

SUMMARY REPORT AND  
CODEBOOK WITH MARGINALS  
WASHTENAW AND JACKSON COUNTIES 1971  
SURVEY ON DRINKING AND DRIVING

Arthur C. Wolfe  
Marion M. Chapman

September 1972

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 Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

1. Report No. UM-HSRI-AL-72-6	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Washtenaw and Jackson Counties 1971 survey on drinking and driving. Summary report and codebook with marginals.		5. Report Date September 1972	
7. Author(s) Arthur C. Wolfe and Marion M. Chapman		6. Performing Organization Code	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Highway Safety Research Institute University of Michigan Huron Parkway and Baxter Road Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105		8. Performing Organization Report No. UM-HSRI-AL-72-6	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Washington, D.C. 20590		10. Work Unit No.	
15. Supplementary Notes Prime contractor: Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104		11. Contract or Grant No. FH-11-7535	
16. Abstract This report summarizes the results of a questionnaire filled out by 370 members of 12 Washtenaw County service clubs and by 425 members of 13 Jackson County service clubs. Content areas of the survey include knowledge about the role of alcohol in traffic crashes and the relationship between the consumption of various amounts of alcohol and accident risk; awareness of media messages on drinking and driving; attitudes toward the alcohol problem in general; willingness to support alcohol safety programs; attitudes toward various alcohol safety countermeasures; and own drinking and driving behavior. The survey was carried out in order to obtain baseline information useful to the evaluation of the Washtenaw Alcohol Safety Action Program. Jackson County does not have such a program and is to be used as a control county. In general the two samples were quite comparable in their answers, although the Jackson respondents were slightly more likely to report having seen or heard drinking driving messages (87%-81%) and were slightly less likely to report driving after drinking too much themselves (27%-31%). Appended to the report is the complete survey codebook showing the percentage results on each question for the two county sample.		13. Type of Report and Period Covered	
17. Key Words Alcohol and driving		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED		18. Distribution Statement UNLIMITED	
20. Security Classif. (of this page) UNCLASSIFIED		21. No. of Pages 23	22. Price

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	1
Washtenaw County Results	1
Sample Design and Demographic Background	3
Alcohol and Accidents	4
Exposure to Driving After Drinking Media Messages	8
Knowledge of Alcoholism and Attitudes Toward Treatment	8
Respondents' Own Drinking Before Driving Behavior	10
Attitudes Toward Strict Enforcement and Punishment	10
General Attitudes Toward the Drunk Driver Problem	11
Appendix. Codebook with Marginals	
Index to Variables	i
Codebook	1-11

## 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, Otto A. Engelke, MD, Principal Investigator, and 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.

## SUMMARY

As part of the baseline data collection for the evaluation of the Washtenaw Alcohol Safety Action Program, questionnaires on drinking and driving were filled out by samples of service club members in Washtenaw County and Jackson County. The results in brief are reported here, followed by a codebook containing the detailed results on each question.

Differences between the two county samples were evident on some items, but generally, the variations were minimal. Specifically, the Washtenaw sample contained 8% more males and 16% more college graduates. Jackson respondents were slightly more negative about the use of Alcohol and slightly less likely to say they had a crash after drinking too much. Despite these and other differences, comparability was adequate for the purpose of utilizing the Jackson service club sample as a comparison group with the Washtenaw sample.

### Washtenaw County Results

On balance, unsatisfactory levels of knowledge, directions of attitudes and forms of behavior were indicated more often than not. On the positive side, fairly accurate estimates were made of problem drinker driver involvement in alcohol-related fatal crashes and of the number of drinks on the average which are safe to consume before driving. Many respondents felt correctly that fewer drinks would be included in a definition of safe drinking before driving than would be included in a definition of legal drinking before driving.

Counseling and treatment programs for convicted drunk drivers were favored as an alternative to jail sentences, and respondents felt generally that convicted drunk drivers who have a serious drinking problem should be required to obtain medical treatment. Most respondents also agreed that the government should spend money for treatment services if they are demonstrated to be effective in reducing the drunk driving problem, and a majority were willing to pay additional taxes to support an expanded government program of reducing the drunk driving problem.

Respondents generally agreed with the use of breath tests in all reported accidents, did not feel that too much fuss has been made about the problem of drunk driving, and were not willing to regard driving as a right rather than as a privilege which requires responsible behavior. On a social level most respondents agreed that party hosts should see that their guests who drive home do not drink too much to drive safely.

Less desirable results, however, were obtained in many areas. Few respondents were aware of the correct county traffic fatality statistics, most did not know the minimum presumptive BAC for impaired driving or the number of drinks required to reach an illegal BAC, and most made inaccurate estimates of accident risk resulting from consumption of specific quantities of alcohol.

Less than one-third of the respondents had a correct perception of the incidence of alcoholism in Washtenaw County, and less than half felt optimistic about the likelihood of overcoming a serious drinking problem. Only half of the respondents favored the use of Antabuse with convicted drunk drivers.

Although many respondents did not feel that stronger punishments should be invoked against drunk drivers, many also did not favor requiring bars to provide either transportation service or breath-testing devices for customers who were concerned about their ability to drive safely after drinking. Forty-one percent of the respondents were against the use of breath tests by police in random road checks.

The respondents' own reported driving after drinking behavior was also unacceptable. A full 31% said they had driven after drinking too much, and one respondent said he had done so over 100 times in the previous year. Very few respondents had refused a ride with a driver they felt had drunk too much to drive safely.

Clearly, the survey results indicate both a moderate base of support among service club members and several areas in which the public information campaign needs to increase awareness of and concern about the drunk driving problem in Washtenaw County.

## SAMPLE DESIGN AND DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

The 1971 voluntary organization survey was designed to obtain baseline data regarding service club members' awareness of and support for ASAP activities, and the amount of knowledge, direction of attitudes, and general behavior of service club members regarding drinking and driving.

Twelve service clubs in Washtenaw County were selected for inclusion in the survey. The clubs, such as Rotary, Kiwanis, Jaycees, etc., were chosen primarily on the basis of a history of demonstrated civic involvement which the WCA hoped to engage through its public information and education campaign.

Each selected Washtenaw club was matched with a club of the same type in Jackson County, a neighboring county which does not have a special alcohol safety action program. Although overall demographic comparability between the two counties was not expected to be exact, the corresponding service club members were expected to be reasonably similar in age, sex, and education, by virtue of their self-selection as club members. Both samples were expected to include many civic leaders and other citizens with a high level of community awareness.

The data collected in Jackson County and in Washtenaw County have been valuable for comparability in the baseline period. Comparison of the results from pre- and post campaign surveys of service clubs in each county will be used to estimate the extent of change in Washtenaw County service clubs which can be attributed to the WCA's public information campaign, and the extent of change which has resulted from various uncontrolled factors.

A four-page self-administered questionnaire was distributed in one meeting of each of the selected service clubs. The attendance of the clubs ranged from 8 to 93; a total of 370 questionnaires were completed by members of 12 Washtenaw County clubs, and a total of 425 questionnaires were received from members of 13 Jackson County clubs. A nominal payment of 25 cents was offered for each completed questionnaire, but many clubs chose instead to donate their services to the survey project.

The sex and age distributions in the Washtenaw and Jackson samples were roughly comparable. Four-fifths of the Washtenaw sample was male compared with 72% males in the Jackson sample. Half of each sample was 45-64 years old, and about one-fourth of each sample was between the ages of 30 and 44. The remainder of the Washtenaw sample consisted of 15% aged 18-29 and 12% aged 65 and older. In the Jackson sample, 12% were below the age of 30 and 9% were 65 years and older.

In terms of education both samples were above average. In the Washtenaw sample, a full 90% had completed some college courses and 41% reported some post-college study. Seventy-eight percent of the Jackson respondents had completed some college, and 29% had studied beyond a B.A.

#### ALCOHOL AND ACCIDENTS

The respondents were asked to make an estimate of how many persons had been killed in traffic crashes in their county in 1970. The actual 1970 traffic fatality statistics were 78 persons in Washtenaw County and 29 persons in Jackson County. Approximately one-third (32%) of the Washtenaw respondents made estimates in the range of 50-99 and almost half (46%) of the Jackson respondents made their estimates from 10 to 49.

In both counties large numbers of respondents tended to overestimate the magnitude of highway fatalities. Almost half of the Washtenaw sample estimated 100 or more local fatalities, and more than one-quarter estimated 1,000 or more. In Jackson County 29% estimated 100 or more local fatalities, and 14% estimated 1,000 or more. On this question some respondents may have misread the word "county" as "country".

Clearly, there were significant numbers of respondents who were not well-informed about the traffic fatality statistics in their county. Since the Washtenaw residents are being asked to support a program whose ultimate objective is the reduction of those statistics, there is a clear need for a higher level of awareness in this area.

Substantial majorities of respondents in both samples estimated correctly that at least 50% of all fatal crashes involve a drinking driver. Seventy-three percent of the Washtenaw sample and 67% of the Jackson sample thought that 50% to 80% of fatal crashes involve drinking drivers, and 5% in both samples felt that drinking drivers were involved in 81% to 100% of all fatal crashes.

There was no consensus within either sample about whether social drinkers or problem drinkers are primarily responsible for alcohol-related crashes. In the Washtenaw sample, 59% of the respondents felt that social drinkers cause more alcohol-related crashes, while 41% felt that the primary contributors were problem drinkers. In the Jackson sample slightly more respondents (64%) attributed more alcohol-related accidents to social drinkers, but a significant minority (36%) felt that problem drinkers cause more alcohol-related crashes.

Estimates of how many drinks containing one ounce of liquor a person of average weight can have in one hour without becoming too drunk to drive safely were consistent between the samples and fairly accurate. Close to half of each sample (42% and 44%) estimated correctly that about two drinks in an hour was the limit for safe driving after drinking (assuming an average weight of about 150 pounds), while an additional 28% and 26% of the respective samples felt that even two drinks would be too many for the average person to have before driving. Unfortunately, 18% and 17% of the two samples thought that three drinks would still be within the boundary of safety, although studies show that a person with a .05-.06% BAC increases his risk of having a traffic accident by a factor of two. In addition, 10% of the Washtenaw and 12% of the Jackson respondents thought that four, five, or six drinks in an hour would be safe, when in fact the risk of accident increases by at least six times for a drinker of average weight following consumption of even four drinks in an hour.



There was considerable variation of opinion in response to the statement that having even one drink will make a person a poorer driver. While the majority (59%) of Washtenaw respondents agreed with the statement, only 21% were in strong agreement. Strong disagreement was expressed by 22%, with an additional 19% responding with moderate disagreement. Since many factors must be considered in assessing the probable effect on driving of having one drink, the respondents who were moderate in their opinion (59%) should be considered as the most nearly correct. Statistically, a .02% BAC does not increase the average driver's risk of accident above the normal probability. But weight will determine the BAC reached following one drink, and factors such as fatigue, emotional upset, and former drinking and driving experience can combine with the alcohol to affect driving behavior. Generally speaking, however, two drinks in an hour or an approximate BAC of .04% will be within safe drinking before driving limits.

Less than half of the respondents in either sample knew even approximately what was the presumptive minimum BAC for impaired driving. At the time of the survey the minimum was .10% BAC, but in the Washtenaw sample only 7% gave the correct answer. An additional 7% thought the number was ten but omitted the decimal point. Confusion regarding the distinction between impaired driving and driving under the influence (DUIL) was apparent in that 21% of the Washtenaw respondents thought that .15% or 15% BAC was the minimum presumptive limit for impaired driving when, at that time, .15% BAC was the correct answer for DUIL. Twelve percent of the Washtenaw sample gave nearly correct numbers (.05-09% or .11-.14% or 5-9% or 11-14%). But the answers of a full 40% of the Washtenaw respondents were not even nearly correct, and 14% indicated that they did not know the correct answer. The findings from the Jackson sample were very similar to those in the Washtenaw sample.

There was a strong tendency for respondents to underestimate the number of drinks an average man can have in one hour before reaching the level at which he can be convicted of impaired driving (.10% BAC). Two-thirds (66%) of the Washtenaw respondents thought that fewer than four drinks would be the average person's legal limit, 13% made estimates higher than four drinks, and only 19% correctly answered four drinks. The Jackson respondents tended to underestimate the number of legal drinks even more than the Washtenaw respondents.

The majority of Washtenaw respondents (61%) felt that the number of "safe" drinks was less than the number of "legal" drinks. An additional 15% thought that safe and legal drinks were equivalent quantities, and only 11% of the Washtenaw respondents thought that one could consume a greater quantity of alcohol and still be a safe driver than he could consume and remain below the legal presumptive BAC minimum for impaired driving. Corresponding figures from the Jackson sample were 53%, 33%, and 13%.

The survey also sought to determine respondents' perceptions of accident risk following the consumption of increasing amounts of alcohol. The majority of respondents in both samples overestimated the increased accident risk following three drinks, but underestimated the increased risks following six and nine drinks (all quantities to have been consumed in one hour by an average man). Fifty-nine percent of the Washtenaw residents thought that there would be an increased accident risk of more than six times following three drinks, but the average risk at .06% BAC is actually increased by two times. Following six drinks or an approximate BAC of .12%, the risk of accident increases to about 11 times that of a sober driver, but 69% of the Washtenaw respondents made risk estimates below 11. Similarly, over half (55%) of the Washtenaw sample estimated the increased risk factor following nine drinks at 25 or less, contrary to studies which have determined that the increased risk at a .18% BAC is more than 25 times. There were only slight variations in the findings for the Jackson sample.

## EXPOSURE TO DRIVING AFTER DRINKING MEDIA MESSAGES

Four-fifths of the Washtenaw respondents and 87% of the Jackson respondents remembered having seen or heard advertisements, spot commercials, articles, films or other items about the effects of drinking on driving. Television, followed by radio and newspapers, was the most frequently mentioned media source (65%, 30%, and 22%, respectively among the Washtenaw club members). One in four Washtenaw respondents remembered a message advising people never to drink before driving, and one in five had seen an informational or "scare" message about the extent of the driving after drinking problem in general. Fifteen percent of the Washtenaw respondents remembered a message about the physiological effects of drinking, number of safe drinks, the relation of number of drinks to chance of accident and BAC levels, etc. Very few Washtenaw respondents remembered messages related to legal penalties for drunk driving (5%), governmental actions to solve the drinking driver problem (6%), or treatment for alcoholism (5%). The findings were similar for the Jackson sample.

Without regard to what messages were remembered by the respondents, a clear majority (71%) felt that the best approach for such messages was to get people to understand and follow their safe drinking before driving limits, rather than to get people never to drink before driving.

## KNOWLEDGE OF ALCOHOLISM AND ATTITUDES TOWARD TREATMENT

In each county sample there were great variations in the response to a question concerning the percent of adults with serious drinking problems in the county. In the Washtenaw sample, although most respondents (82%) estimated no higher than a 20% alcoholic population, the estimates ranged from 1% to 100%, with a median estimate of 10%. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents made estimates of 6-10%, which agree most nearly with current research estimates. But 39% of the respondents

made low estimates of 1-5%, while almost one-third (31%) estimated more than 10%. The findings for the Jackson sample were comparable.

About half (51%) of the Washtenaw respondents felt that successful treatment of alcoholism was relatively rare, while about half (49%) felt that alcoholism could be successfully treated about half of the time or better. The Jackson sample was also evenly divided between those who were somewhat optimistic and those who were pessimistic about the ability of persons with alcohol problems to overcome them.

Ninety-two percent of the Washtenaw respondents, however, agreed that drivers convicted of drunk driving should be required to obtain medical treatment. Apart from revealing a near consensus of opinion on the need for medical treatment, this belief may also indicate a tendency toward viewing drunk drivers as persons suffering from a disease. As noted above, a majority of respondents were not optimistic about the effectiveness of treating alcoholism, and much more effort needs to be directed by the public information campaign toward raising the level of understanding about the results of treatment methods for alcoholism.

The use of Antabuse with drivers convicted of drunk driving was favored by only half of the Washtenaw respondents and by only 40% of the Jackson respondents. In the Washtenaw sample, approximately 25% of the respondents appeared in each of the four categories from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Thirty-eight percent of the Jackson sample disagreed strongly with this approach. Thus the Washtenaw sample was significantly less hostile to the Antabuse program, but clearly the WCA information program still faces a big task in increasing service club understanding of and support for the Antabuse element of the ASAP activities.

## RESPONDENTS' OWN DRINKING BEFORE DRIVING BEHAVIOR

Over three-fourths (77%) of the Washtenaw respondents reported that they do drink before driving, and 31% admitted to having driven after drinking too much at least once in the previous year. In all, 6% had driven once after drinking too much, 9% had driven twice after drinking too much, 11% had driven 3-7 times after drinking too much, and 5% had driven from eight times to 100 times (one respondent) after drinking too much. Slightly fewer Jackson respondents reported drinking at all before driving (72%), and also fewer Jackson respondents admitted to driving after drinking too much (27%).

Only 15% of the respondents had ever turned down a ride because they felt that the driver had been drinking too much. Although it cannot be determined how often such an occasion occurred for the respondents, it is probable that more than 15% had had an opportunity to refuse a ride on the grounds that the driver had drunk too much to drive safely. It can be hoped that the Washtenaw public information campaign can effectively change both the driving after drinking behavior of some respondents and their participation in the driving after drinking behavior of others.

## ATTITUDES TOWARD STRICT ENFORCEMENT AND PUNISHMENT

Almost three-fourths (71%) of the Washtenaw respondents agreed that stronger punishments for drunk driving would be an effective countermeasure to the problem of fatal traffic crashes. But only 33% agreed strongly with the stronger punishment countermeasure, while 29% disagreed at least somewhat with its effectiveness. The Jackson respondents reported similar views.

There was broader agreement among Washtenaw respondents that breath tests should be required in all reported accidents. Eighty-one percent agreed (52% "strongly") with this breath test countermeasure and 20% disagreed, with only 5% disagreeing strongly. Jackson respondents were somewhat more negative on this issue.

Wide variance of opinion, however, was evident regarding the use of breath tests in random road checks by police for the purpose of apprehending drivers who have drunk too much. A small majority of the Washtenaw sample (58%) agreed with the use of random checks and only 25% expressed strong agreement. Forty-one percent disagreed and almost one in five (18%) were in strong disagreement. Again the Jackson respondents were somewhat more negative than the Washtenaw respondents with 27% disagreeing strongly.

Although a majority (64%) of Washtenaw respondents agreed that bars and taverns should be required to provide transportation for customers who had drunk too much to drive safely, one in five respondents disagreed strongly with such a measure. Among Jackson respondents, there was slightly less agreement (54%) and more strong disagreement (28%) with this measure. A "self-help" measure of making breath testing devices available for customers' use in bars met with favor among many Washtenaw respondents (71% agreed). But the fact that even 30% were in disagreement with this non-legalistic, self-help approach is evidence of the need for more intensive efforts to increase the level of public concern for resolving the drunk driver problem.

Ninety-three percent of the Washtenaw respondents agreed that a good host should try to see that a guest who must drive home does not drink too much. Sixty-two percent of the Washtenaw respondents and 68% of the Jackson respondents indicated strong acceptance of the host's responsibility for his guests' drinking before driving behavior. Although the expression of an attitude is only suggestive of like behavior, it is evidence of a behavioral tendency and could be used effectively to promote greater responsibility among party hosts.

#### General Attitudes Toward the Drunk Driver Problem

A full 89% of the Washtenaw respondents disagreed with the statement that "far too much fuss is made about the dangers of

driving after drinking". Seventy-three percent disagreed (46% strongly disagreed) that a person should not be denied the right to drive if he needs his car to get to work. Eighty-six percent agreed that the government should help keep drunk drivers off the road even if it means spending money to provide medical and psychological help, and 76% were willing to pay additional taxes to support an expanded government program to reduce alcohol-related traffic crashes. The Jackson respondents gave quite similar answers to each of these questions.

A reasonable level of support of the ASAP-type activities is evident in both Washtenaw and Jackson Counties. It will be the role of the WCA public information and education campaign to actualize and increase that support among the Washtenaw County community leaders and their service clubs.

APPENDIX  
CODEBOOK WITH MARGINALS



## INDEX TO VARIABLES

<u>Var.#</u>	<u>Variable Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Data Set Number (03)	1
3	Respondent ID Number	1
<b>SAMPLE DESIGN AND DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND</b>		
2	County	1
4	Group Number	1
33	Sex	9
34	Age 1971	9
35	Age-6	9
36	Education	9
<b>ALCOHOL AND ACCIDENTS</b>		
5	County Fatalities	1
6	County Fatalities-7	1
7	Alcohol Fatal %	2
8	Alcohol Fatal %-7	2
9	Soc./Prob. Drinker	2
10	No. of Safe Drinks	2
11	Impaired BAC Number	2
12	Correct Impaired BAC	3
13	No. of Legal Drinks	3
14	Safe/Legal Ratio	3
15	Accident 3 Drinks	3
16	Accident 3 Drinks-8	4
17	Accident 6 Drinks	4
18	Accident 6 Drinks-8	4
19	Accident 9 Drinks	4
20	Accident 9 Drinks-8	4
39	Drive Poorer with 1	9
<b>EXPOSURE TO DRINKING AND DRIVING MEDIA MESSAGES</b>		
23	DAD Advertisements	5
24	What DAD Media	5
25	What DAD Messages	6
21	Best Main Approach	5

<u>Var.#</u>	<u>Variable Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
KNOWLEDGE OF ALCOHOLISM AND ATTITUDES TOWARD TREATMENT		
26	Alcoholic Percentage	7
27	Alcoholic %-7	7
28	Alcoholism Success	7
46	Medical Treatment	11
47	Antabuse Pills	11
48	Counseling Not Jail	11
RESPONDENTS' OWN DRINKING BEFORE DRIVING BEHAVIOR		
29	Drink Before Drive	7
30	Times Driven Drunk	8
31	Drink & Drive-9	8
32	Ever Refused Ride	8
ATTITUDES TOWARD STRICT ENFORCEMENT AND PUNISHMENT		
40	Stronger Punishment	10
41	Bars Provide Trans.	10
42	Bars Provide Tests	10
43	Host Should Limit	10
44	Test All Accidents	10
45	Test Random Check	11
GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD THE DRUNK DRIVER PROBLEM		
37	Not Deny Right	9
38	Too Much Fuss DAO	9
49	Gov't Should Help	11
22	ASAP Tax Support	5

CODEBOOK WITH MARGINALS  
 WASHTENAW AND JACKSON COUNTY VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATION 1971 SURVEY ON  
 DRINKING AND DRIVING

V1 R1 Data Set Number (03)

V2 R2 County

<u>TS Freqs</u>	
370	1. Washtenaw
425	2. Jackson

V3 R3 Respondent ID Number

V4 R4 Group Number

<u>Freqs</u>	
45	01. Ann Arbor Business & Professional Women's Club
26	02. Ypsilanti Lions Club
8	03. Ypsilanti Civitan Club
10	04. YMCA
19	05. Ann Arbor Breakfast Optimist Club
81	06. Ann Arbor Rotary Club
15	07. Whitmore Lake Kiwanis Club
30	08. Milan Rotary Club
29	10. Ann Arbor Noon Optimist Club
30	11. Ann Arbor Exchange Club
32	12. Ann Arbor Zonta Club
45	13. Ann Arbor Jaycees
73	51. Jackson Business & Professional Women's Club
21	52. Jackson Cascades Lions Club
11	53. Jackson Civitan Club
21	54. Jackson Hi-Twelve Club (YMCA)
25	55. Jackson Optimist Club
93	56. Jackson Rotary Club
11	57. Kiwanis Club of Jackson, East
35	58. Jackson Exchange Club
32	59. Jackson Jaycees
29	60. Cascades Exchange Club
11	61. Altrusa Club of Jackson
45	62. Napoleon Lions Club
18	63. Zonta Club of Jackson

V5 R5 County Fatalities (Q1. About how many persons would you guess were killed in traffic accidents in this county in 1970?) MD=998,999

<u>Percentiles</u>		
<u>W.C.*J.C.*</u>		
10. 25 22		ACTUAL NUMBER CODED
30. 60 34		
50. 90 50		996. 996-1,000
70. 700 85		997. Over 1,000
90. 997 997		998. DK
		999. NA

V6 R5A County Fatalities - 7 (R5 Collapsed) MD=9

<u>Percentages</u>		
<u>W.C.</u>	<u>J.C.</u>	
0	0	0. None
1	1	1. 1-9
18	46	2. 10-49
18	15	3. 50-69
14	8	4. 70-99
12	9	5. 100-199
9	6	6. 200-995
28	14	7. 996 & more
1	1	8. DK
*13	*11	9. NA

\*W.C. = Washtenaw County  
 J.C. = Jackson County

<u>Percentiles</u>		V7 <u>R6 Alcohol Fatal %</u> (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
WC	JC	
10.	30	25
30.	50	50
50.	60	50
70.	67	65
90.	80	76

ACTUAL PERCENT CODED

97. 97-100  
98. DK  
99. NA

<u>Percentages</u>		V8 <u>R6A Alcohol Fatal % - 7</u> (R6 Collapsed) MD=9
W.C.	J.C.	
0	0	0. None
2	6	1. 1-19%
11	10	2. 20-34%
10	11	3. 35-49%
23	23	4. 50%
24	19	5. 51-65%
26	25	6. 66-80%
5	5	7. 81-100%
0	1	8. DK
*5	*7	9. NA

V9 R7 Soc./Prob.Drinker (Q3. Would you think that more alcohol-related 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

<u>Percentages</u>		
W.C.	J.C.	
59	64	1. More by social drinkers
41	36	2. More by problem drinkers
*1	0	8. DK
0	*2	9. NA

V10 R8 No. of Safe Drinks (Q4. How many drinks containing one ounce of whiskey or other hard liquor (that is, a normal shot) do you think a person of average weight can drink in one hour without becoming too drunk to drive safely?) MD=99

<u>Percentages</u>		
W.C.	J.C.	
2	2	00. None
26	24	01. One
42	44	02. Two
18	17	03. Three
7	9	04. Four
2	2	05. Five
1	1	06. Six
*1	0	08. Eight
0	*1	09. Nine
*1	0	10. Ten
0	*1	12. Twelve
*1	0	25. Twenty-five
1	1	98. DK
*6	*4	99. NA

See V12  
for results

V11 R9 Impaired BAC Number (Q5. As you probably know, a blood-alcohol test is used to measure the amount of alcohol in the bloodstream resulting from drinking alcoholic beverages. Do you happen to know the lowest blood-alcohol concentration at which a driver is considered impaired under Michigan law?) MD=9998,9999

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

0001. .01% or less  
9997. 99.97% or more  
9998. DK  
9999. NA

Percentages		V12 R9A Correct Impaired BAC (R9 Collapsed)	MD=9
W.C.	J.C.		
7	11	1. Exactly correct number including decimal point (.10)	
7	6	2. Exactly correct number but no decimal point (10)	
4	5	3. Nearly correct number including decimal point (.05-.09, .11-.14)	
8	7	4. Nearly correct number but no decimal point (5-9, 11-14)	
40	46	5. Not nearly correct number (other numbers)	
15	11	6. Exactly correct number, including decimal point, for DUIL presumptive limit (.15)	
6	4	7. Exactly correct number, but no decimal point, for DUIL presumptive limit (.15)	
14	9	8. DK	
*46	*32	9. NA	

V13 R10 No. of Legal Drinks (Q6. About how many drinks do you think the average man can have in an hour before he reaches a blood alcohol concentration high enough to be convicted of impaired driving?) MD=99

Percentages		
W.C.	J.C.	
0	1	00. None
8	11	01. One
29	31	02. Two
29	30	03. Three
19	15	04. Four
8	7	05. Five
4	3	06. Six
*1	0	07. Seven
1	2	08. Eight
0	1	10. Ten
1	1	98. DK
*11	*6	99. NA

Percentages		V14 R10A Safe/Legal Ratio (R8/R10)	MD=9
W.C.	J.C.		
18	16	0. Less than .5	
43	37	1. .5-.999	
28	33	2. 1.000	
3	1	3. 1.001-1.499	
3	5	4. 1.5-1.999	
5	5	5. 2.0-2.999	
*1	2	6. 3.0-9.999	
*1	0	7. 10 0-99.998	
*12	*10	9. DK, NA on one or both	

Percentiles		V15 R11 Accident 3 drinks (Q6. Suppose a man of average weight has 3 drinks in one hour. How many times more likely do you think he is to cause an accident than a person who has not been drinking?)	MD=98,99
WC	JC		
10.	2	01. No increased chance of accident	
30.	2	96. 96-100	
50.	3	97. Over 100	
70.	5	98. DK	
90.	10	99. NA	

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED

Percentages		V16 <u>R11A Accident 3 Drinks - 8 (R11 Collapsed)</u>	MD=0
<u>W.C.</u>	<u>J.C.</u>		
9	10	1. No or small increased chance of accident	
31	35	2. 1.50-2.49	
36	36	3. 2.50-5.49	
17	17	4. 5.50-10.49	
1	3	5. 10.50-25.49	
3	2	6. 25.50-50.49	
2	1	7. 50.50-100.49	
0	*1	8. Over 100.49	
1	1	9. DK	
*25	*14	0. NA	

Percentiles		V17 <u>R12 Accident 6 Drinks (Q7a. How about with 6 drinks in one hour?)</u>	MD=98,99
<u>WC</u>	<u>JC</u>		
10.	3	4	
30.	6	5	ACTUAL NUMBER CODED
50.	9	9	
70.	18	12	01. No or small increased chance
90.	50	50	96. 96-100
			97. Over 100
			98. DK
			99. NA

Percentages		V18 <u>R12A Accident 6 Drinks - 8 (R12 Collapsed)</u>	MD=0
<u>W.C.</u>	<u>J.C.</u>		
1	1	1. No or small increased chance	
5	3	2. 1.50-2.49	
23	29	3. 2.50-5.49	
40	36	4. 5.50-10.49	
11	12	5. 10.50-25.49	
11	10	6. 25.50-50.49	
7	6	7. 50.50-100.49	
1	1	8. Over 100.49	
1	1	9. DK	
*30	*20	0. NA	

Percentiles		V19 <u>R13 Accident 9 Drinks (Q7b. How about with 9 drinks in one hour?)</u>	MD=98,99
<u>WC</u>	<u>JC</u>		
10.	6	6	
30.	10	10	ACTUAL NUMBER CODED
50.	20	20	
70.	80	75	01. No or small increased chance
90.	96	96	96. 96-100
			97. Over 100
			98. DK
			99. NA

Percentages		V20 <u>R13A Accident 9 Drinks - 8 (R13 Collapsed)</u>	MD=0
<u>W.C.</u>	<u>J.C.</u>		
3	2	1. No or small increased chance	
1	*1	2. 1.50-2.49	
5	5	3. 2.50-5.49	
30	35	4. 5.50-10.49	
16	13	5. 10.50-25.49	
12	10	6. 25.50-50.49	
24	27	7. 50.50-100.49	
7	5	8. Over 100.49	
2	2	9. DK	
*35	*22	0. NA	

V21 R14 Best Main Approach (Q8. In trying to reduce the number of alcohol-related accidents, do you think the main effort should be to get people never to drink before driving, or to get people to understand how much they can safely drink and to stick to those limits?) MD=9

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
29	33
71	67
0	0
*6	*6

1. Get people never to drink before driving
2. Get people to understand and follow their safe limits
8. DK
9. NA

V22 R15 ASAP Tax Support (Q9. 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

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
24	22
20	25
10	15
17	15
7	5
10	9
2	1
9	7
1	*1
*29	*24

0. None, no more
1. \$1-5
2. \$6-10
3. \$11-20
4. \$21-39
5. \$40-59
6. \$60-99
7. \$100 or more
8. Yes, willing to support, but DK how much
9. DK, NA

\*Additional comments:

(8) Would depend on nature of the program.

V23 R16 DAD Advertisements (Q10. Do you remember seeing or hearing any recent advertisements, spot commercials, articles, films, or other items about the effects of drinking on driving?) MD=9

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
81	87
19	13
0	0
*10	*13

1. Yes
2. No
8. DK
9. NA

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
65	71
22	29
17	15
30	34
11	22
5	8
2	1

V24 R17 What DAD Media (Q10a. Where did you see or hear these?) Responses=3 MD=9

1. Television
2. Newspapers
3. Magazines
4. Radio
5. Billboards
6. Pamphlets
7. Other codable response:
 

State police presentation.	Safety talk at work.
Kiwanis.	Service club program.
Program at meeting.	My parents.
AAA.	Speakers.
Univ. of Mich., HSRI.	State police film.
Rotary meeting.	Service club.
8. DK
9. NA
0. Inap., R has seen or heard no DAD advertisements (coded 2 in V23); no second or third mention

1	0
*13	*18

Percentages		V25 R18 What DAD Message (Q10b. What do you remember most from what you saw or heard?)	Responses=2 MD=9
W.C.	J.C.		
20	23	1. Inform (scare) people about the extent of DAD problem in general	
5	6	2. Inform (scare) people about legal penalties for drunk driving	
15	21	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.	
25	25	4. Educate people never to drink before driving	
6	5	5. Encourage more governmental actions to solve DAD problem (Scream Bloody Murder)*, to keep drunk drivers off the road	
5	2	6. Encourage people with alcohol problems to obtain treatment	
4	3	7. Other codable response: The moralistic tone. They are not too effective. The uselessness of it. Inept hogwash. Push by insurance companies. Poor policy--insurance companies only look to help themselves. Insurance pushing to their own gain. Sponsored by AAA. Allstate Insurance Company. 3X auto club. Who it was, 3A auto club. The Auto Club of Michigan seems to be the only organization working on the drinking driver. Mobil. Sponsor. Why do people indulge? Think and drive. Social drinking. Cost of insurance. Safe driving. The new (18-21 agers) adults are suspect for greater number of accidents. Don't drink the first--oriented to youth. Control your drinking (I think it was a distillery ad).	
2	3	8. DK	
*85	*90	9. NA	
		0. Inap., it has seen or heard no DAD advertisements; no second mention	

\*Additional Comments:

The statement "don't drink and drive" vehicle is virtually impossible as most people out to dinner would have a cocktail prior to their meal, if one drink meant they should not drive, why go out to dinner?

As a teetotaler of 84 years, I feel safe so far as causing accidents is concerned but unsafe in presence of drinking drivers.



<u>Percentiles</u>		V26 <u>R19 Alcoholic Percentage</u> (Q11. Out of every 100 adults in this county, how many would you guess are alcoholics or have serious drinking problems?)	MD=98,99
WC	JC		
10.	3		
30.	5		
50.	10	ACTUAL PERCENT CODED	
70.	15		
90.	30	01. One percent or less	
		97. 97-100	
		98. DK	
		99. NA	

<u>Percentages</u>		V27 <u>R19A Alcoholic %-7</u> (R19 Collapsed)	MD=9
W.C.	J.C.		
0	0	0. None	
15	20	1. 1-3%	
24	21	2. 4-5%	
29	27	3. 6-10%	
14	10	4. 11-20%	
9	10	5. 21-30%	
6	8	6. 31-50%	
2	2	7. 51-100%	
0	1	8. DK	
*20	*11	9. NA	

<u>Percentages</u>		V28 <u>R20 Alcoholism Success</u> (Q12. How often do you think persons with serious drinking problems are able to overcome them?)	MD=9
W.C.	J.C.		
3	2	1. Almost always	
11	11	2. Most of the time	
35	33	3. About half the time	
45	45	4. Only occasionally	
6	9	5. Almost never	
0	0	8. DK	
*9	*8	9. NA	

<u>Percentages</u>		V29 <u>R21 Drink Before Drive</u> (Q13. Now a question about your own driving. Some people say that you should never drink alcohol before driving: others say it doesn't matter very much. Do you ever have a drink before driving?)	MD=9
W.C.	J.C.		
77	72	1. Yes	
22	27	2. No, never	
1	*1	5. R indicates he/she is not a driver	
*11	*15	9. NA	

V30 R22 Times Driven Drunk (Q13a. Of course even when one knows he has drunk more than he should have before driving, he often has no other way home. About how many times in the past 12 months would you say you had driven after drinking too much?) MD=98,99

Percentages

W.C.	J.C.
45	44
6	10
9	8
4	3
3	2
2	*2
1	1
*1	0
*1	0
2	*2
1	*2
*1	0
0	*2
0	*1
*1	0
*1	0
1	*1
0	*1
*1	0
*1	*2
*15	*21
23	27

- 00. Never
- 01. Once
- 02. Twice
- 03. Three times
- 04. Four times
- 05. Five times
- 06. Six times
- 07. Seven times
- 08. Eight times
- 10. Ten times
- 12. Twelve times
- 15. Fifteen times
- 20. Twenty times
- 25. Twenty-five times
- 36. Thirty-six times
- 40. Forty times
- 50. Fifty times
- 52. Fifty-two times
- 97. Over 100 times
- 98. DK
- 99. NA
- 00. Inap., R does not drink before he drives, or R is not presently a driver (coded 2 or 5 in V29)

Percentages

W.C.	J.C.
1	*1
22	28
45	45
6	10
9	8
11	7
5	2
*16	*23

V31 R22A Drink & Drive-9 (R21 and R22 Combined) MD=9

- 1. Not presently a driver
- 3. Present driver who never drinks before driving
- 4. Present driver who drinks before driving but did not drive after drinking too much in the previous year
- 5. Present driver who drove once after drinking too much in the previous year
- 6. Present driver who drove twice after drinking too much in the previous year
- 7. Present driver who drove 3-7 times after drinking too much in the previous year.
- 8. Present driver who drove 8 or more times after drinking too much in the previous year
- 9. NA on R21 and/or R22

V32 R23 Ever Refused Ride (Q14. In the past 12 months have you ever turned down a ride because you felt the driver had been drinking too much?) MD=9

Percentages

W.C.	J.C.
15	15
85	85
*10	*15

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 9. NA

<u>Percentages</u>		V33 <u>R24 Sex (Q15a. Sex.)</u>	MD=9
<u>W.C.</u>	<u>J.C.</u>		
80	72	1. Male	
21	28	2. Female	
0	0	9. NA	

See V35  
for Results

V34 R25 Age 1971 (Q15b. Year of Birth.) MD=99

ACTUAL AGE AS OF JAN. 1, 1971 CODED BY SUBTRACTING LAST TWO DIGITS OF BIRTH YEAR FROM 70.

99. NA

<u>Percentages</u>		V35 <u>R25A Age - 6 (R25 Collapsed)</u>	MD=9
<u>W.C.</u>	<u>J.C.</u>		
0	0	1. 16-17	
1	1	2. 18-20	
14	11	3. 21-29	
23	29	4. 30-44	
50	51	5. 45-64	
12	9	6. 65 & up	
*9	*13	9. NA	

<u>Percentages</u>		V36 <u>R26 Education (Q15c. Education completed.)</u>	MD=9
<u>W.C.</u>	<u>J.C.</u>		
2	4	1. Not a high school graduate	
9	17	2. Finished high school	
26	32	3. Some college	
23	17	4. Finished college	
41	29	5. Some post-college study	
*4	*9	9. NA	

<u>Percentages</u>		V37 <u>R27 Not Deny Right (Q16a. No person should be denied the right to drive if he needs his car to get to work.)</u>	MD=9
<u>W.C.</u>	<u>J.C.</u>		
8	10	1. Agree strongly	
19	21	2. Agree somewhat	
27	26	3. Disagree somewhat	
46	42	4. Disagree strongly	
0	0	8. DK	
*16	*21	9. NA	

<u>Percentages</u>		V38 <u>R28 Too Much Fuss DAD (Q16b. Far too much fuss is made about the dangers of drinking and driving.)</u>	MD=9
<u>W.C.</u>	<u>J.C.</u>		
7	5	1. Agree strongly	
4	7	2. Agree somewhat	
18	17	3. Disagree somewhat	
71	71	4. Disagree strongly	
0	0	8. DK	
*14	*20	9. NA	

<u>Percentages</u>		V39 <u>R29 Drive Poorer with 1 (Q16c. Having even one drink will make a person a poorer driver.)</u>	MD=9
<u>W.C.</u>	<u>J.C.</u>		
21	25	1. Agree strongly	
38	36	2. Agree somewhat	
19	22	3. Disagree somewhat	
22	17	4. Disagree strongly	
*1	0	8. DK	
*9	*17	9. NA	

V40 R30 Stronger Punishment (Q16d. The number of fatal accidents would go way down if those persons who drive after drinking were more strongly punished.) MD=9

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
33	38
38	33
22	17
7	11
*1	0
*14	*20

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

V41 R31 Bars Provide Trans. (Q16e. Taverns and bars should be required to provide transportation for customers who get too drunk to drive safely.) MD=9

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
31	31
33	23
17	17
20	28
*1	0
*13	*19

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

V42 R32 Bars Provide Tests (Q16f. Alcohol breath-testing devices should be available in taverns and bars for customers' use in determining whether they have exceeded legal limits?) MD=9

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
30	26
41	39
18	15
12	20
*1	0
*18	*21

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

V43 R33 Host Should Limit (Q16g. A good host at a party will try to see that his guests who must drive home do not drink too much.) MD=9

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
62	68
31	24
5	3
2	5
0	0
*14	*20

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

V44 R34 Test All Accidents (Q16h. Breath tests to determine blood alcohol concentrations should be required in all reported accidents.) MD=9

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
52	41
29	30
15	19
5	10
*1	0
*19	*22

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

V45 R35 Test Random Checks (Q16i. The police should carry out random road checks to catch drivers who have drunk too much and anyone stopped should be required to take a breath test.) MD=9

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
25	24
33	28
23	21
18	27
*1	0
*15	*20

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

V46 R36 Medical Treatment (Q16j. Drivers convicted of drunk driving and found to be problem drinkers should be required to submit to medical treatment.) MD=9

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
62	59
30	29
6	7
2	5
0	*1
*14	*20

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

V47 R37 Antabuse Pills (Q16k. Drivers convicted of drunk driving should be required to take pills which cause them to be sick if they drink alcohol.) MD=9

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
21	13
29	27
24	22
26	38
0	1
*20	*24

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

V48 R38 Counseling Not Jail (Q16l. It is better to place those arrested while driving "under the influence" on probation and into a counseling or treatment program than it is to put them in jail.) MD=9

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
54	49
34	33
7	11
4	8
0	*1
*18	*21

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

V49 R39 Gov't. Should Help (Q16m. The government should help keep drunk drivers off the roads even if it means spending money to provide medical and psychological help.)

Percentages	
W.C.	J.C.
43	39
40	38
11	11
6	12
0	*1
*19	*23

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