcohol Fatalities %-8	2
9	Social/Problem Drinker	3
23	Safe Drinks	6
24	Accident 6 Drinks	6
25	Accident 6 Drinks-8	6
26	Accident 9 Drinks	7
27	Accident 9 Drinks-8	7
28	Impaired Drinks	7
29	DUIL Drinks	7
30	Safe-Impaired Ratio	8
31	Safe-DUIL Ratio	8
32	Impaired-DUIL Ratio	8
33	Perceived/Real Safe Ratio	8
34	Perceived/Real Impaired Ratio	8
35	Perceived/Real DUIL Ratio	9
36	Perceived/Real 6 Drinks Ratio	9
37	Perceived/Real 9 Drinks Ratio	9
38	Impaired BAC	9
39	Correct Impaired BAC	10
40	DUIL BAC	10
41	Correct DUIL BAC	10
	<b>KNOWLEDGE OF ASAP COUNTERMEASURES</b>	
10	Heard of WASAP	3
11	Special Patrols	3
12	Roadside Surveys	3
13	Antabuse	3
14	Local Campaign	3
15	More DUIL's	3
16	Special Classes	3
17	Probation Officers	4
18	Couples Clubs	4
19	Total CM's Known	4
20	Heard of DAD Problem	4
21	DAD Media	4
22	DAD Messages	4
42	ASAP Tax Support	10

<u>Variable Number</u>	<u>Variable Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>DRINKING AND DRIVING BEHAVIOR</b>		
43	Ever Drink Alcohol	11
44	Times DAD One	11
45	Times DAD-7	11
46	Times Driven Drunk	11
47	Times Driven Drunk-7	11
48	Times Other Way Home	12
49	% Avoided DAD-9	12
<b>ATTITUDES TOWARD DRUNK DRIVING COUNTERMEASURES</b>		
56	Law Requiring Belt	14
57	Too Much Fuss	14
58	Stronger Punishment	14
59	Test in Bars	14
60	Bartender Should Limit	15
61	Police Patrol Parties	15
62	Host Should Limit	15
63	Test Drunk Crash	15
64	Test Random Check	15
65	DUIL Take Antabuse	16
66	Counsel Not Punish	16
67	DUIL Not Caught	16
68	Gov't Should Help	16
69	Effect Not Likely	16



Variable Number

V1 R1 Data Set Number (15)

V2 R2 County

TS Freqs.

232  
(370)  
320  
(425)

- 1. Washtenaw
- 2. Jackson

V3 R3 Respondent ID Number

V4 R4 Group

Freqs.

33  
(45)  
19  
(26)  
0  
(8)  
4  
(10)  
0  
(19)  
54  
(81)  
11  
(15)  
31  
(30)  
23  
(29)  
15  
(30)  
0  
(32)  
42  
(45)

- 01. Ann Arbor Business & Professional Women's Club
- 02. Ypsilanti Lions Club
- 03. Ypsilanti Civitan Club
- 04. YMCA
- 05. Ann Arbor Breakfast Optimist Club
- 06. Ann Arbor Rotary Club
- 07. Whitmore Lake Kiwanis Club
- 08. Milan Rotary Club
- 10. Ann Arbor Noon Optimist
- 11. Ann Arbor Exchange Club
- 12. Ann Arbor Zonta Club
- 13. Ann Arbor Jaycees

42  
(73)  
0  
(21)  
0  
(11)  
22  
(21)  
0  
(25)  
91  
(93)  
17  
(11)  
36  
(35)  
54  
(32)  
24  
(29)  
0  
(11)  
34  
(45)  
0  
(18)

- 51. Jackson Business & Professional Women's Club
- 52. Jackson Cascades Lions Club
- 53. Jackson Civitan Club
- 54. Jackson Hi-Twelve Club (YMCA)
- 55. Jackson Optimist Club
- 56. Jackson Rotary Club
- 57. Kiwanis Club of Jackson, East
- 58. Jackson Exchange Club
- 59. Jackson Jaycees
- 60. Cascades Exchange Club
- 61. Altrusa Club of Jackson
- 62. Napoleon Lions Club
- 63. Zonta Club of Jackson

	WC	JC	V5	R5 County Fatalities (Q1. About how many persons would you guess were killed in traffic accidents in Washtenaw County in 1972?)	MD=998,999
10.	<u>26</u>	<u>15</u>			
	(25)	(22)			
30.	50	25		ACTUAL NUMBER CODED	
	(60)	(34)			
50.	70	35		996. 996 to 1000	
	(90)	(50)		997. Over 1000 (1000+; 3000;3500;4000;5000(2 entries); 21870)	
70.	95	50		998. DK	
	(700)	(85)		999. NA	
90.	200	128			
	(997)	(997)			

	WC	JC	V6	R5A County Fatalities-8 (R5 collapsed)	MD=9
	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>		0. None	
	(0)	(0)			
	*2	2		1. 1-19	
	(1)	(1)			
	24	61		2. 10-49	
	(18)	(46)			
	22	13		3. 50-69	
	(18)	(15)			
	24	6		4. 70-99	
	(14)	(8)			
	18	10		5. 100-199	
	(12)	(9)			
	9	6		6. 200-995	
	(9)	(6)			
	3	4		7. Over 996	
	(28)	(14)			
	*1	1		8. DK	
	(1)	(1)			
	*6	*10		9. NA	
	(*13)	(*11)			

	WC	JC	V7	R6 Alcohol Fatalities % (Q2. In general, out of every 100 traffic accidents in which someone is killed, how many would you guess involve a driver who has been drinking?)	MD=98,99
10.	<u>30</u>	<u>29</u>			
	(30)	(25)			
30.	50	50		ACTUAL NUMBER CODED	
	(50)	(50)			
50.	54	55		96. 96-100	
	(60)	(50)		97. Over 100	
70.	65	69		98. DK	
	(67)	(65)		99. NA	
90.	80	80			
	(80)	(76)			

	WC	JC	V8	R6A Alcohol Fatalities %-8 (R6 collapsed)	MD=9
	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>		0. None	
	(0)	(0)			
	4	2		1. 1-19%	
	(2)	(6)			
	10	12		2. 20-34%	
	(11)	(10)			
	9	10		3. 35-49%	
	(10)	(11)			
	23	24		4. 50%	
	(23)	(23)			
	24	21		5. 51-65%	
	(24)	(19)			
	23	26		6. 66-80%	
	(26)	(25)			
	7	5		7. Over 80%	
	(5)	(5)			
	0	0		8. DK	
	(0)	(1)			
	*1	*3		9. NA	
	(*5)	(*7)			

V9 R7 Social/Problem Drinker (Q3. Would you think that more alcohol-related fatal accidents are caused by the many social drinkers who occasionally drink too much, or by the smaller number of problem drinkers who frequently drink a great deal?) MD=9

WC	JC	
55	67	1. More caused by social drinkers
(59)	(64)	
45	33	2. More caused by problem drinkers
(41)	(36)	
0	0	8. DK .
(*1)	(0)	
*1	*1	9. NA
(0)	(*2)	

V10 R8 Heard of WASAP (Q4. As you may know, in Washtenaw County the police, the courts, the health department, and the Council on Alcoholism have been working together in a program to reduce accidents involving drunk drivers. Have you happened to hear of the Washtenaw Alcohol Safety Action Program (WASAP)?) MD=9

WC	JC	
59	41	1. Yes
41	59	5. No
*3	*4	9. NA

V11 R9 Special Patrols (Q5. Have you happened to see or hear anything about the following activities of this program? Q5a. Special police patrols looking for drunk drivers?) MD=9

WC	JC	
23	12	1. Yes
77	88	5. No
*10	*6	9. NA

V12 R10 Roadside Surveys (Q5b. Roadside breathtesting surveys?) MD=9

WC	JC	
60	19	1. Yes
40	81	5. No
*7	*8	9. NA

V13 R11 Antabuse (Q5c. Courts asking convicted drunk drivers to take pills which make them sick if they drink alcohol?) MD=9

WC	JC	
45	4	1. Yes
55	96	5. No
*8	*13	9. NA

V14 R12 Local Campaign (Q5d. Local campaign to get drivers to know their own safe alcohol limits?) MD=9

WC	JC	
43	35	1. Yes
57	65	5. No
*9	*7	9. NA

V15 R13 More DUI's (Q5e. More drunk driving arrests?) MD=9

WC	JC	
49	47	1. Yes
51	58	5. No
*14	*13	9. NA

V16 R14 Special Classes (Q5f. Special alcohol education course for drunk drivers?) MD=9

WC	JC	
57	29	1. Yes
43	71	5. No
*9	*11	9. NA

			<b>V17 R15 Probation Officers (Q5g. Special probation officers to work with persons convicted of drunk driving?)</b>	<b>MD=9</b>
<u>WC</u>	<u>JC</u>			
27	13		1. Yes	
73	87		5. No	
*10	*11		9. NA	
			<b>V18 R16 Couples Clubs (Q5h. Counseling in groups &amp; couples clubs for drunk drivers who have a drinking problem?)</b>	<b>MD=9</b>
<u>WC</u>	<u>JC</u>			
34	28		1. Yes	
66	72		5. No	
*11	*10		9. NA	
			<b>V19 R16A Total Countermeasures Known (The number countermeasures known by each respondent, answered yes on R9-R16)</b>	<b>MD=9</b>
<u>WC</u>	<u>JC</u>			
11	29		0. None	
10	21		1. One	
19	19		2. Two	
16	14		3. Three	
16	10		4. Four	
10	4		5. Five	
8	2		6. Six	
6	2		7. Seven	
4	0		8. Eight	
*12	*11		9. NA	
			<b>V20 R17 Heard of DAD Problem (Q6. How about the drunk driving problem nationwide? Have you happened to notice recently any information or messages about the drunk driving problem in general &amp; what can be done about it?)</b>	<b>MD=9</b>
<u>WC</u>	<u>JC</u>			
81	80		1. Yes	
(81)	(87)		5. No	
19	20		9. NA	
(19)	(13)			
*5	*7			
(*10)	(*13)			
			<b>V21 R18 DAD Media (Q6a. Where did you notice the information or messages?)</b>	<b>Responses=3 MD=9</b>
<u>WC</u>	<u>JC</u>			
19	20		0. Inap., R has not heard of problem nationwide	
63	65		1. Television	
34	33		2. Radio	
41	36		3. Newspapers	
15	13		4. Magazines (32 additional responses not coded)	
8	13		5. Billboards (25 additional responses not coded)	
*2	*1		6. Other	
			a. Drivers education.	
			b. Pamphlets.	
			c. Autopsy protocols.	
*6	*9		9. NA	
			<b>V22 R19 DAD Messages (Q6b. What do you remember most from what you heard or saw?)</b>	<b>Responses=2 MD=9</b>
<u>WC</u>	<u>JC</u>			
32	35		0. Inap., R has not heard of the problem nationwide; no second mention	
35	27		1. Inform (scare) people about the extent of the DAD problem in general (2 additional responses not coded)	
4	5		2. Inform (scare) people about legal penalties for drunk driving	
1	5		3. Educate people about physiological effects of alcohol, number of safe drinks, relation of number of drinks to chances of accident, to BAC levels, etc.	

V22 R19 DAD Messages (contd)

WC	JC	
5	10	4. Educate people never to drink before driving
9	6	5. Encourage more governmental actions to solve DAD problem (Scream Bloody Murder), to keep drunk driver off the road
8	3	6. Encourage people with alcohol problems to obtain treatment
13	12	7. Other codable responses: (a) The increase of the drinking driving problem as a result of the lower drinking age (8 entries). (b) Drunks cause accidents-the % of drunk drivers in fatal accidents (4 entries). (c) Emphasis on hosts at parties not to serve too much alcohol, & to take care of their driving guests (3 entries). (d) Social drinkers who exceed their limit are just as dangerous or more dangerous than problem drinkers. (e) The need for stiffer penalties "we should crack down", tougher courts, more traffic officers (2 entries). The alcoholic that appeared on the Dick Cavitt show. It costs us money with higher insurance premiums. The despair of those who were not killed in the accident & that of the family members. Increased concern & efforts to seek out offenders. The drinking driver is accident prone. Drunk drivers need help-not jailed only. Lack of driver coordinator. AA. Michigan Women for Highway Safety. Refuse to go to alcohol-related activities. Don't go to that party just to drink. Publicity about the state police & their program. The law is too easy on them after the officers have taken them in. Drunk drivers are a menace to innocent people as well as themselves. Education courses for those arrested. The amount of time already being spent on prevention. Innocent drivers killed & the trend for 18 year olds to become serious drinkers. There is help available accidents are preventable. About couple invited to cocktail party & they didn't want to go because everyone over-indulged.
*1	2	8. DK
*90	*126	9. NA

In Question 7 one "drink" is used to mean any of the following:

- ONE 12 OZ. BOTTLE OR CAN OF BEER
- ONE 3-4 OZ. GLASS OF WINE OR ALCOHOLIC PUNCH
- ONE 1 OZ. SERVING OF HARD LIQUOR (ALONE OR IN MIXED DRINK)

V23 R20 No. of Safe Drinks (Q7. Suppose that a person of age & weight, who has not eaten recently, drinks for an one hour period before driving. What do you think is the most he could drink without increasing his chance of having an accident?) MD=9

WC	JC	
5	9	00. None
(2)	(2)	
32	33	01. One drink
(26)	(24)	
48	38	02. Two drinks
(42)	(44)	
11	14	03. Three drinks
(18)	(17)	
2	3	04. Four drinks
(7)	(9)	
1	2	05. Five drinks
(2)	(2)	
*2	*2	06. Six drinks
(1)	(1)	
		08. Eight drinks
(*1)	(0)	
		09. Nine drinks
(0)	(*1)	
		10. Ten drinks
(*1)	(0)	
		12. Twelve drinks
(0)	(*1)	
		25. Twenty-five drinks
(*1)	(0)	
0	*1	98. DK
(1)	(1)	
*7	*11	99. NA
(*6)	(*4)	

	WC	JC	V24 <u>R21 Accident 6 Drinks</u> (Q7a. If he has 6 drinks how many times more likely do you think he is to have an accident than if he had not been drinking?) MD=98,99
10.	2	2	
	(3)	(4)	
30.	4	4	ACTUAL NUMBER CODED
	(6)	(5)	
50.	6	6	01. No or small increased chance
	(9)	(9)	96. 96-100
70.	10	10	97. Over 100 (100+; 150; 300; 336; 600; 1250)
	(18)	(12)	98. DK
90.	50	50	99. NA
	(50)	(50)	

V25 R21A Accident 6 Drinks-8 (R21 collapsed) MD=9

WC	JC	
*1	2	0. No or small increased chance
(3)	(2)	
12	10	1. 1.50-2.49
(1)	(*1)	
33	31	2. 2.50-5.49
(5)	(5)	
36	35	3. 5.50-10.49
(30)	(35)	
4	7	4. 10.50-25.49
(16)	(13)	
6	6	5. 25.50-50.49
(12)	(10)	
8	6	6. 50.50-100.49
(24)	(27)	
*1	2	7. Over 100.49
(7)	(5)	
*1	1	8. DK
(2)	(2)	
*17	*37	9. NA
(*35)	(*22)	

	WC	JC	V26 R22 Accident 9 Drinks (Q7b. How about if he has 9 drinks?) MD=98,99
10.	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	
	(6)	(6)	
30.	9	9	ACTUAL NUMBER CODED
	(10)	(10)	96. 96-100
50.	10	10	97. Over 100 (128; 150(2 entries);200(3 entries); 500;
	(20)	(20)	900; 1000(13 entries);10000; Infinity(3 entries))
70.	25	30	98. DK
	(80)	(75)	99. NA
90.	96	96	
	(96)	(96)	

	WC	JC	V27 R22A Accident 9 Drinks-8 (R22 collapsed) MD=9
	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	0. No or small increased chance
	(3)	(2)	
	1	1	1. 1.50-2.49
	(1)	(*1)	
	17	16	2. 2.50-5.49
	(5)	(5)	
	31	32	3. 5.50-10.49
	(30)	(35)	
	20	18	4. 10.50-25.49
	(16)	(13)	
	7	8	5. 25.50-50.49
	(12)	(10)	
	15	17	6. 50.50-100.49
	(24)	(27)	
	8	5	7. Over 100.49
	(7)	(5)	
	1	1	8. DK
	(2)	(2)	
	*32	*44	9. NA
	(*35)	(*22)	

V28 R23 Impaired Drinks (Q8. As you may know, Michigan has two drunk driving laws, one for impaired driving, & one for the more serious charge of driving under the influence of liquor. Under the conditions described at the beginning of Question 7, what do you think is the most he could drink without being presumed impaired by the law?) MD=98,99

	WC	JC	
	*1	<u>2</u>	00. None
	14	18	01. One drink
	40	37	02. Two drinks
	25	25	03. Three drinks
	15	10	04. Four drinks
	2	2	05. Five drinks
	2	6	06. Six drinks
	*2	0	09. Nine drinks
	0	*2	10. Ten drinks
	*1	*5	98. DK
	*17	*21	99. NA

V29 R24 Drinks DUIL (Q8a. And what do you think is the most he could drink before driving without being presumed under the influence by the law?) MD=98,99

	WC	JC	
	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	00. None
	5	10	01. One drink
	24	19	02. Two drinks
	22	23	03. Three drinks
	19	16	04. Four drinks
	11	11	05. Five drinks
	14	13	06. Six drinks
	*1	*2	07. Seven drinks
	*2	3	08. Eight drinks
	*2	*2	09. Nine drinks
	2	1	10. Ten drinks
	0	*1	12. Twelve drinks
	*2	*5	98. DK
	*18	*20	99. NA

V30 R20A Safe-Impaired Ratio (R20/R23 collapsed) MD=9

WC	JC	
<u>15</u>	<u>23</u>	0. 0.0-0.49
43	32	1. 0.50-0.99
37	36	2. 1.00 exactly
0	*1	3. 1.01-1.49
4	4	4. 1.50-1.99
1	3	5. 2.00-2.99
0	1	6. 3.00-9.99
0	0	7. 10.00-99.998
*22	*29	9. DK, NA on R20 or R23

V31 R20B Safe-DUIL Ratio (R20/R24 collapsed) MD=9

WC	JC	
<u>48</u>	<u>45</u>	0. 0.0-0.49
31	32	1. 0.50-0.99
18	14	2. 1.00 exactly
0	*1	3. 1.01-1.49
1	2	4. 1.50-1.99
1	5	5. 2.00-2.99
0	1	6. 3.00-9.99
0	0	7. 10.00-99.998
*24	*28	9. DK, NA on R20 or R24

V32 R24A Impaired-DUIL Ratio (R23/R24 collapsed) MD=9

WC	JC	
<u>11</u>	<u>14</u>	0. 0.0-0.49
61	56	1. 0.50-0.99
15	17	2. 1.00 exactly
0	1	3. 1.01-1.49
5	3	4. 1.50-1.99
6	7	5. 2.00-2.99
1	2	6. 3.00-3.99
0	0	7. 10.00-99.998
*22	*31	9. DK, NA on R23 or R24

V33 R20A Perceived/Real Safe Ratio (R20 divided by the number of drinks which would get a person of R's weight to .05% BAC, collapsed) MD=9

WC	JC	
<u>5</u>	<u>9</u>	0. 0.000-0.080
25	28	1. 0.080-0.390
24	18	2. 0.390-0.600
34	30	3. 0.600-0.890
8	9	4. 0.890-1.100
2	3	5. 1.100-1.390
2	3	6. 1.390-1.990
0	*1	7. 1.990-4.990
0	0	8. 4.990-99.900
*7	*12	9. DK, NA on R20 or R34

V34 R23A Perceived/Real Impaired Ratio (R23 divided by the number of drinks which would get a person of R's weight to .07% BAC, collapsed) MD=9

WC	JC	
<u>*1</u>	<u>2</u>	0. 0.000-0.080
16	20	1. 0.080-0.390
33	34	2. 0.390-0.600
32	28	3. 0.600-0.890
8	6	4. 0.890-1.100
7	6	5. 1.100-1.390
2	4	6. 1.390-1.990
*1	1	7. 1.990-4.990
0	0	8. 4.990-99.90
*18	*26	9. DK, NA on R23 or R34



V35 R24A Perceived/Real DUIIL Ratio (R24/divided by the number of drinks which would get a person of R's weight to .09% BAC, collapsed) MD=9

WC	JC	
<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	0. 0.000-0.080
19	20	1. 0.080-0.390
22	23	2. 0.390-0.600
29	26	3. 0.600-0.890
12	14	4. 0.890-1.100
11	9	5. 1.100-1.390
5	4	6. 1.390-1.990
*1	1	7. 1.990-4.990
0	0	8. 4.990-99.900
*20	*25	9. DK, NA on R24 or R34

V36 R21B Perceived/Real 6 Drink Ratio (R21 divided by the estimate of increased risk for a person of R's weight based on the Borckenstein study in Grand Rapids) MD=9

WC	JC	
<u>*1</u>	<u>1</u>	0. 0.000-0.080
22	19	1. 0.080-0.390
19	17	2. 0.390-0.600
12	13	3. 0.600-0.890
9	8	4. 0.890-1.100
10	9	5. 1.100-1.390
7	11	6. 1.390-1.990
6	8	7. 1.990-4.990
14	13	8. 4.990-99.900
*17	*38	9. DK, NA on R21 or R34

V37 R22B Perceived/Real 9 Drinks Ratio (R22 divided by the estimate of increased risk for a person of R's weight based on the Borckenstein study in Grand Rapids) MD=9

WC	JC	
<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	0. 0.000-0.080
40	36	1. 0.080-0.390
9	11	2. 0.390-0.600
9	10	3. 0.600-0.890
7	4	4. 0.890-1.100
3	3	5. 1.100-1.390
7	12	6. 1.390-1.990
11	10	7. 1.990-4.990
7	6	8. 4.990-99.900
*32	*48	9. DK, NA on R22 or R34

V38 R25 Impaired BAC (Q9. In Michigan a driver is presumed impaired or under the influence when his blood contains certain percentages of alcohol. This is known as his blood alcohol concentration or BAC. What do you think is the lowest percent of BAC at which a driver is presumed impaired in Michigan?) MD=9998,9999

See V39 for results

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED TO TWO DECIMAL PLACES IN FORM XX.XX%

- 0001. .01% or less
- 9996. 9996-10,000
- 9997. More than 10,000
- 9998. DK
- 9999. NA

V39 R26A Correct Impaired BAC (R26 collapsed) MD=9

WC	JC	
3	5	1. Exactly correct (.07 & .08)
6	4	2. Correct but no or misplaced decimal (.7, .8, 7, 8)
6	6	3. Nearly correct (.05-.06, .09)
14	11	4. Nearly correct but no or misplaced decimal (.5-.69, .81-.99, 5-6.99, 8.01-99.99)
41	52	5. Not nearly correct (.00-.04, .11-.14, .16-.49, 1.00-4.99, 10.01-14.99, 15.01-99.99)
21	13	6. Correct for past or present DUIL (.10, .15)
10	10	7. Correct for past or present DUIL but no decimal point (10, 15)
0	0	8. DK
*57	*73	9. NA

V40 R26 DUIL BAC (Q9a. And what do you think is the lowest percent at which a driver is presumed under the influence?) MD=9998,9999

See V41 for Results

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED TO TWO DECIMAL PLACES IN FORM XX.XX%

- 0001. .01 or less
- 9996. 9996-10,000
- 9997. Over 10,000
- 9998. DK
- 9999. NA

V41 R27A Correct DUIL BAC (R26 collapsed) MD=9

WC	JC	
12	11	1. Exactly correct (.10)
5	6	2. Correct but no or misplaced decimal point (1.0, 10)
8	6	3. Nearly correct (.05-.09, .11-.14)
11	13	4. Nearly correct, but no or misplaced decimal (5.0-9.0, 11.0-14.0)
48	53	5. Not nearly correct (.00-.04, .16-.49, 15.0-99.97)
10	8	6. Correct for past DUIL (.15)
5	3	7. Correct for past DUIL but no or misplaced decimal (15.0, 1.5)
0	0	8. DK
*63	*83	9. NA

V42 R27 ASAP Tax Support (Q10. If there were an expanded governmental program which could cut down on alcohol related traffic accidents by as much as one-third or one-half, how much more taxes per year would you personally be willing to pay to support such a program?) MD=9

WC	JC	
18	31	0. None, no more
(24)	(22)	
17	15	1. \$1-5
(20)	(25)	
19	19	2. \$6-10
(10)	(15)	
15	12	3. \$11-20
(17)	(15)	
6	3	4. \$21-39
(7)	(5)	
12	11	5. \$40-59
(10)	(9)	
2	2	6. \$60-99
(2)	(1)	
11	7	7. \$100 or more
(9)	(7)	
*24	*33	9. DK, NA
(*29)	(*24)	

Additional Comments:

Take from gas tax.

Have an increased tax on alcohol (2 entries).

V43 R28 Ever Drink Alcohol (Q11. Now a question about yourself. Do you drink alcoholic beverages or are you a total abstainer?) MD=9

WC	JC
<u>86</u>	<u>83</u>
14	17
*7	*14

- 1. Yes
- 5. No
- 9. NA

V44 R29 Times DAD One (Q11a. As you know, most people who drink do drive after drinking at least occasionally. During the past year how many times would you say you had driven after having one or more drinks?) MD=99

	WC	JC
10.	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
30.	4	6
50.	10	19
70.	35	71
90.	96	96

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED

- 96. 96-100
- 97. Over 100 (100+;104;120;125 (2 entries))
- 98. DK (150(3 entries);200(4 entries))
- 99. NA (250(3 entries);275;280;300(2 entries);360;365(2 entries))
- 00. Inap., R is an abstainer or R does not drive

V45 R29A Times DAD-7 (R29 collapsed) MD=9

	WC	JC
	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>
	2	3
	5	5
	18	12
	4	5
	22	22
	7	7
	12	16
	4	5
	14	17
	*13	*21

- 0. None
- 1. 1
- 2. 2
- 3. 3-5
- 4. 6-9
- 5. 10-24
- 6. 25-49
- 7. 50-100
- 8. 100 or more
- 0. Inap., R is abstainer
- 9. DK, NA

V46 R30 Times Driven Drunk (Q11b. Sometimes a person drinks more than his safe limit, but still has no other way to get home except to drive himself. About how many times in the past year would you say you have driven after drinking too much for safe driving?) MD=99

	WC	JC
10.	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
30.	0	0
50.	0	0
70.	2	2
90.	96	96

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED

- 96. 96-100
- 97. Over 100 (150)
- 98. DK
- 99. NA
- 00. None; or Inap., R is an abstainer, R has not driven after drinking in the past year or R does not drive

V47 R30A Times Driven Drunk-7 (R30 collapsed) MD=9

	WC	JC
	<u>55</u>	<u>55</u>
	(68)	(71)
	10	8
	(6)	(10)
	8	7
	(9)	(8)
	7	5
	(9)	(5)
	1	*1
	(2)	(2)
	2	5
	(2)	(1)
	1	1
	(0)	(*1)
	1	1
	(0)	(0)
	*1	*1
	(*1)	(0)
	14	17
	*8	*16
	(*9)	(*19)

- 0. None (including R is abstainer in 1971)
- 1. 1
- 2. 2
- 3. 3-5
- 4. 6-9
- 5. 10-24
- 6. 25-49
- 7. 50-100
- 8. 100 or more
- 0. Inap., R is abstainer
- 9. DK, NA

V48 R31 Times Other Way Home (Q11c. And about how many times did you have someone else drive you, did you use some other means to travel because you had drunk too much for safe driving?) MD-99

WC	JC	
68	63	00. None; or Inap., R is an abstainer or R has not driven after drinking in the past year or R does not drive
9	6	01. One
6	5	02. Two
1	2	03. Three
*2	*2	04. Four
*2	1	05. Five
0	1	06. Six
0	*1	07. Seven
0	*2	08. Eight
*1	2	10. Ten
0	*1	15. Fifteen
0	*1	18. Eighteen
1	0	20. Twenty
0	*1	25. Twenty-five
0	*1	75. Seventy-five
11	17	96. 96 or over
*9	*19	99. NA

V49 R31A % Avoided DAD-9 (R31 divided by the total number of times R had driven after drinking too much or had found another way home because he had drunk too much for safe driving; that is the collapsed result of R31 divided by the sum of R30 & R31)

WC	JC	
53	49	0. R is an abstainer, R has not driven after drinking in the past year, R does not drive
16	13	1. 0%
1	1	2. .1-14.9%
*2	3	3. 15-29.9%
5	2	4. 30-49.9%
18	20	5. 50-69.9%
*2	2	6. 70-84.9%
0	1	7. 85-99.9%
5	7	8. 100%
*9	*20	9. DK or NA on R30 or R31

V50 R32 Sex (Q12. Please fill out the following background information on yourself. a.Sex?)

WC	JC	
86	86	1. Male
(80)	(72)	2. Female
14	14	
(21)	(28)	
*5	*10	9. NA
(0)	(0)	

V51 R33 Age (Q12b. Year of birth?) MD=99

ACTUAL AGE AS OF JANUARY 1, 1973

Coded by subtracting last two digits of birth year from 73.

99. NA

See V52 for Results

		V52 <u>R33A Age-6</u> (R33 collapsed)	MD=9
WC	JC		
<u>0</u>	<u>*1</u>	1. 16-17	
(0)	(0)		
0	*1	2. 18-20	
(1)	(1)		
13	19	3. 21-29	
(14)	(11)		
26	30	4. 30-44	
(23)	(29)		
45	39	5. 45-64	
(50)	(51)		
16	12	6. 65 & up	
(12)	(9)		
*11	*20	9. NA	
(*9)	(*13)		

		V53 <u>R33B Age-8</u> (R33 collapsed)	MD=9
WC	JC		
<u>0</u>	<u>*1</u>	1. 16-17	
0	*1	2. 18-20	
4	5	3. 21-24	
19	23	4. 25-34	
15	22	5. 35-44	
25	22	6. 45-54	
19	17	7. 55-64	
16	12	8. 65 & over	
*11	*20	9. NA	

		V54 <u>R34 Weight</u> (Q12c. Weight category?)	MD=0
WC	JC		
<u>0</u>	<u>*1</u>	1. Less than 100 lbs.	
3	3	2. 100-120 lbs.	
10	9	3. 120-140 lbs.	
21	25	4. 140-160 lbs.	
33	28	5. 160-180 lbs.	
20	21	6. 180-200 lbs.	
8	8	7. 200-220 lbs.	
2	2	8. 220-240 lbs.	
3	4	9. Over 240 lbs.	

		V55 <u>R35 Education</u> (Q12d. Education completed?)	MD=9
WC	JC		
<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	1. Not a high school graduate	
(2)	(4)		
5	14	2. Finished high school	
(9)	(17)		
24	27	3. Some college	
(26)	(32)		
23	22	4. Finished college	
(23)	(17)		
46	32	5. Some post-college study	
(41)	(29)		
*6	*11	9. NA	
(*4)	(*9)		

Q13. Finally there are a number of statements that we would like your opinion about. Please write the number for your feeling about each statement on the line in front of it, according to the following code.

1. AGREE STRONGLY
2. AGREE SOMEWHAT
3. DISAGREE SOMEWHAT
4. DISAGREE STRONGLY

V56 R36 Law Requiring Belt (Q13a. There should be a seat belt law like the motorcycle helmet law, which requires people to wear seat belts for their own protection?) MD=9

WC	JC
<u>42</u>	<u>29</u>
27	29
17	18
13	23
*8	*10

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Disagree somewhat
4. Disagree strongly
9. NA

V57 R37 Too Much Fuss (Q13b. Far too much fuss is made about the dangers of drinking & driving?)

WC	JC
<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>
(7)	(5)
6	9
(4)	(7)
12	15
(18)	(17)
75	71
(71)	(71)
*9	*12
(*14)	(*20)

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Disagree somewhat
4. Disagree strongly
9. NA

V58 R38 Stronger Punishment (Q13c. The number of fatal accidents would go way down if those persons who drive after drinking too much were more strongly punished?) MD= 9

WC	JC
<u>40</u>	<u>40</u>
(33)	(38)
35	31
(38)	(33)
22	18
(22)	(17)
3	11
(7)	(11)
*9	*12
(*14)	(*20)

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Disagree somewhat
4. Disagree strongly
9. NA

V59 R39 Test in Bars (Q13d. Alcohol breathtesting devices should be available in taverns & bars for customer's use in determining whether they have drunk too much for legal driving?) MD=9

WC	JC
<u>32</u>	<u>26</u>
(30)	(26)
45	41
(41)	(39)
16	20
(18)	(15)
7	13
(12)	(20)
*11	*10
(*13)	(*19)

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Disagree somewhat
4. Disagree strongly
9. NA

V60 R40 Bartender Should Limit (Q13e. Bartenders should limit the number of drinks that they will serve to customers who plan to drive?) MD=9

WC	JC	
37	35	1. Agree strongly
31	29	2. Agree somewhat
20	22	3. Disagree somewhat
12	14	4. Disagree strongly
*9	*13	

V61 R41 Police Patrol Parties (Q13f. The police should patrol more around places where people are having parties at night?) MD=9

WC	JC	
13	11	1. Agree strongly
37	33	2. Agree somewhat
27	28	3. Disagree somewhat
23	27	4. Disagree strongly
*12	*13	9. NA

V62 R42 Host Should Limit (Q13g. A good host at a party will try to see that his guest who must drive home do not drink too much?) MD=9

WC	JC	
68	70	1. Agree strongly
(62)	(68)	2. Agree somewhat
29	26	3. Disagree somewhat
(31)	(24)	4. Disagree strongly
1	3	
(5)	(3)	
1	2	
(2)	(5)	
*12	*11	9. NA
(*14)	(*20)	

V63 R43 Test Drunk Crash (Q13h. Breath tests to determine blood alcohol concentrations should be required whenever a driver who appears to have been drinking is involved in a highway crash?)

WC	JC	
74	72	1. Agree strongly
23	19	2. Agree somewhat
2	5	3. Disagree somewhat
*2	4	4. Disagree strongly
*8	*11	9. NA

V64 R44 Test Random Check (Q13i. The police should carry out random road checks to catch drivers who have drunk too much, & anyone stopped should be required to take a breath test?) MD=9

WC	JC	
33	29	1. Agree strongly
(25)	(24)	2. Agree somewhat
35	25	3. Disagree somewhat
(33)	(28)	4. Disagree strongly
12	19	
(23)	(21)	
20	27	
(18)	(27)	
*9	*13	9. NA
(*15)	(*20)	

V65 R45 DUII Take Antabuse (Q13j. Drivers convicted of drunk driving should be required to take pills which cause them to be sick if they drink alcohol?) MD=9

WC	JC	
<u>26</u>	<u>10</u>	1. Agree strongly
(21)	(13)	
26	21	2. Agree somewhat
(29)	(27)	
23	24	3. Disagree somewhat
(24)	(22)	
25	45	4. Disagree strongly
(26)	(38)	
*14	*17	9. NA
(*20)	(*24)	

V66 R46 Counsel not Punish (Q13k. It is better to place problem drinkers who are convicted of drunk driving on probation & into a counseling or treatment program than it is to give them severe penalties?) MD=9

WC	JC	
<u>47</u>	<u>39</u>	1. Agree strongly
(54)	(49)	
35	35	2. Agree somewhat
(34)	(33)	
15	14	3. Disagree somewhat
(7)	(11)	
4	13	4. Disagree strongly
(4)	(8)	
*13	*15	9. NA
(*18)	(*21)	

V67 R47 DUII Not Caught (Q13l. Most drunk driving is not detected by the police?) MD=9

WC	JC	
<u>49</u>	<u>50</u>	1. Agree strongly
41	36	2. Agree somewhat
9	10	3. Disagree somewhat
1	4	4. Disagree strongly
*10	*17	9. NA

V68 R48 Gov't Should Help (Q13m. The government should help to keep drunk drivers off the roads even if it means spending money to provide medical & psychological help?) MD=9

WC	JC	
<u>41</u>	<u>32</u>	1. Agree strongly
(43)	(39)	
40	42	2. Agree somewhat
(40)	(38)	
12	15	3. Disagree somewhat
(11)	(11)	
8	12	4. Disagree strongly
(6)	(12)	
*10	*12	9. NA
(*19)	(*23)	

V69 R49 Effect Not Likely (Q13n. No matter how much effort is invested, there is not likely to be much effect on the drunk driver problem?) MD=9

WC	JC	
<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	1. Agree strongly
25	27	2. Agree somewhat
34	34	3. Disagree somewhat
33	31	4. Disagree strongly
*11	*15	9. NA