

File Copy

NOV 19 1973

29343

1971 AND 1973 ASAP SURVEYS: WASHTENAW COUNTY ATTORNEYS

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-73-10 | 2. Government Accession No. | 3. Recipient's Catalog No. | |
| 4. Title and Subtitle 1971 and 1973 ASAP Surveys: Washtenaw County Attorneys | | 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-73-10 | |
| 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 | |
| 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program Washtenaw County Health Department Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104 | | 13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report | |
| | | 14. Sponsoring Agency Code | |
| 15. Supplementary Notes | | | |
| 16. Abstract Surveys of attorneys in Washtenaw County were conducted in 1971 and 1973 as part of the evaluation for the Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program. The surveys were conducted by mailed self-administered questionnaires and were designed to obtain base-line and comparison data on the knowledge, attitudes and behavior of local attorneys regarding the drunk driving problem in Washtenaw County. The sample sizes of 200 in 1971 and 198 in 1973 represent response rates of 67% and 60% respectively. Evidence suggesting a positive campaign effect on knowledge and attitudes of attorneys was limited to increases found in favorable attitudes toward the use of alcohol breath tests, knowledge of the safe drinking-before-driving limit, and awareness of the existence of local ASAP activities. Attorneys' direct exposure to WCASAP as defense counsel, prosecutors or judges was considered a potentially more effective agent in producing those changes than the WCASAP campaign. | | | |
| 17. Key Words Alcohol and Driving Attorneys | | 18. Distribution Statement | |
| 19. Security Classif.(of this report) Unclassified | 20. Security Classif.(of this page) Unclassified | 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 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 for 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.

With regard to the present report, we would like to express our appreciation to Mr. John Hensel, Assistant Prosecutor of Washtenaw County who assisted in the development of the 1971 questionnaire and to the many attorneys who returned completed questionnaires. The participation of the legal community was essential to the successful completion of this research, and we are most grateful for the cooperation received.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Notices | ii |
| Preface | iii |
| 1. Summary and Conclusions | 1 |
| 2. Purpose and Methodology | 5 |
| 3. Analysis of Results | 7 |
| 3.1 Knowledge of the Role of Alcohol in Accidents | 7 |
| 3.2 Implied Consent Laws and Breath Tests | 8 |
| 3.3 Incidence of Alcoholism and Attitudes Toward Treatment | 8 |
| 3.4 Awareness of ASAP Activities | 9 |
| 3.5 Attitudes Toward the Drunk Driving Problem | 10 |
| Appendix--Codebook with Marginals for 1971 and 1973 ASAP Surveys: Washtenaw County Attorneys | |

1. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Surveys of attorneys in Washtenaw County were conducted in 1971 and 1973 as part of the evaluation of the Washtenaw Alcohol Safety Action Program's public information campaign. The surveys were conducted by mailed self-administered questionnaires to approximately 300 members of the Bar Association of Washtenaw County, and obtained response rates of 67% and 60% in 1971 and 1973 respectively. Approximately three-fourths of each sample consisted of private or corporate attorneys; the remainder were prosecutors, judges and members of The University of Michigan Law School faculty.

The proportion of respondents who had handled ten or more drunk driving cases during the previous two years increased from 15% of the 1971 sample to 25% of the 1973 sample. The median estimate of the number of such cases handled by respondents overall changed only slightly from zero in 1971 to two in 1973.

The majority of respondents in both surveys thought that more than half of fatal crashes are alcohol-related but that social drinkers rather than problem drinkers are primarily involved in such crashes. Only 38% in 1973 estimated correctly that 50-99 traffic fatalities had occurred in Washtenaw County during the previous year. In 1972, there were 69 traffic fatalities in Washtenaw County.

Although a significant* increase from 45% in 1971 to 75% in 1973 was found in the proportion of respondents who correctly thought that no more than two drinks consumed in one hour would permit safe driving, only 18% in 1971 and 29% in 1973 correctly estimated that four drinks in one hour would be the most a 150-pound person could consume in one hour before reaching a .10 blood alcohol contraction (BAC). There were no important changes in the estimates of the increased crash risk resulting from consumption of six and nine drinks in one hour. The majority of respondents in both surveys underestimated the increased risk.

*All tests of significance are one-tailed and assume a confidence of 95%.

The proportion in favor of requiring a breath test when a person is arrested for DUIL increased significantly from 69% in 1971 to 89% in 1973. Support for extending the application of implied consent laws in Michigan was also found. A majority in each sample thought a person involved in an alcohol-related crash should be required to take a breath test.

Three-fourths of each sample approved of the use of Antabuse^(R) * as a condition of probation for convicted drunk drivers who are diagnosed as problem drinkers, and majorities thought Antabuse was of at least some value in reducing drunk driving recidivism. Approximately two-thirds of the 1973 respondents who had handled drunk driving cases had advised some of these clients to use Antabuse and 40% felt that the majority of persons they knew who had used Antabuse had benefited from the experience.

Almost all respondents had heard about at least one of the eight listed local ASAP countermeasures, and 45% had heard of half or more. In comparison with the general public surveyed in Washtenaw County in 1973, attorneys were very well-informed.

Respondents in both surveys generally disagreed that "too much fuss is being made about the dangers of drinking and driving", that the role of government is "to catch and punish drunk drivers and that anything further that is done for problem drinkers should be by private organizations such as Alcoholics Anonymous" and that "no matter how much effort is invested, there is not likely to be much effect on the drunk driver problem". Majorities agreed that treatment is better than severe penalties for problem drinkers who are convicted of drunk driving and that videotapes should be used in sobriety-testing procedures following a drunk driving arrest. But a significant decrease of support from 43% to 33% was found for placing all alcohol-related convictions on an individual's driver record.

In brief, both surveys found a preponderance of favorable attitudes toward treatment-related and legal countermeasures,

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

with significant increases found only in support for requiring alcohol breath tests in DUI arrests and alcohol-related highway crashes. In the area of factual knowledge, few improvements were found in the low level of understanding about the relationships between alcohol consumption, blood alcohol concentration and crash risk demonstrated by respondents in 1971. In 1973, however, attorneys were found to be generally well-informed about the existence of WCASAP activities.

The role of the WCASAP campaign in causing the increase in favorable attitudes about alcohol breath tests and in creating a high level of awareness of other WCASAP activities is confounded by the professional involvement of many attorneys in WCASAP as defense counsel for persons charged with drunk driving, or as prosecutors or judges in such cases. For example, it was unsurprising to find that attorneys who had defended ten or more drunk driving cases in the previous year, as well as prosecutors and judges were more likely to have heard about the WCASAP activities than were their less involved colleagues. On the other hand, in both surveys highly experienced defense attorneys were found to be less likely than their less experienced colleagues to approve of requiring alcohol breath tests in DUI arrests or alcohol-related crashes, although comparable increases were found across all subgroups.

The WCASAP information and education campaign did not develop special materials or carry out activities for attorneys as a target group. Moreover, the general public mass media campaign was not fully operational until the final 12 months of WCASAP. Attorneys, therefore, were exposed to few campaign messages and only as members of the general public.

Regardless of the intensity of the campaign, it is difficult to consider the effect of campaign materials developed for the general public equal to the effect of direct experience in the program in changing attitudes. Therefore, it is suggested that attorneys who frequently defended, prosecuted, or judged drunk driving cases were primarily affected by that experience and secondarily affected by news reports about WCASAP. Given the

relative strength of resistance to the use of breath tests demonstrated in 1971 by experienced defense attorneys, it was undoubtedly fortunate that direct experience was added to their exposure to campaign materials. Attorneys less involved or uninvolved in drunk driving cases, however, probably relied more heavily on the local media as sources of information about WCASAP.

A general public campaign cannot be expected to effect substantial changes in attitudes when professional interests are strongly resistant to change. However, the limited number of changes in attitude which were found even among attorneys whose practice does not involve handling drunk driving cases casts further doubt on the value of a general public campaign for modifying attitudes. In any case, factual knowledge was only marginally acquired by attorneys regardless of the extent of their experience with WCASAP.

In conclusion, evidence suggesting a positive campaign effect on knowledge and attitudes of attorneys was limited to increases found in favorable attitudes toward the use of alcohol breath tests, knowledge of the safe drinking-before-driving limit, and awareness of the existence of local ASAP activities. Attorneys' direct exposure to WCASAP as defense counsel, prosecutors or judges was considered a potentially more effective agent in producing these changes than the WCASAP campaign.

2. PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

In 1971 and 1973, members of the Bar Association of Washtenaw County were surveyed for evaluation of the Washtenaw Alcohol Safety Action Program public information and education campaign. The first survey obtained baseline data at the beginning of the campaign's operational phase and the second survey obtained comparative data at the end of the campaign for evaluation of campaign effectiveness.

The campaign objectives were to raise the level of knowledge about the role of alcohol in highway crashes and to promote support from the legal community for the ASAP countermeasures to drunk driving in Washtenaw County. Although there were no campaign activities undertaken with attorneys specifically, it was expected that messages directed to the general public through local newspapers and radio, public display boards, and speakers at service club meetings would find attorneys an attentive element of the audience. The direct involvement of some attorneys in ASAP as prosecutors, judges and defense attorneys was also expected to have an impact on the legal community as a whole through informal contacts among its members.

The surveys were conducted by a mailed self-administered questionnaire. Both surveys included follow-up mailings to individuals who had not responded to initial contacts. In 1973, a pre-addressed postcard was included with each mailing and instructions were given to sign and return the postcard under separate cover when the completed questionnaire was returned. Respondents were identified by the returned postcard, follow-up mailings were made to persons who had not returned a postcard, and the questionnaires remained anonymous.

In 1971, 200 completed questionnaires were received from 298 potential respondents, a response rate of 67%. In 1973, 198 of the potential respondents returned completed questionnaires, a response rate of 60%. In 1973, 72% of the respondents reported

themselves as private or corporate attorneys, 8% as prosecutors, 4% as judges, 9% as members of the faculty of The University of Michigan Law School and 3% as public defenders. The 1971 sample was distributed in approximately the same proportions. The samples were also similar in regard to the relative amounts of time respondents were engaged in the field of criminal law. Median estimates for both samples were that 5% of a total practice involved criminal cases.

For the purpose of analysis, the respondents in both surveys were categorized according to the number of drunk driving cases they reported having handled in the previous two years: attorneys who had handled ten or more drunk driving cases in the previous two years were designated as frequent defenders, those who had handled one to nine such cases were designated as infrequent defenders, and those who reported having had no such cases became nondefenders. Prosecutors and judges were treated as a separate category without reference to the number of cases they reported having handled in the previous two years.

In 1971, 15% of the respondents had handled ten or more drunk driving cases, 25% had handled one to nine such cases, and 50% had handled none. In 1973, however, 25% were frequent defenders, 21% were infrequent defenders and 42% were nondefenders. No data were available on the distribution of nonrespondents; but it is suspected that such persons were more likely to be infrequent and nondefenders, which would account for the proportional increase in frequent defenders among respondents.

3. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

3.1 KNOWLEDGE OF THE ROLE OF ALCOHOL IN ACCIDENTS

Little change was found in the estimates made by respondents of the percentage of fatal traffic crashes which involve alcohol. The majority gave estimates of from 50% to 65%. Fewer than half in both surveys thought that problem drinkers rather than social drinkers were primarily responsible for these crashes. In 1973, attorneys were asked to estimate the number of traffic fatalities which had occurred in Washtenaw County the previous year, but only 38% estimated in the correct range of 50-99. In 1972, 69 traffic fatalities occurred in Washtenaw County.

There was a significant downward shift in the number of drinks respondents thought a 150-pound person could consume in one hour and not increase his chance of having an accident. In 1973, only 24% gave answers in excess of two drinks, compared with 53% in 1971, and only two respondents in 1973 thought that more than four drinks would be a safe limit, compared with 10% in 1971.

In 1972, the presumptive minimum BAC's for DUIL and for impaired driving in Michigan were reduced from .15 to .10 and from .10 to .08 respectively. Respondents in both surveys were asked to estimate the maximum number of drinks a 150-pound person could consume in one hour before reaching the impaired driving minimum BAC, and in 1973 respondents were also asked the question with respect to the DUIL minimum. Taking into account that the answer of four drinks was correct for the 1971 impaired driving minimum as well as for the 1973 DUIL minimum (based on calculations for a .09 BAC because the questions asked for maximum numbers of drinks before reaching the BAC minimums), a significant increase from 18% to 29% was found in the proportion who thought four drinks was the limit before reaching a .10 BAC. Respondents were more likely to estimate five or more drinks as the limit in 1973 than in 1971 (26% vs. 20%) which suggests that they may have been thinking of the former DUIL minimum of .15 rather than .10.

A ratio was calculated for each respondent based on his estimate of the number of drinks for safe driving and his estimate of the number of drinks to stay below .10 BAC. Analysis of the ratios across each sample showed a significant downward shift from 1971 to 1973 toward ratios less than unity. In 1973, 85% of the ratios were less than unity, compared with 49% in 1971. This finding suggests strongly that the perception of the limit of drinks for safe driving as less than the limit for legal driving has found a wider audience since the beginning of the local ASAP.

3.2 IMPLIED CONSENT LAWS AND BREATH TESTS

With regard to attitudes toward the present application of implied consent laws in Michigan, 89% of the respondents in 1973 were in favor of requiring a breath test of a person arrested for DUIL, compared with 69% in 1971. This represents a significant increase in support for the implied consent laws as they are currently used in Michigan.

Respondents were asked whether they approved of extending implied consent laws in Michigan to include requiring a breath test of persons who are stopped in random road checks by police, requiring a test of persons suspected of drinking who are involved in highway crashes, and requiring a test of an apparently drunk person who is seen getting into a driver's seat. Both samples were generally negative toward requiring tests in random road checks (84% in 1971 and 85% in 1973 opposed the measure). But both samples generally supported the idea of testing persons involved in alcohol-related highway crashes (67% in 1971, and 79% in 1973 were in favor of the measure). A significant increase was found in support for testing an apparently drunk person seen getting into a driver's seat (31% in 1971 and 48% in 1973 were in favor).

3.3 INCIDENCE OF ALCOHOLISM AND ATTITUDES TOWARD TREATMENT

There was little change in the estimate of the proportion of problem drinkers in the adult Washtenaw County population. The majority of respondents in both surveys made estimates in the range of one to ten percent.

When asked for their opinion of the propriety of including the use of Antabuse as a condition of probation for convicted

drunk drivers who were diagnosed as problem drinkers by ASAP counselors, three-fourths of respondents both years indicated general approval of the measure. Further analysis, however, showed that the strength of approval, measured on a four-point scale from "strongly approve" to "strongly disapprove", had declined. Overall, 41% in 1971 and 33% in 1973 had strongly approved of using Antabuse. The shift was most apparent among frequent defenders, 52% of whom had strongly approved in 1971 compared with only 23% of that opinion in 1973. Nevertheless, general approval remained high.

A three-point scale was used to measure opinion regarding the value of Antabuse in reducing drunk driving recidivism. Twenty percent of the respondents in both surveys thought Antabuse was very valuable, 37% in 1971 and 51% in 1973 thought it was of some value, and 20% in each survey thought it was not at all valuable. Ten percent more respondents in 1973 actually gave an opinion than in 1971.

In 1971, 87% of the respondents who had handled drunk driving cases said they would probably advise such clients to use Antabuse if the client had a serious drinking problem. In 1973, 68% of the respondents who had drunk driving clients actually had advised one or more of those clients to use Antabuse and 51% had so advised all or almost all of those clients. Forty percent felt that half or more of the persons they knew who had participated in the Antabuse program had benefited from the experience.

3.4 AWARENESS OF ASAP ACTIVITIES

The table below shows the proportion of respondents who had heard about each of eight listed ASAP activities being used in Washtenaw County.

In comparison with the general public surveyed in Washtenaw County in 1973, attorneys were very well-informed about ASAP activities. One-third or less of the general public had heard about any one of the activities, compared with half or more of the attorneys who had heard about Antabuse, special classes, ASAP probation officers, the public information campaign or increased

| <u>ASAP Activities</u> | <u>%</u> |
|--|----------|
| Special ASAP police patrols | 38 |
| Roadside breathtesting surveys | 40 |
| Use of Antabuse by convicted drunk drivers | 83 |
| Public information campaign | 52 |
| Increased DUIL arrests | 51 |
| Special alcohol education classes | 79 |
| ASAP probation officers | 52 |
| Counseling in couple's clubs | 40 |

DUIL arrests. An analysis of cumulative positive responses showed that 45% of the attorneys had heard of four or more of the eight listed countermeasures, compared with only 20% of the general public.

3.5 ATTITUDES TOWARD THE DRUNK DRIVING PROBLEM

Opinions about several statements relating to the drunk driving countermeasures were measured on a four-point scale from "agree strongly" to "disagree strongly". Almost all respondents in both surveys (95% in 1971, 96% in 1973) disagreed at least somewhat with the statement that "too much fuss is being made about the dangers of drinking and driving", and similarly high proportions (87% in 1971 and 91% in 1973) at least tended to disagree with the statement that "the government's role is to catch and punish drunk drivers and anything more that is done for problem drinkers should be by private organizations such as Alcoholics Anonymous". Most respondents (83% in 1971 and 89% in 1973) also disagreed that "no matter how much effort is invested there is not likely to be much effect on the drunk driver problem".

An increase of 10% (78% in 1971 and 88% in 1973) was found in the proportion of respondents who agreed that "convicted drunk drivers who are diagnosed as problem drinkers should be placed on probation and into treatment programs rather than given severe penalties". A decrease of 10% (43% in 1971 and 33% in 1973) was found of respondents who agreed that "all alcohol-related offense should be recorded on a person's driver record whether or not the

offenses were related to driving". Little change was found in the proportion which agreed that "videotapes of arrested drunk drivers should be used as part of sobriety-testing procedures" (69% in 1971 and 73% in 1973).

APPENDIX

**CODEBOOK WITH MARGINALS FOR 1971 AND 1973
ASAP SURVEYS: WASHTENAW COUNTY ATTORNEYS**

INTRODUCTION

The following codebook represents the findings of two surveys of Washtenaw County attorneys conducted in 1971 and 1973 as part of the evaluation procedures for the Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program.

In 1971, the total sample (TS) size was 200 and in 1973 it was 198. Each sample was divided into subgroups according to the number of drunk driving cases handled by a respondent in the previous 12 months. Attorneys who had handled ten or more drunk driving cases were designated as frequent defenders (FD). Those who had handled one to nine such cases became infrequent defenders (ID), and those who had handled no such cases were called nondefenders (ND). Prosecutors and judges (PJ) were treated as a separate subgroup without reference to the number of drunk driving cases handled. In 1971, FD=29, ID=49, ND=101, and PJ=21. In 1973, FD=50, ID=42, ND=83 and PJ=23. For variables relating specifically to the handling of drunk driving cases, TS decreases to 94 in 1971 and 109 in 1973 because of the exclusion of attorneys who had not handled such cases.

The marginals for categorical variables are presented as percentages. Column percentages usually add to 100. But in the case of a multiple response variable, the number of mentions was divided by the number respondents, resulting in column percentages adding to more than 100. The marginals for numeric variables are presented as percentiles, specifically the tenth, thirtieth, fiftieth, seventieth and nintieth percentiles. An asterisk (*) is used to indicate an actual frequency.

Data obtained from the 1971 survey are presented in parentheses. Data obtained from the 1973 survey are free-standing.

INDEX TO VARIABLES

| <u>VARIABLE NUMBER</u> | <u>VARIABLE DESCRIPTION</u> | <u>PAGE</u> |
|----------------------------|--|-------------|
| 1 | Data Set Number (14) | 1 |
| 2 | Respondent ID Number | 1 |
| | LEGAL BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE WITH DRUNK DRIVING CASES | |
| 3 | DD Cases Experience | 1 |
| 53 | Years in Legal Work | 12 |
| 54 | Type of Practice | 12 |
| 55 | Criminal Law % | 13 |
| 56 | Criminal Law %-8 | 13 |
| 57 | DUIL-Imp Cases-2 Yr. | 13 |
| 58 | DUIL-Imp Cases-2 Yr-8 | 13 |
| 59 | PD Cases | 14 |
| 60 | PD Cases-8 | 14 |
| 61 | PD Cases % | 14 |
| 62 | PD Cases %-7 | 14 |
| | ALCOHOL AND ACCIDENTS | |
| 4 | County Fatalities | 1 |
| 5 | County Fatalities-8 | 1 |
| 6 | Alcohol Fatalities % | 1 |
| 7 | Alcohol Fatalities %-8 | 1 |
| 8 | PD Fatalities % | 2 |
| 9 | PD Fatalities %-8 | 2 |
| 12 | No. of Safe Drinks | 3 |
| 13 | No. of Impaired Drinks | 3 |
| 14 | No. of DUIL Drinks | 4 |
| 15 | Accident 6 Drinks | 4 |
| 16 | Accident 6 Drinks-9 | 4 |
| 17 | Accident 9 Drinks | 5 |
| 18 | Accident 9 Drinks-9 | 5 |
| 19 | Safe-Impaired Ratio | 5 |
| 20 | Safe-DUIL Ratio | 5 |
| 21 | Impaired-DUIL Ratio | 6 |
| | ATTITUDES TOWARD IMPLIED CONSENT LAWS AND BREATH TESTS | |
| 22 | Should Test Random | 6 |
| 23 | Should Test Drunk | 6 |
| 24 | Should Test DUIL Arrestee | 6 |
| 25 | Should Test Crash | 6 |
| 26 | Breath Test Shd-4 | 7 |
| 30 | Roadside Testing | 8 |
| 44 | Bars Provide Tests | 10 |
| 50 | Refusal Effect | 12 |
| | ATTITUDES TOWARD STRICT ENFORCEMENT AND PUNISHMENT OF DRUNK DRIVERS | |
| 43 | Police Patrol Party | 10 |
| 46 | Record All Alcohol | 11 |
| 47 | Stronger Punishment | 11 |
| 48 | Counsel Not Punish | 11 |
| 52 | Deterrence CM Score | 12 |

INCIDENCE OF ALCOHOLISM AND ATTITUDES TOWARD TREATMENT

| | | |
|----|-----------------------------|----|
| 10 | Alcoholic Percentage | 2 |
| 11 | Alcoholic %-8 | 3 |
| 27 | Appropriateness of Antabuse | 7 |
| 28 | Value of Antabuse | 8 |
| 31 | Antabuse CM | 8 |
| 63 | No. Advise Antabuse | 15 |
| 64 | % Advise Antabuse | 15 |
| 65 | % Advise Antabuse-7 | 15 |
| 66 | % Benefit Antabuse | 15 |
| 67 | % Benefit Antabuse-7 | 16 |

WASAP COUNTERMEASURES

| | | |
|----|--------------------|---|
| 32 | Local Campaign | 8 |
| 33 | More DUIs | 8 |
| 34 | Special Classes | 8 |
| 35 | Probation Officers | 9 |
| 36 | Couples Clubs | 9 |
| 37 | Total CM's Known | 9 |

GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD THE DRUNK DRIVER PROBLEM AND TRAFFIC SAFETY

| | | |
|----|----------------------|----|
| 38 | Law Requiring Belt | 9 |
| 39 | Too Much Fuss | 9 |
| 40 | Most DAD Not Caught | 10 |
| 41 | Videotape Opinion | 10 |
| 42 | Host Should Limit | 10 |
| 45 | Bars Liable Damage | 11 |
| 49 | Gov't Not Help | 11 |
| 51 | Not Much Effect | 12 |
| 68 | Improve Legal System | 16 |

Variable #

V1 R1 Data Set Number

V2 R2 Respondent ID Number

V3 R41 & R43 DD Cases Experienced (combination of R41 & R43)

| | TS Freqs. | TS% |
|-------|-----------|-------|
| | 50 | 25 |
| | (29) | (15) |
| | 42 | 21 |
| | (49) | (25) |
| | 83 | 42 |
| | (101) | (50) |
| | 23 | 12 |
| | (21) | (11) |
| Total | 198 | 100 |
| | (200) | (101) |

1. Attorneys who defended ten or more drunk driving cases in the past 2 years
2. Attorneys who defended 1-9 drunk driving cases in the past 2 years
3. Attorneys who defended no drunk driving cases in the past 2 years
4. Prosecutors and judges

V4 R3 County Fatalities (Q1. About how many persons would you guess were killed in traffic accidents in Washtenaw County in 1972?)

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED

MD=998,999

997. Over 997
998. DK
999. NA

V5 R3A County Fatalities-8 (R3 collapsed)

MD=9

0. None
1. 1-9 fatalities
2. 10-49 fatalities
3. 50-69 fatalities
4. 70-99 fatalities
5. 100-199 fatalities
6. 200-995 fatalities
7. Over 996 fatalities (2000)
8. DK
9. NA

V6 R4 Alcohol Fatalities % (Q2. Out of every 100 traffic accidents in which someone is killed, how many would you estimate involve a driver who has been drinking?)

MD=98,99

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED

98. DK
99. NA

V7 R4A Alcohol Fatalities %-8 (R4 collapsed)

MD=9

0. None
1. 1-19%
2. 20-34%
3. 35-49%
4. 50%
5. 51-65%
6. 66-80%

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 10. | 25 | 25 | 20 | 20 | 25 |
| 30. | 40 | 35 | 49 | 40 | 56 |
| 50. | 60 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 70 |
| 70. | 80 | 72 | 75 | 100 | 77 |
| 90. | 139 | 168 | 210 | 150 | 100 |

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| | 35 | 45 | 26 | 36 | 24 |
| | 18 | 18 | 26 | 13 | 24 |
| | 20 | 18 | 18 | 19 | 29 |
| | 19 | 8 | 13 | 28 | 19 |
| | 5 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 0 |
| | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| *12 | *1 | *4 | *5 | *2 | |

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| 10. | 30 | 31 | 35 | 25 | 33 |
| | (25) | (25) | (25) | (25) | (20) |
| 30. | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| | (50) | (50) | (47) | (60) | (50) |
| 50. | 50 | 50 | 54 | 50 | 50 |
| | (50) | (50) | (50) | (50) | (50) |
| 70. | 60 | 57 | 65 | 60 | 61 |
| | (60) | (60) | (56) | (50) | (70) |
| 90. | 75 | 70 | 75 | 75 | 69 |
| | (75) | (71) | (71) | (75) | (80) |

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| | (2) | (4) | (0) | (2) | (5) |
| | 9 | 10 | 5 | 11 | 9 |
| | (13) | (11) | (17) | (14) | (5) |
| | 13 | 14 | 17 | 8 | 18 |
| | (9) | (11) | (13) | (7) | (11) |
| | 35 | 46 | 24 | 35 | 32 |
| | (34) | (25) | (13) | (14) | (16) |
| | 22 | 16 | 27 | 20 | 32 |
| | (16) | (29) | (13) | (14) | (16) |
| | 16 | 14 | 22 | 17 | 5 |
| | (18) | (14) | (13) | (20) | (26) |

Variable #

V1 R1 Data Set Number

V2 R2 Respondent ID Number

V3 R41 & R43 DD Cases Experienced (combination of R41 & R43)

| | TS Freqs. | TS% |
|-------|-----------|-------|
| | 50 | 25 |
| | (29) | (15) |
| | 42 | 21 |
| | (49) | (25) |
| | 83 | 42 |
| | (101) | (50) |
| | 23 | 12 |
| | (21) | (11) |
| Total | 198 | 100 |
| | (200) | (101) |

1. Attorneys who defended ten or more drunk driving cases in the past 2 years
2. Attorneys who defended 1-9 drunk driving cases in the past 2 years
3. Attorneys who defended no drunk driving cases in the past 2 years
4. Prosecutors and judges

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 10. | 25 | 25 | 20 | 20 | 25 |
| 30. | 40 | 35 | 49 | 40 | 56 |
| 50. | 60 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 70 |
| 70. | 80 | 72 | 75 | 100 | 77 |
| 90. | 139 | 168 | 210 | 150 | 100 |

V4 R3 County Fatalities (Q1. About how many persons would you guess were killed in traffic accidents in Washtenaw County in 1972?)

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED

MD=998,999

997. Over 997
998. DK
999. NA

V5 R3A County Fatalities-8 (R3 collapsed)

MD-9

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| | 35 | 45 | 26 | 36 | 24 |
| | 18 | 18 | 26 | 13 | 24 |
| | 20 | 18 | 18 | 19 | 29 |
| | 19 | 8 | 13 | 28 | 19 |
| | 5 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 0 |
| | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| *12 | *1 | *4 | *5 | *2 | |

0. None
1. 1-9 fatalities
2. 10-49 fatalities
3. 50-69 fatalities
4. 70-99 fatalities
5. 100-199 fatalities
6. 200-995 fatalities
7. Over 996 fatalities (2000)
8. DK
9. NA

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| 10. | 30 | 31 | 35 | 25 | 33 |
| | (25) | (25) | (25) | (25) | (20) |
| 30. | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| | (50) | (50) | (47) | (60) | (50) |
| 50. | 50 | 50 | 54 | 50 | 50 |
| | (50) | (50) | (50) | (50) | (50) |
| 70. | 60 | 57 | 65 | 60 | 61 |
| | (60) | (60) | (56) | (50) | (70) |
| 90. | 75 | 70 | 75 | 75 | 69 |
| | (75) | (71) | (71) | (75) | (80) |

V6 R4 Alcohol Fatalities % (Q2. Out of every 100 traffic accidents in which someone is killed, how many would you estimate involve a driver who has been drinking?)

MD=98,99

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED

98. DK
99. NA

V7 R4A Alcohol Fatalities %-8 (R4 collapsed)

MD-9

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| | (2) | (4) | (0) | (2) | (5) |
| | 9 | 10 | 5 | 11 | 9 |
| | (13) | (11) | (17) | (14) | (5) |
| | 13 | 14 | 17 | 8 | 18 |
| | (9) | (11) | (13) | (7) | (11) |
| | 35 | 46 | 24 | 35 | 32 |
| | (34) | (25) | (13) | (14) | (16) |
| | 22 | 16 | 27 | 20 | 32 |
| | (16) | (29) | (13) | (14) | (16) |
| | 16 | 14 | 22 | 17 | 5 |
| | (18) | (14) | (13) | (20) | (26) |

0. None
1. 1-19%
2. 20-34%
3. 35-49%
4. 50%
5. 51-65%
6. 66-80%

Variable #

V1 R1 Data Set Number

V2 R2 Respondent ID Number

V3 R41 & R43 DD Cases Experienced (combination of R41 & R43)

| | TS Freqs. | TS% |
|-------|-----------|-------|
| | 50 | 25 |
| | (29) | (15) |
| | 42 | 21 |
| | (49) | (25) |
| | 83 | 42 |
| | (101) | (50) |
| | 23 | 12 |
| | (21) | (11) |
| Total | 198 | 100 |
| | (200) | (101) |

1. Attorneys who defended ten or more drunk driving cases in the past 2 years
2. Attorneys who defended 1-9 drunk driving cases in the past 2 years
3. Attorneys who defended no drunk driving cases in the past 2 years
4. Prosecutors and judges

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 10. | 25 | 25 | 20 | 20 | 25 |
| 30. | 40 | 35 | 49 | 40 | 56 |
| 50. | 60 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 70 |
| 70. | 80 | 72 | 75 | 100 | 77 |
| 90. | 139 | 168 | 210 | 150 | 100 |

V4 R3 County Fatalities (Q1. About how many persons would you guess were killed in traffic accidents in Washtenaw County in 1972?)

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED

MD=998,999

997. Over 997
998. DK
999. NA

V5 R3A County Fatalities-8 (R3 collapsed)

MD-9

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| | 35 | 45 | 26 | 36 | 24 |
| | 18 | 18 | 26 | 13 | 24 |
| | 20 | 18 | 18 | 19 | 29 |
| | 19 | 8 | 13 | 28 | 19 |
| | 5 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 0 |
| | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| *12 | *1 | *4 | *5 | *2 | |

0. None
1. 1-9 fatalities
2. 10-49 fatalities
3. 50-99 fatalities
4. 70-99 fatalities
5. 100-199 fatalities
6. 200-995 fatalities
7. Over 996 fatalities (2000)
8. DK
9. NA

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| 10. | 30 | 31 | 35 | 25 | 33 |
| | (25) | (25) | (25) | (25) | (20) |
| 30. | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| | (50) | (50) | (47) | (60) | (50) |
| 50. | 50 | 50 | 54 | 50 | 50 |
| | (50) | (50) | (50) | (50) | (50) |
| 70. | 60 | 57 | 65 | 60 | 61 |
| | (60) | (60) | (56) | (50) | (70) |
| 90. | 75 | 70 | 75 | 75 | 69 |
| | (75) | (71) | (71) | (75) | (80) |

V6 R4 Alcohol Fatalities % (Q2. Out of every 100 traffic accidents in which someone is killed, how many would you estimate involve a driver who has been drinking?)

MD=98,99

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED

98. DK
99. NA

V7 R4A Alcohol Fatalities %-8 (R4 collapsed)

MD-9

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| | (2) | (4) | (0) | (2) | (5) |
| | 9 | 10 | 5 | 11 | 9 |
| | (13) | (11) | (17) | (14) | (5) |
| | 13 | 14 | 17 | 8 | 18 |
| | (9) | (11) | (13) | (7) | (11) |
| | 35 | 46 | 24 | 35 | 32 |
| | (34) | (25) | (13) | (14) | (16) |
| | 22 | 16 | 27 | 20 | 32 |
| | (16) | (29) | (13) | (14) | (16) |
| | 16 | 14 | 22 | 17 | 5 |
| | (18) | (14) | (13) | (20) | (26) |

0. None
1. 1-19%
2. 20-34%
3. 35-49%
4. 50%
5. 51-65%
6. 66-80%

V7 R4A Alcohol Fatalities %-8 (cont'd)

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| (2) | (0) | (4) | (0) | (5) |
| 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| (5) | (7) | (0) | (8) | (0) |
| *5 | 0 | *1 | *3 | *1 |
| (*7) | (*1) | (*2) | (*2) | (*2) |

- 7. 81-100%
- 8. DK
- 9. NA

| | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| 10. | 15 | 10 | 25 | 10 | 22 |
| | (10) | (13) | (20) | (10) | (21) |
| 30. | 40 | 30 | 50 | 33 | 50 |
| | (30) | (29) | (31) | (25) | (47) |
| 50. | 50 | 50 | 67 | 50 | 50 |
| | (50) | (50) | (50) | (50) | (50) |
| 70. | 75 | 60 | 80 | 75 | 69 |
| | (60) | (66) | (70) | (50) | (60) |
| 90. | 85 | 80 | 90 | 85 | 83 |
| | (80) | (87) | (85) | (76) | (75) |

V8 R5 Problem Drinker Fatalities-% (Q3. Of these drinking related fatal traffic accidents, in what percent would you estimate that the drinking driver is a person who has a serious drinking problem that affects his health, job or family or social life?)

- ACTUAL NUMBER CODED MD=98,99
- 98. DK
 - 99. NA

V9 R5A Problem Drinker Fatalities %-8 (R5 collapsed) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| 11 | 17 | 5 | 14 | 0 |
| (14) | (18) | (6) | (19) | (5) |
| 15 | 17 | 12 | 15 | 17 |
| (17) | (11) | (28) | (17) | (5) |
| 8 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 4 |
| (9) | (7) | (6) | (8) | (20) |
| 23 | 21 | 22 | 21 | 35 |
| (22) | (18) | (19) | (23) | (30) |
| 6 | 13 | 2 | 3 | 13 |
| (7) | (11) | (2) | (5) | (25) |
| 23 | 19 | 22 | 26 | 22 |
| (18) | (18) | (28) | (13) | (15) |
| 12 | 4 | 27 | 10 | 9 |
| (6) | (7) | (11) | (4) | (0) |
| 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| (7) | (11) | (0) | (10) | (0) |
| *6 | *2 | *1 | *3 | 0 |
| (*9) | (*1) | (*2) | (*5) | (*1) |

- 0. None
- 1. 1-19%
- 2. 20-34%
- 3. 35-49%
- 4. 50%
- 5. 51-65%
- 6. 66-80%
- 7. 81-100%
- 8. DK
- 9. NA

| | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| 10. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| | (3) | (4) | (2) | (3) | (3) |
| 30. | 5 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 8 |
| | (5) | (5) | (5) | (5) | (5) |
| 50. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 9 |
| | (7) | (9) | (10) | (5) | (7) |
| 70. | 12 | 10 | 15 | 10 | 15 |
| | (10) | (15) | (10) | (10) | (10) |
| 90. | 25 | 25 | 25 | 21 | 26 |
| | (20) | (29) | (20) | (20) | (20) |

V10 R6 Alcoholic Percentage (Q4. What percent of the adults of Washtenaw County would you guess are alcoholics or have serious drinking problems?) MD=98,99

- ACTUAL NUMBER CODED
- 98. DK
 - 99. NA

V11 R6A Alcoholic Percentage-8 (R6 collapsed)

MD-9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (1) | (0) | (0) | (1) | (0) |
| 13 | 14 | 10 | 16 | 9 |
| (12) | ((7) | (17) | (12) | (10) |
| 26 | 29 | 17 | 31 | 18 |
| (30) | (28) | (21) | (36) | (25) |
| 29 | 29 | 32 | 25 | 36 |
| (28) | (28) | (34) | (23) | (40) |
| 17 | 12 | 24 | 16 | 14 |
| (16) | (17) | (19) | (13) | (25) |
| 11 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 23 |
| (4) | (10) | (4) | (3) | (0) |
| 2 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| (1) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (0) |
| *1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| (7) | (7) | (2) | (10) | (0) |
| *6 | *1 | *1 | *3 | *1 |
| (*5) | (0) | (*2) | (*2) | (*1) |

- 0. None
- 1. 1-3%
- 2. 4-5%
- 3. 6-10%
- 4. 11-20%
- 5. 21-30%
- 6. 31-50%
- 7. 51-100%
- 8. DK
- 9. NA

In Question 5 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 A MIXED DRINK)

V12 R7 Safe Drinks (Q5. Suppose that a 150-pound person drinks for a one-hour period before driving. What do you think is the most he could drink without increasing his chance of having an accident?)

MD=98,99

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 9 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 5 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (1) | (0) |
| 23 | 20 | 25 | 25 | 14 |
| (12) | (11) | (4) | (18) | (0) |
| 43 | 41 | 47 | 44 | 41 |
| (33) | (29) | (36) | (33) | (37) |
| 19 | 25 | 15 | 18 | 18 |
| (31) | (29) | (36) | (27) | (42) |
| 5 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 18 |
| (12) | (11) | (19) | (11) | (0) |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| (5) | (7) | (4) | (3) | (11) |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| (3) | (11) | (0) | (2) | (0) |
| (1) | (4) | (0) | (0) | (5) |
| (1) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (5) |
| (3) | (0) | (0) | (5) | (0) |
| *5 | *1 | *2 | *1 | *1 |
| (*6) | (*1) | (*2) | (*1) | (*2) |

- 0. None
- 01. One drink
- 02. Two drinks
- 03. Three drinks
- 04. Four drinks
- 05. Five drinks
- 06. Six drinks
- 07. Seven drinks
- 08. Eight drinks
- 98. DK
- 99. NA

V13 R8 Drinks Impaired (Q5a. What do you think is the most he could drink without reaching a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of .08% the minimum BAC for presumptive evidence of impaired driving in Michigan?)

MD=98,99

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 13 | 12 | 10 | 16 | 9 |
| 29 | 31 | 36 | 30 | 9 |
| 32 | 31 | 31 | 33 | 36 |
| 16 | 20 | 18 | 11 | 23 |
| 5 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 9 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| *3 | 0 | *1 | *1 | *1 |
| *5 | *1 | *2 | *2 | 0 |

- 01. One drink
- 02. Two drinks
- 03. Three drinks
- 04. Four drinks
- 05. Five Drinks
- 06. Six drinks
- 08. Eight drinks
- 98. DK
- 99. NA

V14 R9 Drinks DUIIL (Q5b. And what do you think is the most he could drink without reaching a BAC of .10%, the minimum BAC for presumptive evidence of driving under the influence of liquor?) MD-98,99

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 5 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 5 |
| (7) | (0) | (6) | (9) | (5) |
| 13 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 5 |
| (25) | (29) | (32) | (26) | (0) |
| 28 | 29 | 33 | 31 | 5 |
| (27) | (29) | (34) | (25) | (21) |
| 29 | 27 | 31 | 27 | 38 |
| (18) | (25) | (11) | (17) | (26) |
| 13 | 16 | 13 | 9 | 24 |
| (11) | (7) | (6) | (9) | (42) |
| 6 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 5 |
| (5) | (0) | (9) | (5) | (0) |
| 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| (1) | (4) | (0) | (1) | (0) |
| 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 9 |
| (2) | (4) | (2) | (0) | (5) |
| 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| (1) | (4) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| *3 | 0 | *1 | *1 | *1 |
| (4) | (0) | (0) | (7) | (0) |
| *6 | *1 | *2 | *2 | *1 |
| (*7) | (*1) | (*2) | (*2) | (*2) |

- 01. One drink
- 02. Two drinks
- 03. Three drinks
- 04. Four drinks
- 05. Five drinks
- 06. Six drinks
- 07. Seven drinks
- 08. Eight drinks
- 10. Ten drinks
- 98. DK
- 99. NA

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|--------|------|------|------|------|
| 10. 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| (2) | (3) | (2) | (3) | (2) |
| 30. 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| (5) | (4) | (4) | (5) | (3) |
| 50. 5 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 10 |
| (6) | (5) | (5) | (10) | (5) |
| 70. 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| (10) | (16) | (11) | (10) | (9) |
| 90. 66 | 16 | 25 | 96 | 96 |
| (50) | (24) | (41) | (91) | (24) |

V15 R10 Accident 6 Drinks (Q6. 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

- ACTUAL NUMBER CODED
- 96. 96-100 times
 - 97. Over 100 times
 - 98. DK
 - 99. NA

V16 R10A Accident 6 Drinks-9 (R10 collapsed)

MD-9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-------|------|------|------|------|
| *1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (1) | (0) | (2) | (0) | (0) |
| 19 | 23 | 20 | 18 | 9 |
| (10) | (7) | (12) | (8) | (17) |
| 30 | 37 | 23 | 29 | 33 |
| (32) | (44) | (37) | (26) | (33) |
| 30 | 25 | 43 | 25 | 33 |
| (27) | (19) | (19) | (31) | (33) |
| 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 9 |
| (14) | (22) | (19) | (10) | (11) |
| 4 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| (4) | (7) | (2) | (5) | (0) |
| 9 | 7 | 0 | 14 | 14 |
| (6) | (0) | (7) | (7) | (6) |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| (2) | (0) | (0) | (3) | (0) |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| (5) | (0) | (2) | (9) | (0) |
| *10 | *2 | *2 | *4 | *2 |
| (*15) | (*2) | (*6) | (*4) | (*3) |

- 0. No or small increased chance
- 1. 1.50-2.49
- 2. 2.50-5.49
- 3. 5.50-10.49
- 4. 10.50-25.49
- 5. 25.50-50.49
- 6. 50.50-100.49
- 7. Over 100.49
- 8. DK
- 9. NA

V17 R11 Accident 9 Drinks (Q6a. How about if he has 9 drinks?) MD=9 MD-98,99

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| 10. | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| | (4) | (5) | (4) | (4) | (4) |
| 30. | 8 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 9 |
| | (10) | (9) | (8) | (10) | (10) |
| 50. | 14 | 10 | 20 | 12 | 12 |
| | (15) | (10) | (10) | (20) | (11) |
| 70. | 46 | 20 | 50 | 58 | 25 |
| | (46) | (26) | (55) | (50) | (28) |
| 90. | 97 | 79 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| | (97) | (56) | (97) | (97) | (96) |

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED

- 96. 96-100
- 97. Over 100 (Infinitely times more (3 entries);300;500;1000 (2 entries))
- 98. DK
- 99. NA

V18 R11A Accident 9 Drinks-9 (R11 collapsed) MD=9

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|--|-------|------|------|------|------|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| | (2) | (0) | (7) | (0) | (0) |
| | 22 | 35 | 10 | 21 | 14 |
| | (11) | (11) | (14) | (11) | (11) |
| | 24 | 21 | 20 | 25 | 33 |
| | (32) | (44) | (29) | (28) | (39) |
| | 20 | 19 | 27 | 16 | 29 |
| | (16) | (15) | (9) | (18) | (22) |
| | 7 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 0 |
| | (13) | (22) | (9) | (12) | (11) |
| | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 9 |
| | (11) | (7) | (11) | (12) | (11) |
| | 11 | 0 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| | (10) | (0) | (16) | (11) | (6) |
| | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | (6) | (0) | (5) | (9) | (0) |
| | *12 | *2 | *2 | *6 | *2 |
| | (*16) | (*2) | (*5) | (*6) | (*3) |

- 0. No or small increased chance
- 1. 1.50-2.49
- 2. 2.50-5.49
- 3. 5.50-10.49
- 4. 10.50-25.49
- 5. 25.50-50.49
- 6. 50.50-100.49
- 7. Over 100.49
- 8. DK
- 9. NA

V19 R7-8 Safe/Impaired Ratio (R7/R8) MD=9

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 20 | 19 | 23 | 24 | 5 |
| | 41 | 35 | 44 | 36 | 71 |
| | 28 | 37 | 21 | 29 | 19 |
| | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| | 4 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 0 |
| | 4 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | *10 | *2 | *3 | *3 | *2 |
| | (*8) | (*1) | (*2) | (*3) | (*2) |

- 0. 0.0-0.49
- 1. 0.50-0.99
- 2. 1.00 exactly
- 3. 1.01-1.49
- 4. 1.50-1.99
- 5. 2.00-2.99
- 6. 3.00-9.99
- 7. 10.00-99.998
- 8. DK
- 9. DK, NA on V12 or V13 (1971: NA only)

V20 R7-9 Safe-DUIL Ratio (R7/R9 collapsed) MD=9

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 36 | 37 | 41 | 36 | 20 |
| | (3) | (4) | (2) | (3) | (5) |
| | 49 | 48 | 46 | 45 | 75 |
| | (46) | (43) | (36) | (48) | (63) |
| | 11 | 15 | 8 | 14 | 0 |
| | (31) | (29) | (36) | (33) | (16) |
| | *1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| | (4) | (11) | (0) | (6) | (5) |
| | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| | (8) | (14) | (11) | (6) | (5) |
| | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| | (3) | (0) | (6) | (2) | (5) |
| | *1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | (1) | (0) | (2) | (1) | (0) |

- 0. 0.0-0.49
- 1. 0.50-0.99
- 2. 1.00 exactly
- 3. 1.01-1.49
- 4. 1.50-1.99
- 5. 2.00-2.99
- 6. 3.00-9.99

V20 R7-9 Safe-DUIL Ratio (cont'd)

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| (4) | (0) | (0) | (7) | (0) |
| *11 | *2 | *3 | *3 | *3 |

- 7. 10.00-99.998
- 8. DK
- 9. DK or NA on V12 or V14

V21 R8-9 Impaired/DUIL Ratio (R8/R9 collapsed)

MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|----|----|----|----|
| 84 | 90 | 85 | 79 | 91 |
| 14 | 10 | 15 | 17 | 9 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *10 | *2 | *3 | *3 | *2 |

- 0. 0.0-0.49
- 1. 0.50-0.99
- 2. 1.00 exactly
- 3. 1.01-1.49
- 4. 1.50-1.99
- 5. 2.00-2.99
- 6. 3.00-9.99
- 7. 10.00-99.998
- 9. DK, NA on V13 or V14

V22 R12 Should Test Randomly (Q7. Since 1967, implied consent laws in Michigan have governed the use of breath tests for determining the blood alcohol concentration of a driver. In which of the situations below do you think there should be a mandatory penalty for refusing to take a breath test under the implied consent laws? (a) When a driver is stopped in a random road check?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 15 | 8 | 17 | 19 | 9 |
| (17) | (6) | (12) | (21) | (23) |
| 85 | 92 | 83 | 81 | 91 |
| (84) | (93) | (88) | (76) | (76) |
| *10 | *1 | *2 | *6 | *1 |
| (*4) | (0) | (*1) | (*3) | (0) |

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

V23 R13 Should Test Drunk (Q7b. When an apparently drunk person is seen getting into a driver's seat?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 48 | 30 | 37 | 65 | 48 |
| (31) | (13) | (27) | (38) | (18) |
| 52 | 70 | 63 | 35 | 52 |
| (70) | (86) | (73) | (59) | (81) |
| *6 | 0 | *2 | *4 | 0 |
| (*4) | (0) | (*1) | (*3) | (0) |

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

V24 R14 Should Test Arrestee (Q7c. When a driver is arrested for drunk driving?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 89 | 76 | 92 | 93 | 96 |
| (69) | (48) | (69) | (69) | (89) |
| 11 | 24 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| (32) | (51) | (31) | (28) | (10) |
| *5 | 0 | *3 | *2 | 0 |
| (*4) | (0) | (*1) | (*3) | (0) |

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

V25 R15 Should Test Any Accident (Q7d. When a person who appears to have been drinking is involved in a traffic accident?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 79 | 60 | 85 | 89 | 78 |
| (67) | (48) | (62) | (71) | (70) |
| 20 | 40 | 15 | 10 | 22 |
| (34) | (51) | (38) | (26) | (29) |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| (*1) | (0) | (0) | (*1) | (0) |
| *7 | 0 | *3 | *4 | 0 |
| (*4) | (0) | (*1) | (*3) | (0) |

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

V26 R12-15 Breath Test Should-4 (combination of R12-R15) The police should test:

- (c) When a driver is arrested for drunk driving.
- (a) When a driver is stopped in a random road check.
- (b) When an apparently drunk person is seen getting into a driver's seat.
- (d) When a person who appears to have been drinking is involved in a highway crash.

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 9 | 14 | 8 | 4 | 18 |
| (14) | (7) | (21) | (10) | (24) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (1) | (0) | (0) | (2) | (0) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (1) | (3) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| (2) | (0) | (4) | (2) | (0) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| 2 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| (10) | (7) | (10) | (11) | (5) |
| 30 | 29 | 44 | 23 | 32 |
| (23) | (28) | (23) | (19) | (33) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| (6) | (3) | (6) | (5) | (14) |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| (2) | (0) | (4) | (1) | (0) |
| 32 | 22 | 18 | 43 | 36 |
| (18) | (7) | (17) | (23) | (9) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| 12 | 4 | 15 | 17 | 9 |
| (8) | (3) | (2) | (12) | (9) |
| 10 | 25 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| (16) | (41) | (13) | (12) | (5) |
| (*1) | (0) | (0) | (*1) | (0) |
| *11 | *1 | *3 | *6 | *1 |
| (*4) | (0) | (*1) | (*3) | (0) |

- 1. c only
- 2. a only
- 3. a & c
- 4. b only
- 5. b & c
- 6. b & a
- 7. a & b & c
- 8. d only
- 9. c & d
- 10. a & d
- 11. a & c & d
- 12. b & d
- 13. b & c & d
- 14. a & b & d
- 15. a & b & c & d
- 20. None, including DK, NA on up to 3 questions (1971: none only)
- 98. DK (1971)
- 99. NA on all four questions

V27 R16 Appropriateness of Antabuse (Q8. How do you feel about the appropriateness of a judge including the use of Antabuse as a condition of probation for convicted drunk drivers who are problem drinkers?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 33 | 28 | 31 | 32 | 48 |
| (41) | (52) | (39) | (33) | (67) |
| 44 | 46 | 41 | 45 | 39 |
| (29) | (28) | (39) | (27) | (19) |
| 16 | 18 | 19 | 15 | 13 |
| (14) | (7) | (6) | (20) | (9) |
| 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| (14) | (14) | (16) | (15) | (5) |
| (3) | (0) | (0) | (5) | (0) |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | *1 | 0 |
| (*1) | (0) | (0) | (*1) | (0) |

- 1. Strongly agree
- 2. Tend to approve
- 3. Tend to disapprove
- 4. Strongly disapprove
- 8. DK
- 9. NA

V28 R17 Value of Antabuse (Q9. In general how much value do you think the use of Antabuse during probation is likely to have in helping problem drinkers to gain control of their drinking & thus to avoid repeating their offense after the probationary period?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 20 | 26 | 14 | 17 | 26 |
| (23) | (41) | (23) | (13) | (48) |
| 51 | 44 | 50 | 53 | 57 |
| (37) | (28) | (54) | (32) | (38) |
| 18 | 24 | 29 | 10 | 13 |
| (19) | (17) | (13) | (25) | (9) |
| 12 | 6 | 7 | 21 | 4 |
| (21) | (14) | (11) | (31) | (5) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

- 1. Quite a lot of value
- 2. Some value
- 3. Not much value
- 0. No opinion
- 9. NA

V29 R18 Special Patrols (Q10. As you may know, in Washtenaw County the police, the courts, the health department, & the Council on Alcoholism have been working together in a program to reduce accidents involving drunk drivers. Have you happened to see or hear anything about the following activities of this program? (a) Special Patrols looking for drunk drivers?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 38 | 68 | 36 | 14 | 61 |
| 62 | 32 | 64 | 86 | 39 |
| *5 | 0 | *3 | *2 | 0 |

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

V30 R19 Roadside Testing (Q10b. Roadside breathtesting surveys?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 40 | 52 | 31 | 28 | 70 |
| 60 | 48 | 69 | 72 | 30 |
| *4 | 0 | *3 | *1 | 0 |

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

V31 R20 Antabuse (Q10c. Courts asking convicted drunk drivers to take pills which make them sick if they drink alcohol?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 83 | 98 | 98 | 63 | 91 |
| 17 | 2 | 2 | 37 | 9 |
| *2 | 0 | *1 | *1 | 0 |

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

V32 R21 Local Campaign (Q10d. Local campaign to get drivers to know their own safe alcohol limits?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 52 | 66 | 44 | 41 | 74 |
| 48 | 34 | 56 | 59 | 26 |
| *4 | 0 | *3 | *1 | 0 |

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

V33 R22 More DUIs (Q18e. More drunk driving arrests?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 51 | 72 | 53 | 32 | 65 |
| 49 | 28 | 47 | 68 | 35 |
| *4 | 0 | *2 | *2 | 0 |

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

V34 R23 Special Classes (Q10f. Special alcohol education course for drunk drivers?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 79 | 98 | 98 | 56 | 83 |
| 21 | 2 | 2 | 44 | 17 |
| *2 | 0 | *1 | *1 | 0 |

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

V35 R24 Probation Officers (Q10g. Special probation officers to work with persons convicted of drunk driving?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 52 | 82 | 76 | 16 | 74 |
| 48 | 18 | 24 | 84 | 26 |
| *3 | 0 | *1 | *2 | 0 |

1. Yes
5. No
9. NA

V36 R25 Couple's Clubs (Q10h. Counseling in groups & couples clubs for drunk drivers who have a drinking problem?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 40 | 56 | 49 | 19 | 61 |
| 60 | 44 | 51 | 81 | 39 |
| *4 | 0 | *3 | *1 | 0 |

1. Yes
5. No
9. NA

V37 R18-25 Total Countermeasures Known (Total number of countermeasures recognized by respondent in R18-R25) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 0 |
| 12 | 2 | 3 | 25 | 4 |
| 12 | 10 | 13 | 12 | 17 |
| 16 | 8 | 33 | 16 | 4 |
| 13 | 24 | 10 | 7 | 17 |
| 11 | 12 | 21 | 6 | 9 |
| 11 | 18 | 18 | 1 | 22 |
| 10 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 26 |
| *5 | 0 | *3 | *2 | 0 |

0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. Five
6. Six
7. Seven
8. Eight
9. DK or NA on 3 or more countermeasures in R18-R25

We would like your opinion concerning each of the statements below. 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. TEND TO AGREE
3. TEND TO DISAGREE
4. STRONGLY DISAGREE

V38 R26 Law Requiring Belt (Q11. 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

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 36 | 25 | 41 | 43 | 26 |
| 25 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 39 |
| 18 | 22 | 19 | 16 | 13 |
| 21 | 31 | 17 | 18 | 22 |
| *2 | *1 | 0 | *1 | 0 |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly
9. NA

V39 R27 Too Much Fuss (Q12. Far too much fuss is made about the dangers of drinking & driving?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| *1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| (1) | (3) | (0) | (1) | (0) |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 5 |
| (5) | (0) | (4) | (7) | (0) |
| 18 | 26 | 17 | 15 | 14 |
| (23) | (31) | (33) | (16) | (20) |
| 78 | 72 | 81 | 79 | 77 |
| (72) | (65) | (63) | (76) | (80) |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | *1 |
| (*2) | (0) | (0) | (*1) | (*1) |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly
9. NA

V40 R28 Most DAD Not Caught (Q13. Most drunk driving is not detected by the police?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 31 | 30 | 43 | 31 | 17 |
| 56 | 56 | 43 | 60 | 70 |
| 11 | 14 | 9 | 9 | 13 |
| 2 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | *1 | 0 |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly
9. NA

V41 R29 Videotape Opinion(Q14. Videotaping of accused drunk drivers should be part of sobriety testing procedures?)* MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 31 | 28 | 39 | 24 | 48 |
| (43) | (31) | (40) | (41) | (76) |
| 42 | 32 | 44 | 49 | 35 |
| (26) | (38) | (28) | (23) | (19) |
| 18 | 28 | 10 | 17 | 13 |
| (9) | (0) | (4) | (17) | (0) |
| 9 | 12 | 7 | 10 | 4 |
| (21) | (31) | (28) | (19) | (5) |
| *1 | 0 | *1 | 0 | 0 |
| (*8) | (0) | (*1) | (*6) | (0) |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly
9. NA

*1971: How much emphasis should be placed on videotaping accused drunk drivers as part of sobriety testing procedures in an expanded program to reduce alcohol-related crashes?
 (1) A lot of emphasis (3) Little emphasis
 (2) Some emphasis (4) No emphasis

V42 R30 Host Should Limit (Q15. A good host at a party will try to see that his guests who must drive home do not drink too much?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 65 | 58 | 64 | 65 | 78 |
| 32 | 34 | 36 | 31 | 22 |
| 2 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly

V43 R31 Police Patrol Party (Q16. The police should patrol more around places where people are having parties at night?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 5 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 4 |
| (8) | (14) | (2) | (9) | (5) |
| 33 | 27 | 32 | 35 | 43 |
| (25) | (21) | (25) | (26) | (29) |
| 45 | 37 | 46 | 46 | 52 |
| (44) | (41) | (49) | (39) | (62) |
| 17 | 33 | 14 | 12 | 0 |
| (22) | (24) | (25) | (24) | (5) |
| (1) | (0) | (0) | (1) | (0) |
| *4 | *2 | *1 | *1 | 0 |
| (*2) | (0) | (0) | (*2) | (0) |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly
8. DK
9. NA

V44 R32 Bars Provide Tests (Q17. Alcohol breathtesting devices should be available in taverns & bars for customers' use in determining whether they have drunk too much for legal driving?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 32 | 41 | 33 | 27 | 30 |
| 49 | 37 | 50 | 54 | 52 |
| 15 | 16 | 10 | 16 | 17 |
| 4 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 0 |
| *1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| *4 | *1 | *2 | *1 | 0 |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly
8. DK
9. NA

V45 R33 Bars Liable Damage (Q18. Bar operators should be liable for personal & property damage which are caused by patrons who were served alcoholic beverages when visibly intoxicated, as in the present Michigan Dramshop Law?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 53 | 68 | 52 | 42 | 57 |
| 34 | 30 | 36 | 35 | 35 |
| 8 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 4 |
| 6 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 4 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly
9. NA

V46 R34 Record All Alcohol (Q19. All alcohol-related convictions should be entered on a drivers record whether or not they are related to driving (e.g., drunk & disorderly)?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 11 | 6 | 12 | 11 | 17 |
| (15) | (17) | (4) | (18) | (24) |
| 22 | 16 | 24 | 23 | 26 |
| (28) | (31) | (27) | (25) | (48) |
| 33 | 30 | 21 | 39 | 35 |
| (25) | (17) | (25) | (28) | (24) |
| 35 | 48 | 43 | 27 | 22 |
| (31) | (35) | (45) | (30) | (5) |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | *1 | 0 |
| (*3) | (0) | (0) | (*3) | (0) |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly
9. NA

V47 R35 Stronger Punishment (Q20. The number of fatal accidents would go way down if those persons who drive after drinking too much were more strongly punished?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 11 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 9 |
| 25 | 18 | 9 | 37 | 23 |
| 41 | 28 | 52 | 41 | 55 |
| 23 | 44 | 33 | 6 | 14 |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *3 | 0 | 0 | *2 | *1 |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly
8. DK
9. NA

V48 R36 Counsel Not Punish (Q21. 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

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 40 | 59 | 41 | 24 | 55 |
| (39) | (59) | (50) | (29) | (38) |
| 48 | 27 | 50 | 61 | 45 |
| (39) | (24) | (37) | (45) | (38) |
| 8 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 0 |
| (15) | (14) | (8) | (19) | (14) |
| 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| (6) | (3) | (4) | (7) | (9) |
| *5 | *1 | 0 | *3 | *1 |
| (*2) | (0) | (*1) | (*1) | (0) |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly
9. NA

V49 R37 Government Not Help (Q22. The governments job is to catch & punish drunk drivers; anything further that is done for problem drinkers should be by private organizations such as Alcoholic Anonymous?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| (2) | (0) | (0) | (3) | (5) |
| 8 | 6 | 2 | 13 | 4 |
| (12) | (7) | (10) | (16) | (0) |
| 41 | 24 | 43 | 51 | 35 |
| (37) | (31) | (29) | (42) | (38) |
| 50 | 68 | 55 | 34 | 61 |
| (50) | (62) | (61) | (39) | (54) |
| *3 | 0 | 0 | *3 | 0 |
| (*1) | (0) | (0) | (*1) | (0) |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly
9. NA

V50 R38 Refusal Effect (Q23. In general most persons who are arrested for DUII incur fewer undesirable consequences overall if they refuse the breath test than if they take it, despite the mandatory penalty for refusal?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|----|----|-----|----|
| 5 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| 40 | 35 | 29 | 44 | 57 |
| 39 | 29 | 39 | 49 | 30 |
| 16 | 31 | 29 | 3 | 4 |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *20 | *1 | *4 | *15 | 0 |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly
8. DK
9. NA

V51 R39 Not Much Effect (Q24. No matter how much effort is invested, there is not likely to be much effect on the drunk driver problem?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 3 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| (1) | (0) | (0) | (2) | (0) |
| 13 | 12 | 10 | 15 | 13 |
| (6) | (3) | (12) | (22) | (14) |
| 51 | 46 | 44 | 57 | 57 |
| (43) | (45) | (45) | (40) | (48) |
| 33 | 36 | 41 | 28 | 30 |
| (40) | (52) | (43) | (36) | (38) |
| *2 | 0 | *1 | *1 | 0 |
| (*1) | (0) | (0) | (*1) | (0) |

1. Agree strongly
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Disagree strongly
9. NA

V52 R31,34,35 Deterrence Countermeasures (Number of deterrent countermeasures agreed strongly to by respondents in R31,34,35) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 81 | 87 | 78 | 77 | 82 |
| 13 | 8 | 19 | 14 | 5 |
| 7 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 14 |
| *8 | *2 | *1 | *4 | *1 |

0. None
1. One
2. Two
9. NA on at least one countermeasure

V53 R40 Years in Legal Work (Q25. How many years have you been in legal work in Washtenaw County?)

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 36 | 34 | 38 | 37 | 35 |
| (45) | (55) | (45) | (41) | (48) |
| 26 | 30 | 41 | 18 | 22 |
| (20) | (7) | (33) | (17) | (19) |
| 17 | 26 | 7 | 18 | 13 |
| (19) | (28) | (14) | (20) | (14) |
| 20 | 10 | 14 | 27 | 30 |
| (16) | (10) | (8) | (21) | (19) |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | *1 | 0 |
| (*8) | (0) | (0) | (*1) | (0) |

1. Four or fewer years
2. 5-9 years
3. 10-19 years
4. 20 or more years
9. NA

V54 R41 Type of Practice (Q26. Which of the following best describes your legal practice at the present time?) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| 61 | 98 | 78 | 48 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 0 |
| (72) | | | | |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| (8) | | | | |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| (3) | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 0 |
| (11) | | | | |
| 5 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| *4 | *1 | *1 | *2 | 0 |
| (*7) | | | | |

1. Private practice
2. Corporate counsel (1971: defense)
3. Prosecutor, city attorney
4. Judge
5. Public defender
6. Law professor
7. Other
 - (1) Referee-family law.
 - (2) Primarily administration work in state government.
 - (3) Employed civil law.
 - (4) Retired-private practice
9. NA

V55 R42 Criminal Law-% (about what percent of your legal work is devoted to criminal law?) MD=98,99

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|------|------|------|-----|------|
| 10. | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | (0) | (5) | (1) | (0) | (5) |
| 30. | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 9 |
| | (0) | (15) | (5) | (0) | (50) |
| 50. | 5 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 27 |
| | (5) | (20) | (10) | (0) | (65) |
| 70. | 10 | 20 | 12 | 0 | 52 |
| | (20) | (30) | (23) | (0) | (90) |
| 90. | 40 | 33 | 50 | 2 | 93 |
| | (50) | (40) | (50) | (5) | (95) |

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED

- 96. 96-100
- 98. DK
- 99. NA

V56 R42A Criminal Law %-8 (R42 collapsed) MD=9

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|--|-------|------|------|-------|------|
| | 37 | 2 | 7 | 82 | 5 |
| | (38) | (0) | (6) | (74) | (0) |
| | 10 | 6 | 17 | 10 | 9 |
| | (7) | (3) | (9) | (8) | (5) |
| | 12 | 20 | 22 | 2 | 14 |
| | (12) | (14) | (21) | (9) | (5) |
| | 12 | 18 | 24 | 4 | 9 |
| | (8) | (10) | (15) | (2) | (11) |
| | 9 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| | (10) | (24) | (19) | (2) | (5) |
| | 8 | 18 | 7 | 1 | 9 |
| | (17) | (45) | (23) | (3) | (21) |
| | 6 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 18 |
| | (8) | (3) | (6) | (1) | (48) |
| | 6 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 27 |
| | (1) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (5) |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | *2 | 0 | *1 | 0 | *1 |
| | (*15) | (0) | (*1) | (*11) | (*2) |

- 0. None
- 1. 1-3%
- 2. 4-5%
- 3. 6-10%
- 4. 11-20%
- 5. 21-30%
- 6. 31-50%
- 7. 51-100%
- 8. DK
- 9. NA

V57 R43 DUII-Impaired Cases -.2 yr. (Q28. About how many DUII & impaired driving cases have you handled in the past two years?) MD=998,999

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|-----|------|------|-----|-----|------|
| 10. | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| | (0) | (10) | (1) | (0) | (0) |
| 30. | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| | (0) | (12) | (2) | (0) | (3) |
| 50. | 2 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 20 |
| | (0) | (20) | (3) | (0) | (25) |
| 70. | 10 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 87 |
| | (4) | (25) | (4) | (0) | (96) |
| 90. | 25 | 50 | 7 | 0 | 913 |
| | (23) | (96) | (6) | (0) | (97) |

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED

- 996. 996-1000
- 997. Over 1000
- 998. DK
- 999. NA

V58 R43A DUII-Impaired Cases-8 (R43 collapsed) MD=9

| | TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|--|------|------|-------|-------|------|
| | 45 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 23 |
| | (51) | (0) | (0) | (100) | (16) |
| | 39 | 58 | 100 | 0 | 23 |
| | (31) | (21) | (100) | (0) | (27) |
| | 10 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| | (8) | (48) | (0) | (0) | (5) |
| | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| | (5) | (21) | (0) | (0) | (16) |
| | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| | (2) | (7) | (0) | (0) | (11) |
| | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| | (3) | (3) | (0) | (0) | (26) |
| | *1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

- 0. None
- 1. 1-15 (1971: 1-10)
- 2. 16-30 (1971: 11-20)
- 3. 31-50 (1971: 21-50)
- 4. 51-100
- 5. 101-400 (1971: Over 100)
- 6. 401-700

V58 R43A DUII-Impaired Cases-8 (cont'd)

| TS | FD | ID | ND | PJ |
|------------|----------|-----------|----------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *1 (*7) | 0 (0) | 0 (*5) | 0 (0) | *1 (*2) |

- 7. Over 700
- 8. DK
- 9. NA

V59 R44 Problem Drinker Cases (Q29. In about how many of these cases would you estimate that the defendant had a serious drinking problem?) MD=998,999

| | TS | FD | ID | PJ |
|-----|----|----|----|-----|
| 10. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 30. | 2 | 3 | 1 | 10 |
| 50. | 4 | 6 | 2 | 25 |
| 70. | 8 | 9 | 2 | 134 |
| 90. | 27 | 15 | 5 | 380 |

- ACTUAL NUMBER CODED
- 998. DK
 - 999. NA

V60 R44A Problem Drinker Cases-8 (R44 collapsed)

MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | PJ |
|----|----|----|----|
| 9 | 2 | 22 | 0 |
| 79 | 90 | 78 | 47 |
| 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 |
| 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| *1 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *3 | 0 | *1 | *2 |

- 0. None
- 1. 1-15
- 2. 16-30
- 3. 31-50
- 4. 51-100
- 5. 101-400
- 6. 401-700
- 7. Over 700
- 8. DK
- 9. NA

V61 R44/R43 Problem Drinker Cases % (R44/R43)

MD=9.99

| | TS | FD | ID | PJ |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| 10. | 7 | 20 | 0 | 27 |
| | (0) | (7) | (0) | (9) |
| 30. | 30 | 26 | 24 | 44 |
| | (20) | (20) | (20) | (38) |
| 50. | 40 | 33 | 37 | 67 |
| | (40) | (25) | (50) | (50) |
| 70. | 50 | 49 | 57 | 80 |
| | (50) | (50) | (50) | (70) |
| 90. | 83 | 79 | 99 | 100 |

- 9.99. DK,NA
- 000. R had no problem drinkers or, R did not have any drunk driving cases

V62 R44B Problem Drinker Cases %-7 (R44/R43 (output variable 61) collapsed)

| TS | FD | ID | PJ |
|------|------|------|------|
| 9 | 2 | 21 | 0 |
| (12) | (0) | (23) | (0) |
| 13 | 20 | 7 | 6 |
| (21) | (38) | (10) | (21) |
| 36 | 48 | 26 | 23 |
| (17) | (24) | (15) | (7) |
| 16 | 16 | 14 | 18 |
| (22) | (14) | (25) | (29) |
| 15 | 12 | 12 | 29 |
| (13) | (17) | (10) | (14) |
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| (4) | (7) | (0) | (14) |
| 9 | 0 | 17 | 18 |
| (9) | (0) | (15) | (7) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (2) | (0) | (2) | (7) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (*3) | (0) | (*1) | (*2) |

- 1. Zero
- 2. 1-19%
- 3. 20-49%
- 4. 50%
- 5. 51-79%
- 6. 80-96%
- 7. 97-100%
- 8. DK
- 9. NA

V63 R45 No. Advise Antabuse (Q30. In about how many of these cases did you yourself encourage the defendant to accept the use of Antabuse as part of his term of probation?) MD=998,999

| TS | FD | ID | PJ | |
|----|----|----|----|--|
| 32 | 23 | 49 | 9 | 0. None; or had no problem drinker cases |
| 13 | 10 | 20 | 0 | 1. One |
| 12 | 8 | 17 | 9 | 2. Two |
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 3. Three |
| 4 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 4. Four |
| 7 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 5. Five |
| 5 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 6. Six |
| 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 7. Seven |
| 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8. Eight |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9. Nine |
| 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 10. Ten |
| 5 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 15. Fifteen |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20. Twenty |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 25. Twenty-five |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 50. Fifty |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 75. Seventy-five |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 150. One hundred & fifty |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 300. Three hundred |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 500. Five hundred |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 720. Seven hundred & twenty |
| *9 | *2 | *1 | *6 | 999. NA |

1971 Results:

V135 R80 Probation Antabuse (QB16. If you had a client charged with DUI who had a serious drinking problem, would you encourage him to accept the use of Antabuse as a condition of probation?) MD=0,9

| TS | FD | ID | PJ | |
|----|----|----|----|--------------------------------------|
| 87 | 83 | 87 | 93 | 1. Probably yes |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 3. Maybe |
| 3 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 5. Probably not |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8. DK |
| *2 | 0 | *1 | *1 | 9. NA |
| | | | | 0. Inap., R has accepted no DD cases |

V64 R45A % Advise Antabuse (R45/R44) MD=9.99

| | TS | FD | ID | PJ | |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|
| 10. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 9.99. NA |
| 30. | 1 | 31 | 0 | 50 | 0.00. None; or R had no problem drinker cases |
| 50. | 99 | 99 | 13 | 99 | |
| 70. | 99 | 99 | 99 | 100 | |
| 90. | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |

V65 R45B % Advise Antabuse-7 (R45A collapsed) MD=9

| TS | FD | ID | PJ | |
|----|----|----|----|---|
| 9 | 2 | 22 | 0 | 0. R did not have any problem drinker cases |
| 21 | 20 | 27 | 7 | 1. 0% |
| 4 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 2. 1-19% |
| 7 | 14 | 0 | 7 | 3. 20-49% |
| 6 | 4 | 2 | 20 | 4. 50% |
| 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5. 51-79% |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6. 80-96% |
| 51 | 52 | 46 | 60 | 7. 97-100% |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8. DK |
| *3 | 0 | *1 | *2 | 9. NA |

V66 R46 % Benefit Antabuse (Q31. Of the defendants you know who took part in the Antabuse program about what percent would you estimate really benefited personally from the program?) MD=98,99

| | TS | FD | ID | PJ | |
|-----|----|----|----|----|--|
| 10. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| 30. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 35 | |
| 50. | 25 | 25 | 20 | 40 | |
| 70. | 50 | 55 | 50 | 50 | |
| 90. | 97 | 97 | 97 | 73 | |

ACTUAL NUMBER CODED

98. DK
99. NA

V67 R46A % Benefit Antabuse (R46 collapsed)

MD-9

| TS | FD | ID | PJ |
|-----|-----|-----|----|
| 26 | 25 | 37 | 0 |
| 11 | 13 | 8 | 10 |
| 15 | 15 | 13 | 20 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| 18 | 15 | 21 | 20 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 9 | 15 | 0 | 10 |
| 12 | 13 | 17 | 0 |
| 4 | 5 | 4 | 0 |
| *35 | *10 | *18 | *7 |

0. None or R did not have any problem drinker cases
1. 1-19%
2. 20-34%
3. 35-49%
4. 50% exactly
5. 51-65%
6. 66-80%
7. 81-100%
8. DK
9. NA

V68 R47 Improve Legal System (Q32. Do you have any general suggestions for the improvement of the legal system as it relates to drunk driving (laws, procedures, etc.)?)

MD-9

| | | | |
|------|------|------|------|
| 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| (1) | (3) | (0) | (0) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (2) | (3) | (2) | (0) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (4) | (7) | (4) | (0) |
| 16 | 21 | 12 | 0 |
| (25) | (43) | (15) | (27) |
| 14 | 11 | 24 | 0 |
| (8) | (7) | (2) | (27) |
| 16 | 18 | 6 | 33 |
| (16) | (14) | (19) | (13) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (3) | (3) | (4) | (0) |
| 51 | 43 | 59 | 67 |
| (19) | (11) | (21) | (27) |

1. Police enforce the law too strictly; too many arrests are made for DUII when they should have been arrests for impaired driving
2. Breath tests should be more strongly required in DUII arrests
3. Videotapes or other evidentiary factors should be introduced in DUII cases.
4. The mandatory penalties for a DUII conviction are too severe (license suspension & financial responsibility insurance).
5. Should be more severe penalties (especially for multiple offenders), person with a drinking problem should not be allowed to drive until he can demonstrate that his problem is solved: strict enforcement of license revocations is essential.
6. The legal system should recognize the illness as well as the criminal aspect of DUII cases; should emphasize treatment and counseling.
7. The legal system is arbitrary in DUII cases, many pre-trials are meaningless.
8. Other codeable response:
 - Antabuse should be voluntary program, people should not be threatened with jail if they don't want it. More selectivity should be exercised in selecting people for the antabuse program. Should require closer medical supervision.
 - More publicity hit. Tavern owners who knowingly serve. The law should devote itself less to rehabilitation, ideally we would have an effective regional public transport system, then the courts could simply revoke the operator license of those with a serious drinking problem at evidenced e.g., by repeated offense.
 - Making Antabuse a condition of probation means that taking it is not voluntary. I don't believe a person should be forced by a judge to take any drug as they are now. I have no objective to counseling and encouraging people to take Antabuse.
 - Stronger dram-shop laws to hit bars in pocketbook if not more careful, possible criminal penalties for bar owners.
 - Greater variety of treatment techniques for problem drinkers. On conviction of DUII, mandatory loss of license results in reduced charges. The courts, police, agencies, and administrative staffs are inadequately staffed to handle the case load, therefore reduced charges as a compromise is the system utilized.
 - There should be a medical determination of problem drinking before a defendant is forced onto Antabuse. Too many "non-problem drinkers" are forced by the threat of jail into joining the program.
 - Drunk driving might respond to changes in the social system but probably not for changes in the legal system.
 - No sale of liquor by glass or takeout after 9:00PM close bars & take out at 12:00 midnight. No sale of alcohol by glass before noon, between 2-5PM.

V68 R47 Improve Legal System (con'td)

8. Other codeable response (cont'd)

- Education of bar owners and employees in handling their customers--more power in courts to give alternate relief.
- Have a special judge or magistrate judge just for traffic and DUIL/Imp. cases.
- Misdemeanor to drive with blood alcohol level of .015 or more. Eliminate difference between DUIL & DWUI.
- Provide or induce employees to provide to and from work busing for disqualified drivers. Impound cars of DUIL convicts for 10-30 days.
- Public transportation so drunk person can get home without driving. More equitable treatment for everyone & uniformity on a county wide basis.
- There are too many reductions from the original charge of DUIL. The only way to keep drunk drivers or people who have had their licenses suspended from driving is a public transportation system that works. Alcohol will not be wiped out driving is not a luxury but a need until there is a way to get from point to point without driving whether after drinking or sober.
- Prohibit sale of or furnishing intoxicants to anyone with a conviction for drinking related offense.
- A better statutory definition of "under the influence" & "visibly impaired". A prompter system for trial & disposition of these cases.
- The public ought to be made aware of the successful cures of drivers with alcohol-related problems so they would be encouraged to support treatment oriented procedures.
- I would raise the fine to \$500-1000 and allow 1st offenders to plead guilty to impaired.
- I think the district judges should have the discretion to allow a convicted DUIL defendant to drive under restricted circumstances. I oppose mandatory penalties of any kind. When a judge earns \$30,000 a year he should be given appropriate discretion.
- Even though I prefer education, etc., to punishment, social drinking is usually voluntary & word of stiff penalties gets around. I think things are going well. I do not like the use of drugs in any circumstances.
- The Antabuse program is in many cases imposed when there is no need for it. It is used after as a part of a sentence package when the background of the individual demonstrates no need for it I get those persons doing the screening of ten times recommend it where there is no use for the drug by the accused but he must go along with it to obtain desirable disposition of his case.
- I think that heavy penalties make less sense than intensive enforcement--that is creating the likelihood of a way high probability of arrest.
- Better guides for determining the true problem drinker.
- See to it that all circuit judges are receptive to petitions for at least restricted license reinstatements. When hardship resulting from loss of license can be shown. Also possibly limit loss of license to second offenders and making AES mandatory for first offenders.
- It seems to me that alcohol has become so much a part of our culture to attempt to attack is piecemeal is going to be ineffective. The real progress will be made until attitudes over a generation or more are altered as to its use & its hazards.
- Require every convicted drunk driver to display prominently a license plate insignia denoting his conviction. His desire for social approval will tend strongly to discourage drunk driving in my opinion.
- Remove judicial pressure on defendants forcing them into involuntary participation in Antabuse program. Only voluntary participation can work in the long run - also personal experience of 20 years ago in prosecuting approximately 30 negligent homicide cases (all convicted) drinking

was involved in only two.
Give on court complete power over the sentencing of drinking drivers including suspension & restoration of drivers licenses.

Persons with funds get a competent attorney & invariably the first DUIL is reduced to impairment. The poor plead guilty. This discrepancy should stop.

*58 *22 *25 *11
(*3)(*1)(*1)(*1)
2 4 0 0

9. NA

0. No; Inap., R has accepted no PD cases, no second response