SUMMARY REPORT AND
CODEBOOK WITH MARGINALS

WASHTENAW COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT
OFFICERS 1971 SURVEY ON ALCOHOL AND
TRAFFIC SAFETY

Arthur C. Wolfe
Marion M. Chapman

January 1972

1. Report No. UM-HSRI-AL-72-2	2. Government Accession No. PB-220-772	3. Recipient's Catalog No.
4. Title and Subtitle Washtenaw County law enforcement officers 1971 survey on alcohol and traffic safety. Summary report and codebook with marginals.		5. Report Date January 1972
		6. Performing Organization Code
7. Author's) Arthur C. Wolfe and Marion M. Chapman		8. Performing Organization Report No. UM-HSRI-AL-72-2
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Highway Safety Research Institute 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 Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Washington, D.C. 20590		13. Type of Report and Period Covered
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code

15. Supplementary Notes
Prime contractor: Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

16. Abstract
This report summarizes the results of an eleven-page self-administered questionnaire completed by 94 law enforcement officers of the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department and of the Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti Police Departments. 165 patrol and command officers in the three departments were asked to fill out the questionnaire. Content areas included alcohol and other factors in traffic accidents; alcohol consumption quantities, accident risk, and illegal levels; factors influencing alcohol effects; alcohol problems in general and sources of help; attitudes toward various drunk driving countermeasures; own training and experience in handling drunk driving cases; and own drinking behavior and other personal data.

The survey was carried out in order to obtain baseline data useful to the development and evaluation of the public information program for police officers being carried out by the Washtenaw Alcohol Safety Action Program. Only one quarter of the officers reported any special training in the drinking driver problem, and many were poorly informed regarding numbers of safe and legal drinks and factors influencing alcohol effects. Almost all the respondents felt that drunk driving charges are reduced too frequently by the prosecutors and judges.

Appended to the report is the complete survey codebook showing percentage results on each question for the total sample and for the three police departments separately.

17. Key Words Police Alcohol and Driving	18. Distribution Statement UNLIMITED	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED	20. Security Classif. (of this page) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 52

22. Price

Form DOT F 1700.7 (r-69)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTICES

SUMMARY

At the beginning of the Washtenaw Alcohol Safety Action Program (WASAP) a self-administered questionnaire was filled out anonymously by 94 of the 165 patrol and command officers in the Ann Arbor Police Department, in the Ypsilanti Police Department, and in the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department. The resulting information on their knowledge and attitudes concerning alcohol and traffic safety was to be used in designing an in-service educational program for the law enforcement officers of these three departments which are subcontractors in the law enforcement aspects of WASAP.

Only one-quarter of the responding officers said they had had special training concerning the drinking driver problem, but most did recognize drinking as a very important contributing factor in traffic accidents. Two-thirds thought that more accidents are caused by social drinkers than by problem drinkers. In regard to numbers of drinks required to make the average person unsafe as a driver and to reach illegal blood alcohol concentrations, only a minority of the responding officers showed evidence of being well informed on the relationships between consumption and BAC. Large proportions tended to underestimate the numbers of drinks involved, while smaller proportions tended to overestimate them. As for increased risks after drinking, most respondents tended to overestimate the increased risk after three drinks but to underestimate the increased risk after six and after nine drinks. Also only one-quarter of the responding officers recognized that the amount of food in the stomach, body weight, and drinking experience are all very important factors influencing how a given amount of alcohol will affect a person.

Most of the officers considered alcohol to be a contributing factor in a large proportion of the cases which they handled, and they tended to estimate drinking problems as present in large proportions of the adult population of Washtenaw County. They also tended to be rather pessimistic about the ability of most

persons with drinking problems to overcome these problems. Most
were familiar with Alcoholics Anonymous and some knew about the
court Antabuse program, but only 10% mentioned the Washtenaw
Council on Alcoholism as a source of alcoholism help. Almost
half said they had recommended an alcohol help organization to
one of their contacts at some time, mostly Alcoholics Anonymous.
Only 38% of the officers mentioned knowing anything about WASAP
activities, and only 4% mentioned increased police enforcement
as an element of WASAP.

As for countermeasures against drunk driving, the responding
officers tended to favor harsher penalties and increased law
enforcement as the primary approach to reducing drunk driving.
Majorities of the respondents agreed that drunk drivers should
lose their drivers licenses, go to jail, lose their license plates,
pay higher insurance rates, and lose their collision insurance.
However, most were also supportive of requiring problem drinking
drunk drivers to submit to medical treatment, and almost half
agreed that it is better to place drunk drivers into a counseling
and treatment program than to put them in jail. As for present
handling of drunk driving cases, the average estimates were that
20% of the arrestees had their charges reduced or dropped at the
police station and that 50% had their charges reduced by the
prosecutor or judge. Most felt that the main reason for such
reductions was the overloaded court dockets, but still almost all
respondents (90%) felt that such reductions took place too often.

All in all, the 94 respondents proved to be quite diverse
in their knowledge and viewpoint on drunk driving. For instance,
the range of estimates concerning reductions by the prosecutors
and judges went from 5% to 100%. Clearly the law enforcement
officers of Washtenaw County are not of one mind in their views
of how drunk driving cases are handled. Nor are they united in
a common perspective on the amenability of the drunk driving
problem to improvement. In response to the statement "no matter
how much effort is invested, there is not likely to be much
effect on the drunk driver problem", 10% agreed strongly, 31%
agreed somewhat, 36% disagreed somewhat, and 23% disagreed

strongly. Only in the feeling that drunk driving charges are reduced too frequently by the prosecutors and judges was there near unanimity among the responding officers.

THE SURVEY SAMPLE

As part of the baseline data collection for the evaluation of the Washtenaw Alcohol Safety Action Program an eleven-page self-administered questionnaire was distributed to 165 road patrol and command officers in the three WASAP involved police departments. Excellent cooperation was obtained in the Ypsilanti Police Department where questionnaires were returned by 28 of the 33 eligible respondents, an 85% response rate. However, in the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department only 13 completed questionnaires were obtained from the 36 eligible personnel, a 36% response rate. In the Ann Arbor Police Department 53 of a possible 96 questionnaires were obtained, a 55% response rate. In Ann Arbor some completed questionnaires were apparently lost, but since they were filled out anonymously there was no way to know which officers' questionnaires were missing.

Thus a total of 94 out of a possible 165 questionnaires were obtained, an overall response rate of 57%. Due to the likelihood that the 94 respondents may tend to be different from the 71 non-respondents in their knowledge, attitudes, and experience concerning alcohol and traffic safety, one cannot assume that the survey results are accurately representative of all the law enforcement officers in the three departments. And one must be particularly cautious in making comparisons among the three departments. Nevertheless the 94 respondents compose well over half of the relevant personnel of the three departments, and the results reported here should be of considerable value in determining what kind of educational program would be useful for their personnel.

BACKGROUND OF THE RESPONDENTS

The 94 respondents include 72 road patrol officers, four foot patrol officers (all in Ann Arbor), 12 command officers (seven in Ann Arbor, four in Ypsilanti, and one in the Sheriff's

Department), and five officers with other primary duties. Twelve
of the respondents had served as law enforcement officers for
less than one year, 51 had served from one to five years, and 30
had served six or more years. Almost one-quarter said they were
college graduates, and a further 38% said they had had some post
high school education.

Only one-quarter said they had had any special training in
the drinking driver problem. The main sources of this training
were the Highway Traffic Safety Center at MSU and the Washtenaw
County Police Academy. Most of these respondents said they had
had training in the physiological/psychological effects of drink-
ing and in the relationship between excessive drinking and traffic
accidents, while smaller numbers had learned about alcoholism
as a social problem and about various treatment approaches. When
asked in which areas they would like to have (more) training,
half mentioned traffic safety aspects, two-fifths mentioned
treatment aspects, and one-quarter mentioned alcoholism as a
social problem.

When the respondents were asked to classify themselves as
to their own use of alcohol, 13% said they were total abstainers,
30% said they were very light drinkers, 29% said they were fairly
light drinkers, 26% said they were moderate drinkers, one respon-
dent said he was a fairly heavy drinker, and one said he was a
heavy drinker. These figures indicate a very similar pattern of
use of alcohol by this sample of police personnel as by a general
public sample of males aged 21-44 in Washtenaw County. Corres-
ponding percentages in the general public sample were 14%
abstainers, 27% very light drinkers, 34% fairly light drinkers,
22% moderate drinkers, 3% fairly heavy drinkers, and 0% heavy
drinkers.

The drinkers were also asked if they had any special rules
about drinking and driving. Almost one-third said "no", and
another one-sixth said their rule was never to drink before driv-
ing. Eleven percent said they limited themselves to one or two
drinks before driving, 8% said three drinks was their limit, 4%
said four drinks was their limit, one respondent said six drinks

was his limit, one said eight drinks was his limit, and 9% said
they limited their drinking before driving without specifying
the number of drinks. Also 9% said they have someone else drive
if they have been drinking. The officers were not asked how
many times they had driven after drinking too much, but one
hopes that the two respondents who said their limits were six
drinks and eight drinks are very large men.

ROLE OF ALCOHOL IN TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

Seven-eighths of the officers rated "drivers who have had
too much to drink" as a very important cause of highway acci-
dents. Tied for second as the most important accident cause
were "drivers who drive too fast" and "drivers who don't care
about traffic regulations", each with 16%, while "drivers who
can't handle a car well" was fourth with 14%. Most of the
officers (78%) estimated that drinking was a contributing factor
in at least half of the fatal accidents, and one-third thought
it was involved in 66% or more of the fatal accidents. Only one
out of eight thought it was involved in less than 35% of the
fatals. Twenty-eight percent of the officers estimated the same
percentages of drinking involvement in non-fatal but serious
accidents as in fatal accidents, while 41% estimated more alcohol
involvement in non-fatals than fatal accidents, and 31% estimated
the reverse. Careful studies of alcohol involvement in non-
fatal accidents are not yet available, but most experts think
alcohol is more likely to be involved in fatal accidents than in
non-fatal accidents.

The officers were also asked to indicate the criterion which
they used in deciding whether or not to check the "Had Been
Drinking" box on the UD 71-1 accident report form which they are
required to fill out for each accident they cover. The great
majority (87%) said they checked this box "whenever the driver
appears to have been drinking at all, whether or not it is con-
sidered that the drinking contributed to the accident". However,
ten officers (some in each department) said they check the box
"whenever the driver's drinking is considered to be a contributing

factor in the accident", and two officers (both in Ann Arbor) said they checked the box "only when a drinking-related arrest is made in conjunction with the accident". Only four respondents said their criterion for checking the "HBD" box had changed on the new (January 1971) accident report form compared to the previous form. When asked an open question as to any reasons why an officer might be hesitant to check the "HBD" box, only 19% offered any suggestions. Eight officers mentioned the possibility of giving special consideration to certain types of drivers, five mentioned uncertainty reasons, and five mentioned other possible reasons for hesitance in checking the box. Presumably, then, the great majority of officers feel no reluctance in checking the HBD box whenever the criterion they follow is met in an accident which they report.

The officers were also asked to estimate whether 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". Two-thirds of the respondents opted for the social drinkers as causing more accidents than the problem drinkers .

ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION AND RISK

There was considerable variation in regard to the number of drinks officers thought a person of average weight could consume in an hour without becoming too drunk to drive. Thirteen percent said only one drink, 22% said two drinks (the correct category according to the Borkenstein study*, if we assume "average weight" means about 150 pounds), 38% said three drinks, 11% said four drinks, 7% said five drinks, 4% said six drinks, 1% said seven drinks, 1% said eight drinks, and 1% said ten drinks. The same range of responses was given in regard to the number of

---

*Borkenstein, R.F. & Crowther, R.F. The role of the drinking driver in traffic accidents; a summary. Traffic Digest & Review, 12,6:4-7,29, June 1964.

drinks a person of average weight could consume in an hour before reaching a Blood Alcohol Concentration of .10%. However, this time the most popular response was four drinks, the response given by 32% of the respondents. The correct response for a person weighing 150 pounds, five drinks, was chosen by 19% of the officers. Thirty-two percent chose one, two, or three drinks, while 14% chose six or more drinks. Similar variation resulted from the question on the number of drinks before reaching a .15% BAC. The most frequent response with 29% was six drinks. However, 37% picked two, three, four, or five drinks; while only 5% chose seven drinks, the correct number for a 150 pound person; 25% chose eight, nine, ten, or eleven drinks; and one respondent said 15 drinks. Evaluating these responses is difficult because we do not know the body weight each officer had in mind as "average weight", but still it is apparent that many police officers in Washtenaw County are poorly informed as to the amounts of alcohol consumption which lead to impaired driving and to illegal BAC's. Many of the respondents underestimated these amounts, while many others overestimated them.

The officers were also asked about the increased risks of accident when a person of average weight consumes in one hour three drinks, six drinks, and nine drinks. Only 33% correctly answered (according to the Borkenstein study) that the increased chance of accident was about two times after three drinks (.06% BAC). Fifty-nine percent guessed a larger increased risk, while 8% guessed a lower increased risk. For a person who consumes six drinks in an hour (.12% BAC for a 150 pound person), 9% correctly placed the increased risk in the 11-25 times range, while 66% underestimated and 22% overestimated the increased risk. The tendency was also to underestimate the increased risk for a driver who consumes nine drinks in an hour (a .18% BAC for a 150 pound person). Only 7% were in the correct 26-50 times category, while 65% underestimated and 26% overestimated the increased risk.

FACTORS INFLUENCING ALCOHOL EFFECT

The law enforcement officers were asked to rate the importance of a number of factors which might influence how much an individual drinker would be affected by a given amount of alcohol. Seventy-seven percent correctly considered drinking on an empty stomach as a very important factor influencing the alcohol effect, and a further 20% thought this factor somewhat important. However, only 52% rated body weight as very important, suggesting that many of the officers are not sufficiently aware of the crucial role of the drinker's body weight in determining how high a BAC he will have from consuming a certain amount of alcohol. Forty-three percent rated drinking experience as very important, while another 50% said it was somewhat important. Altogether only one-quarter of the respondents rated all three of these factors as very important in influencing the effect of a given amount of alcohol.

Twenty-five percent of the officers felt that age was a very important factor, and a similar proportion thought that changing the kind of drink was very important. An even larger proportion, 49% thought that bolting one's drinks was a very important factor. Thirty-seven percent considered how the person was feeling as a very important factor, and 18% considered the behavior of companions as very important.

The factor rated very important by the largest proportion of officers, 79%, was "using some strong drug like LSD" along with the alcohol. Also 61% thought smoking marijuana would have a very important influence on the alcohol effect, and 66% thought taking medicine for some sickness was a very important factor. More research is needed as to how various substances of these kinds interact with alcohol in the human body, but it is interesting that so many officers suspect these factors may be very important.

ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IN GENERAL

Turning to the role of alcohol in all aspects of a police officer's work, half of the respondents estimated that at least half of their cases of all kinds involved drinking as a contributing factor. Moreover, one out of seven placed drinking involvement in their cases at 75% or more. When asked to estimate the percentage of adults in Washtenaw County who are alcoholics or have serious drinking problems, more than half of the officers estimated 10% or more, and one out of six estimated 21% or more. Only one-sixth chose 3% or less. These estimates are quite comparable to those made by samples of Washtenaw County physicians and attorneys.

Fifty-nine percent of the officers strongly agreed with the statement alcoholism is a disease, and a further 22% agreed somewhat with this statement. Only 19% disagreed with this concept of alcoholism (10% strongly). Nevertheless 17% agreed strongly and 36% agreed somewhat that alcoholics could stop drinking if they really wanted to. And only 4% agreed with the idea that "since a drunk is not in full control of his actions, he should not be held responsibile for violating the law while drunk". Most of the officers were rather pessimistic about recovery from alcohol problems. One-sixth said persons with serious drinking problems are almost never able to overcome these problems, and more than half expected success "only occasionally". Only 7% thought success was likely most of the time or almost always.

In regard to sources of help for alcohol problems, 77% of the police officers mentioned the name of at least one local source. Almost all of these officers mentioned Alcoholics Anonymous, while 19% mentioned WASAP or the court Antabuse program and 11% mentioned the Crisis Clinic. Only 10% mentioned the Washtenaw Council on Alcoholism. Alcoholics Anonymous was also considered the most effective local organization, followed by WASAP and the WCA. Almost half of the respondents said they had actually suggested at least one local alcohol help

organization to someone they had picked up. Thirty-seven per-
cent had suggested AA, 13% had suggested WASAP, and 3% had sug-
gested WCA. It is apparent that many more of the police officers
in Washtenaw County need to be made aware of the WASAP and the
WCA programs and to be convinced of their effectiveness in help-
ing persons with alcohol problems.

DRUNK DRIVING COUNTERMEASURES

Returning to the problem of drunk driving in particular, the
officers were asked a number of questions about the Washtenaw
Alcohol Safety Action Program and possible approaches to reduc-
ing the incidence of drunk driving. When asked what they knew
about WASAP, 62% of the respondents failed to mention any
specific activities. Twenty-two percent mentioned the court
Antabuse program; 13% mentioned roadside breathtesting; 6% men-
tioned surveys; and only 4% mentioned increased police enforce-
ment. Obviously even some of the officers who themselves had
been working on the special alcohol patrols did not think of the
patrols as part of WASAP. And a large proportion of the officers
demonstrated a need for a lot more information about the elements
of WASAP.

When asked their preferences among seven different types of
drunk driving countermeasures, more than half of the respondents
chose "more severe penalties for convicted drunk drivers", and
a further 17% chose "greater police enforcement". Only 11%
placed first emphasis on improved treatment services, 9% chose
the Antabuse approach, and 4% chose public information and
education. Also 4% preferred a random road check approach, and
1% chose special alcohol-education courses. In regard to public
information campaigns, two-thirds of the officers felt it was
better to educate people to know their safe limits and to stick
to them than to try to get people never to drink before driving.

The tendency of the police to favor harsher penalties for
drunk driving is also shown in the strong agreement of most of
the respondents (77%) that persons who drive after drinking too
much should go to jail. Also 79% agreed strongly or agreed

somewhat that insurance rates of convicted drunk drivers should automatically be raised, and half agreed that the collision insurance policies of convicted drunk drivers should be cancelled. Forty percent agreed with the idea of special license plates for persons convicted of alcohol-related traffic accidents, and 70% agreed that the license plates of convicted drunk drivers should be suspended or revoked. Seventy-seven percent agreed strongly and 18% agreed somewhat that drunk drivers should lose their licenses. However, most recognized that many continue to drive without licenses. Ninety-three percent estimated that half or more of the drunk drivers who lose their licenses continue to drive and 35% thought that at least four-fifths of such persons would continue to drive.

In regard to police enforcement activities against drunk drivers, 85% agreed that most drunk driving is not detected by the police. Ninety-two percent agreed that there should be more police patrolling at times and places that alcohol-related accidents are most likely to happen; 67% agreed that they should patrol more around bars at night; and 50% agreed that they should patrol more around places where people were having parties. Sixty-nine percent agreed that bartenders should limit the drinks of driving customers, and 34% agreed that bars should be required to provide transportation for customers who get too drunk to drive safely. Forty-four percent agreed that breathtesting devices should be available in bars for the customers to use.

Most of the police seemed strongly supportive of the implied consent law and the use of breath tests. Eighty-nine percent of the officers agreed that the legal use of breath test evidence has served to increase the number of drunk driving convictions. As for the old presumptive limit of .15% BAC for drunk drivers, 55% felt that it was too high, 34% felt it was about right, and, surprisingly, ten officers felt it was too low. In regard to new situations in which breath tests might be required, the great majority of respondents (84%) supported requiring a breath test whenever a person who appears to have been drinking is involved in an accident. Also forty-four percent favored requiring breath

tests in all reported accidents, and 42% favored requiring a breath test whenever an apparently drunk person was seen getting into a driver's seat. However, only 20% supported requiring breath tests in a random road check. This is much less than the 57% of the Washtenaw general public who supported breathtesting in random road checks. Other situations suggested by the police as candidates for required breathtesting include: all fatal accidents, whenever an apparently drunk person gets out of a car, whenever a driver stopped by the police appears to have been drinking, in marine violations, whenever an apparently drunk pedestrian is involved in an accident, and whenever a drunk and disorderly arrest is made. Also 61% agreed that the use of balloon breath tests on the road instead of the breathalyzer at the station could greatly simplify the police officer's task in seeking to apprehend drunk drivers.

Turning to treatment type countermeasures, 83% of the officers agreed that convicted drunk drivers who are found to be problem drinkers should be required to submit to medical treatment, and 67% agreed that spending government money to provide medical and psychological help for drunk drivers was a legitimate means of trying to reduce drunk driving. However, the police respondents tended to divide almost evenly in the choice between more treatment or harsher penalties as the most effective deterrence to future drunk driving. Fifty-six percent disagreed and 44% agreed that "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, and, similarly, 54% agreed and 46% disagreed that "what is needed by most problem drinkers who drive after drinking is more severe punishments, not counseling by psychologists and social workers".

Overall, however, the law enforcement officers demonstrated a great range in feeling as to the likely success of any drunk driving countermeasures. When asked to react to the statement "no matter how much effort is invested, there is not likely to be much effect on the drunk driver problem", 10% agreed strongly, 31% agreed somewhat, 36% disagreed somewhat, and 23% disagreed

strongly. The optimists do outnumber the pessimists, but it is clear that a large proportion of the "front line troops" in the battle against drunk driving in Washtenaw County are not convinced that very much can be done to reduce this most serious traffic safety problem.

COURT HANDLING OF DRUNK DRIVING CASES

A great many of the police respondents seemed quite concerned about the ways in which the drunk driving cases are handled in the courts. When asked their opinion of reductions of drunk driving charges 85 of the 94 respondents said they felt reductions took place too often. Eight felt that the proportion of reductions which took place was about right, and only one felt charges were reduced less often than they should be. Seventy percent of the respondents thought that charges were most likely to be reduced in a pretrial settlement, but 16% said reductions were most common at the time of seeking the authorization from the prosecutor. Also 9% said the most frequent reduction place was in the trial jury, 4% said it was at the police station prior to seeking authorization, and 1% said it was the judge's decision at a trial.

In terms of the actual proportion of reductions which take place at the police state, the average response was that in 20% of drunk driving arrests the charge was dropped or authorization was sought for a lesser offense. Such reductions were seen as most likely in the Sheriff's Department and least likely in the Ypsilanti Police Department. However, there were great ranges in response in each of the departments, some officers indicating that almost no charges were reduced or dropped at the police station, and other officers indicating that as many as 90% of the charges were reduced or dropped at the police station. Similar variety of response was obtained concerning reductions by the prosecutor or the judge, although on this question the average estimate was that in 50% of the drunk driving cases the charge was reduced by either the prosecutor or the judge.

-13-

When asked the reasons which lie behind so many reductions,
two-thirds of the officers said the most important reason was
the desire to reduce the court load by obtaining a guilty plea.
Fifteen percent said the most important reason was lack of suf-
ficient or convincing evidence, and only 11% felt that the most
important reason was willingness to give special treatment to
some defendants. However, 83% indicated that this might some-
times be a factor in drunk driving cases. The officers were
also asked to estimate what percentage of persons who refused
to take a breath test were actually charged with drunk driving
by the prosecutor. Half of the respondents estimated that 95%
or more of the breath test refusers were actually prosecuted,
but some of the officers were much more pessimistic about prose-
cution of such persons. Thirteen percent felt that less 30%
of the breath test refusers were actually prosecuted.

The respondents also varied greatly in the amount of their
own work time which they had to spend in court on drunk driving
cases. Six officers said they did not usually have any court
time on such cases, while four officers said they averaged 20
hours or more per month. However, only one-quarter of the officers
averaged as much as four hours per month on drunk driving cases.
Presumably this diversity in amount of actual court experience with
drunk driving cases accounts for the great differences in view-
point as to how drunk driving cases are handled by the prosecutors
and judges. Nevertheless, the responding police officers were
almost unanimous in their view that charges are reduced more fre-
quently than they should be. Most of them did place the chief
blame for this situation on the crowded court system rather than
on favoritism by the judges or prosecutors. But, it is evident
that many law enforcement officers in Washtenaw County feel that
more severe punishments would act as an increased deterrent to
drunk driving, and they are resentful of a court system which
frequently does not penalize drunk drivers to the extent that they
should be according to the law which they have violated.

APPENDIX

CODEBOOK WITH MARGINALS

CODEBOOK FOR THE WASHTENAW COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS SURVEY ON ALCOHOL & TRAFFIC SAFETY

The following codebook shows the results obtained from self-administered questionnaires filled out by 94 law enforcement officers in the Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti Police Departments and in the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department. These are the three police agencies which hold subcontracts for special law enforcement efforts in the Washtenaw County Alcohol Safety Action Program.

It was planned that all 165 command and patrol personnel in these three departments would fill ' out the questionnaire. However, after the questionnaires were distributed by the three officers in charge of traffic safety in the three departments, there was considerable variation in the rates of response. The questionnaire was completed and returned by 28 out of 33 eligible personnel in the Ypsilanti Police Department, by 53 out of 96 eligible personnel in the Ann Arbor Police Department, and by 13 out of 36 eligible personnel in the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department. In addition, it is thought that some questionnaires which were filled out by Ann Arbor officers were lost. Since all the questionnaires were anonymous there was no way to know who should be asked to answer the questions again.

For most of the variables in the codebook four columns of percentaged data are provided in the left margin next to the code categories of the question responses. The first column under the heading "TS" contains the percentage distribution for the 94 officers in the total sample. The second column under the heading "AA" contains the percentage distributions for the 53 Ann Arbor Police Department respondents. The third column under the heading "Y" contains the percentage distributions for the 28 Ypsilanti Police Department respondents. And the fourth column under the heading "WS" contains the percentage distributions for the 13 Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department respondents. If a number in one of these columns is preceded by an "*", this means that it is an actual frequency rather than a percent. It must be

recognized that with the relatively low response rate from the Ann
Arbor Police Department (55%) and the very low response rate from
the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department (36%) these distributions
may not accurately represent the opinions of all the command and
patrol personnel in these departments, and thus one should be
very cautious in drawing any conclusions based on comparisons
among the three departments.

In most cases percentages will add to one hundred in each
column, but for the multiple response variables (e.g. V56 Helpful
Organizations) the percentages are based on dividing the number
of mentions of a category by the number of respondents and thus they
usually add to more than one hundred. In addition to the vari-
ables with percentage distributions there are 15 two-digit vari-
ables for which percentages in each numeric category would be
too cumbersome. For these variables the answers given by the
tenth, thirtieth, fiftieth, seventieth, and ninetieth percentiles
are shown for the same four groups of respondents.

Appended to the end of the codebook is a listing of the
content of the "other" responses which did not fit into the re-
gular code categories of the indicated variables.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

iv

CODEBOOK FOR WASAP POLICE SURVEY

V1 <u>R1 Data Set Number</u> (02)   TL=1-2   W=2

Deck Number (1)

V2 <u>R2 Respondent ID Number</u>   TL=3-4   W=2

V3 <u>R3 Police Department</u>   TL=5   W=1

T Freqs.	T%s.
53	56
28	30
13	14
94	100

1. Ann Arbor (AA)
2. Ypsilanti (Y)
3. Washtenaw County Sheriff Department (WS)

V4-V13 IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS ACCIDENT CAUSES
From your own experience, how important do you feel each of
the following items is in causing traffic accidents?

V4 <u>R4 Poor Road Design</u> (Q1a. Poor road design or main-
tenance)   TL=6   W=1   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS
34	26	43	46
48	59	32	39
18	15	25	15
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0

1. Very important
2. Somewhat important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important
9. NA (not ascertained)

V5 <u>R5 Defective Cars</u> (Q1b. Cars which have something wrong
with them)   TL=7   W=1   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS
32	28	43	23
48	49	43	54
19	23	11	23
1	0	4	0
0	0	0	0

1. Very important
2. Somewhat important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important
9. NA

V6 <u>R6 Poor Traffic Laws</u> (Q1c. Poor traffic laws and regu-
lations)   TL=8   W=1   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS
25	23	32	23
38	36	36	54
25	28	21	23
11	13	11	0
0	0	0	0

1. Very important
2. Somewhat important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important
9. NA

V7 <u>R7 Poor Conditions</u> (Q1d. Poor driving conditions such as
fog, rain, or icy roads)   TL=9   W=1   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS
53	55	54	46
38	34	43	46
9	11	4	8
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0

1. Very important
2. Somewhat important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important
9. NA

V8 <u>R8 Poor Drivers</u> (Q1e. Drivers who can't handle a car
well)   TL=10   W=1   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS
63	62	63	69
30	34	26	23
4	2	11	0
2	2	0	8
*1	0	*1	0

1. Very important
2. Somewhat important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important
9. NA

V9 <u>R9 Fast Drivers</u> (Q1f. Drivers who drive too fast)

TL=11 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
70	74	57	85	1.	Very important
25	25	32	15	2.	Somewhat important
4	2	11	0	3.	Not very important
0	0	0	0	4.	Not at all important
0	0	0	0	9.	NA

V10 <u>R10 Careless Drivers</u> (Q1g. Drivers who don't care about traffic regulations)

TL=12 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
78	77	79	77	1.	Very important
19	23	18	8	2.	Somewhat important
3	0	4	15	3.	Not very important
0	0	0	0	4.	Not at all important
0	0	0	0	9.	NA

V11 <u>R11 Drunk Drivers</u> (Q1h. Drivers who have had too much to drink)

TL=13 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
87	81	96	92	1.	Very important
13	19	4	8	2.	Somewhat important
0	0	0	0	3.	Not very important
0	0	0	0	4.	Not at all important
0	0	0	0	9.	NA

V12 <u>R12 Pedestrians & Bicyclists</u> (Q1i. Pedestrians and bicyclists who don't follow traffic regulations)

TL=14 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
37	40	36	31	1.	Very important
49	51	43	54	2.	Somewhat important
14	9	21	15	3.	Not very important
0	0	0	0	4.	Not at all important
0	0	0	0	9.	NA

V13 <u>R13 Drunk Pedestrians</u> (Q1j. Pedestrians who have had too much to drink)

TL=15 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
19	11	32	23	1.	Very important
35	43	18	39	2.	Somewhat important
35	36	39	23	3.	Not very important
11	9	11	15	4.	Not at all important
0	0	0	0	9.	NA

V14 <u>R14 Most Important Cause</u> (Q2. Which of the causes in Q1. do you think is the most important cause of traffic accidents?)

TL=16 W=2 MD=99

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
4	0	11	8	01.	Poor road design or maintenance
1	0	4	0	02.	Cars which have something wrong with them
0	0	0	0	03.	Poor traffic laws and regulations
4	6	4	0	04.	Poor driving conditions such as rain, fog, or icy roads
14	23	4	0	05.	Drivers who can't handle a car well
16	17	11	23	06.	Drivers who drive too fast
16	19	18	0	07.	Drivers who don't care about traffic regulations
44	36	46	69	08.	Drivers who have had too much to drink
1	0	3	0	09.	Pedestrians & bicyclists who don't follow traffic regulations
0	0	0	0	10.	Pedestrians who have had too much to drink
0	0	0	0	88.	DK
0	0	0	0	99.	NA

V15 <u>R15 Second Most Imp.Cause</u> (Q2a. Which do you think is
the second most important?)   TL=18 W=2 MD=99

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
3	4	4	0	01.	Poor road design or maintenance
4	2	7	8	02.	Cars which have something wrong with them
0	0	0	0	03.	Poor traffic laws and regulations
9	7	11	8	04.	Poor driving conditions such as rain, fog, or icy roads
13	13	11	15	05.	Drivers who can't handle a car well
18	23	7	23	06.	Drivers who drive too fast
25	23	25	31	07.	Drivers who don't care about traffic regulations
29	28	36	15	08.	Drivers who have had too much to drink
0	0	0	0	09.	Pedestrians & bicyclists who don't follow traffic regulations
0	0	0	0	10.	Pedestrians who have had too much to drink
0	0	0	0	88.	DK
0	0	0	0	99.	NA

V16 <u>R16 Third Most Imp.Cause</u> (Q2b. Which do you think is
the third most important?)   TL=20 W=2 MD=99

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
12	9	4	39	01.	Poor road design or maintenance
3	4	4	0	02.	Cars which have something wrong with them
0	0	0	0	03.	Poor traffic laws and regulations
20	23	21	8	04.	Poor driving conditions such as rain, fog, or icy roads
19	9	32	31	05.	Drivers who can't handle a car well
17	21	14	8	06.	Drivers who drive too fast
14	13	18	8	07.	Drivers who don't care about traffic regulations
13	17	7	8	08.	Drivers who have had too much to drink
2	4	0	0	09.	Pedestrians & bicyclists who don't follow traffic regulations
0	0	0	0	10.	Pedestrians who have had too much to drink
0	0	0	0	88.	DK
0	0	0	0	99.	NA

V17 <u>R17 Alcohol Fatalities %</u> (Q3. Out of every 100 traffic
accidents in which someone is killed, in how many would
you estimate drinking by a driver was a contributing
factor?)   TL=22 W=2 MD=99

Percentiles

	TS	AA	Y	WS
10.	30	34	25	31
30.	50	50	50	46
50.	55	55	55	60
70.	70	69	75	69
90.	80	80	80	78

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER   See Also V109

88. DK
99. NA

V18 <u>R18 Alcohol-Nonfatalities %</u> (Q4. Out of every 100 non-
fatal but serious traffic accidents, in how many would
you estimate drinking by a driver was a contributing
factor?)   TL=24-25 W=2 MD=99

Percentiles

	TS	AA	Y	WS
10.	30	30	25	30
30.	47	41	50	46
50.	55	50	60	60
70.	65	60	71	69
90.	80	75	85	80

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER   See Also V110

88. DK
99. NA

V19 <u>R19 Soc./Prob.Drinkers</u> (Q5. Would you estimate that more
alcohol-related traffic 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?)   TL=26 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
66	74	43	85	1.	Social drinker
34	26	57	15	2.	Problem drinker
0	0	0	0	9.	NA

V20 R20 Criteria for UD.71-1 (Q6. Under which of the follow-
ing 3 conditions do you generally check the "Had Been
Drinking" box on the UD 71-1 accident report form?)

Percentages   TL=27 W=1 MD=9

TS	AA	Y	WS	
2	4	0	0	1. Only when a drinking-related arrest is made in con-junction with the accident
11	9	7	23	2. Whenever the driver's drinking is considered to be a contributing factor in the accident
87	87	93	77	3. Whenever the driver appears to have been drinking at all, whether or not it is considered that the drink-ing contributed to the accident
0	0	0	0	9. NA
				0. Inap., UD-71 not used by respondent

V21 R21 Criteria for UD-10C (Q6a. Were the conditions under
which you checked one of the 3 HBD boxes on the old UD-
10C accident report form different in any way from the
conditions you have indicated above?) TL=28 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
3	5	0	0	1. No different; first condition checked in Q6
4	3	5	11	2. No different; second condition checked in Q6
88	90	84	89	3. No different; third condition checked in Q6
0	0	0	0	4. Yes, first condition (Q6) used in UD-10C
0	0	0	0	5. Yes, second condition (Q6) used in UD-10C
3	0	11	0	6. Yes, third condition (Q6) used in UD-10C
1	3	0	0	7. Yes, UD-10C more flexible regarding officer's deter-mination of driver's drinking
*15	*3	*9	*3	9. NA
				0. Inap., UD-10C or UD-71-1 not used by respondent

V22 R22 Why HBD Not Checked (Q6b. Can you think of any rea-
sons why an officer might be hesitant to check the HBD
box even though he suspects the driver's drinking con-
tributed to the accident?)   TL=29 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
4	2	4	15	1. Special consideration to the driver if he has had no previous record of accidents or moving violations
4	4	4	8	2. Special consideration to the driver if he (she) is a woman, a "hard-working" person, an influential person in the community, a relative or a friend
1	2	0	0	3. Inconvenience to the officer caused by the driver's later denial of drinking prior to the accident
1	0	0	8	4. Reluctance to involve the driver in insurance com-plications
1	2	0	0	5. Officer's uncertainty about the influence of other factors (fatigue, minor injury) on the driver's behavior or appearance
2	2	4	0	6. Officer's uncertainty or underestimation of how much alcohol a person can drink before he is impaired as a driver
2	2	4	0	7. Officer's uncertainty about precisely how much the driver has had to drink
3	4	4	0	8. Other codable response: Poor courts in this area. Yes, some officers are reluctant to give drivers a drinking record, too soft hearted-neglect their duty. There shouldn't be any reason but I am sure that some officers would not mark the box in an effort to try & help someone out.
81	83	82	69	9. NA, No.

V23 **R23 No.of Safe Drinks** (Q7. 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 have in 1 hour without becoming too drunk to drive?)
TL=30-31 W=2 MD=99

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY.

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
13	17	8	8	01.	One
22	26	11	25	02.	Two
38	34	46	42	03.	Three
11	13	11	0	04.	Four
7	6	11	0	05.	Five
4	0	8	17	06.	Six
1	0	0	8	07.	Seven
1	0	4	0	08.	Eight
1	2	0	0	10.	Ten
1	2	0	0	88.	DK
*3	0	*2	*1	99.	NA

V24 **R24 No. of .10% Drinks** (Q8. How many drinks do you think a person of average weight can have in 1 hour before reaching a BAC of .10%?) TL=32-33 W=2 MD=99

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY.

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
3	4	4	0	01.	One
7	7	8	0	02.	Two
22	23	23	17	03.	Three
32	34	27	33	04.	Four
19	19	15	25	05.	Five
7	6	11	0	06.	Six
3	2	4	8	07.	Seven
3	2	8	0	08.	Eight
1	0	0	8	10.	Ten
3	4	0	8	88.	DK
*3	0	*2	*1	99.	NA

V25 **R25 No.of .15% Drinks** (Q8. Before reaching a BAC of .15%)
TL=34-35 W=2 MD=99

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY.

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
2	4	0	0	02.	Two
9	7	15	0	03.	Three
9	13	0	8	04.	Four
17	17	19	8	05.	Five
29	28	27	33	06.	Six
5	6	8	0	07.	Seven
13	13	8	25	08.	Eight
3	2	8	0	09.	Nine
8	6	15	0	10.	Ten
1	0	0	8	11.	Eleven
1	0	0	8	15.	Fifteen
3	4	0	8	88.	DK
*3	0	*2	*1	99.	NA

V26 **R26 Accident 3 Drinks** (Q9. Suppose a person of average weight has 3 drinks in 1 hour. How many times more likely do you think he is to cause an accident than a person who has not been drinking?) TL=36-37 W=2 MD=98,99
  See Also V113

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY. IF ANSWER IS IN %, ROUND TO NEAREST WHOLE NUMBER AND MAKE A CARD.

01. No increased chance of accident
96. 96-100
97. Over 100
98. DK, no idea
99. NA

Percentiles

	TS	AA	Y	WS
10.	1	2	0	2
30.	2	2	2	2
50.	3	3	3	2
70.	5	8	5	7
90.	30	30	36	90

V27 **R27 Accident 6 Drinks** (Q9a. How about with 6 drinks in 1 hour?)   See Also V114   TL=38-39 W=2 MD=98,99

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY. IF ANSWER IS IN %, ROUND TO NEAREST WHOLE NUMBER AND MAKE A CARD.

01. No increased chance of accident
96. 96-100
97. Over 100
98. DK, no idea
99. NA

Percentiles

	TS	AA	Y	WS
10.	3	3	2	4
30.	5	5	4	5
50.	6	6	6	6
70.	15	20	12	14
90.	61	65	64	88

V28 **R28 Accident 9 Drinks** (Q9b. How about with 9 drinks in 1 hour?)   See Also V115   TL=38-39 W=2 MD=98,99

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY. IF ANSWER IS IN %, ROUND TO NEAREST WHOLE NUMBER AND MAKE A CARD.

01. No increased chance of accident
96. 96-100
97. Over 100
98. DK, no idea
99. NA

Percentiles

	TS	AA	Y	WS
10.	6	6	4	8
30.	9	9	8	10
50.	10	10	10	15
70.	50	50	38	60
90.	96	96	96	97

V29 **R29 % DAD Arrests/Cases** (Q10. Out of all your cases in the past year which involved a driver who had been drinking, in what percent would you guess a drunk driving arrest (DUIL or impaired) was made?)
  See Also V116   TL=42-43 W=2 MD=97,98

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY.

96. 96-100
97. Inap., no cases involving driver who had been drinking
98. DK, no idea
99. NA

Percentiles

	TS	AA	Y	WS
10.	9	5	18	3
30.	20	20	33	11
50.	50	45	65	30
70.	75	74	80	78
90.	95	96	92	94

V30 R30 New Breath Tests-3 (Q11. As you know, the Michigan Implied Consent Law presently covers only situations in which a driver has been arrested for DUIL or impaired driving. In which of the following additional situations do you think it would be useful to be able to request a breath test with the same penalty for refusing as provided in the Michigan Implied Consent Law?) TL=44 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
4	6	4	0	1. In a random road check (choice "a" only)
9	9	7	8	2. When an apparently drunk person is seen getting into a driver's seat (choice "b" only)
2	2	4	0	3. Random road check & drunk in driver's seat (a+b)
51	57	43	46	4. Whenever a person who appears to have been drinking is involved in an accident (choice "c" only)
2	2	0	8	5. Random road check & drinker in crash (a&c)
19	15	29	15	6. Drunk in driver's seat & drinker in crash (b&c)
12	7	14	23	7. Random road check, drunk in driver's seat and drinker in crash (a+b+c)
0	0	0	0	8. DK
0	0	0	0	9. NA
1	2	0	0	0. In none of the above situations

V31 R31 New Breath Test - Oth (Q11) TL=45 W=1 MD=9

CODE "OTHER" (d) AS FOLLOWS

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
86	87	86	85	0. Other not checked
1	0	4	0	1. Whenver a driver is involved in a fatal accident
1	0	4	0	2. Whenever an apparently drunk person is seen getting out of a vehicle he has just stopped operating
3	6	0	0	3. Whenever a Drunk & Disorderly arrest is made
4	4	4	8	4. Whenever a driver is involved in an accident not witnessed by the police
2	2	4	0	5. Whenever a driver is stopped by the police and appears to have been drinking
1	0	0	8	6. In marine violations
1	2	0	0	7. Whenever an apparently drunk pedestrian is involved in an accident
0	0	0	0	8. Other checked, but unspecified
0	0	0	0	9. NA

V32 R32 % Refusals Prosec. (Q12. In what percent of the drunk driving arrests in which a driver refuses to take a breath test would you think the prosecutor still authorizes one of the two drunk driving charges?)
    See Also V117   TL=46-47 W=2 MD=98,99

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT, ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY.

Percentiles

	TS	AA	Y	WS
10.	25	25	9	21
30.	80	80	73	76
50.	95	90	97	90
70.	97	95	97	94
90.	97	97	97	97

97. 97-100
98. DK, no guess
99. NA

V33 R33 % Drive on Revoked (Q13. In what percent of the drunk driving cases in which a driver's license is revoked would you guess the person continues to drive anyway?)
    See Also V118   TL=48-49 W=2 MD=98,99

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT, ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY.

Percentiles

	TS	AA	Y	WS
10.	50	50	31	50
30.	60	60	50	63
50.	75	75	70	75
70.	80	80	90	84
90.	90	90	97	93

97. 97-100
98. DK, no guess
99. NA

V34 R34 % Police Reductions (Q14. As you know, drunk driving charges are often reduced to lesser offenses. In what percent of cases in which a person is brought in on a drunk driving charge by officers of your department would you guess that authorization for a lesser offense is sought or the charge is dropped prior to authorization?)   See Also V119   TL=50-51 W=2 MD=98,99

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT, ROUND TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY.

97. 97-100
98. DK, no guess
99. NA

Percentiles

	TS	AA	Y	WS
10.	2	2	0	2
30.	10	11	9	10
50.	20	23	10	30
70.	40	40	53	68
90.	80	75	85	86

V35 R35 % Prosec.Reductions (Q15. In what percent of drunk driving cases of your department would you guess the charge is reduced by the prosecutor or later reduced by the judge?) See Also V120   TL=52-53 W=2 MD=98,99

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY.

97. 97-100
98. DK, no guess
99. NA

Percentiles

	TS	AA	Y	WS
10.	20	30	10	16
30.	40	40	35	50
50.	50	50	50	50
70.	65	70	50	69
90.	84	91	88	89

V36 R36 % .15+ Reductions (Q16. In what percent of the DUIL cases in which the BAC is above .15% would you guess the charge is reduced?)   TL=54-55 W=2 MD=98,99
     See Also V121

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY.

97. 97-100
98. DK, no guess
99. NA

Percentiles

	TS	AA	Y	WS
10.	10	10	5	13
30.	28	30	22	34
50.	40	40	40	50
70.	52	50	60	61
90.	79	75	87	79

V37 R37 Places of Reductions (Q17. At which point(s) in the legal system do you think drunk driving charges are most likely to be reduced?)   TL=56-59 Responses=4 MD=0,9

CODE UP TO FOUR RESPONSES IN THE ORDER IN WHICH THEY ARE RANKED BY THE RESPONDENT.

1. At the police station prior to seeking authorization of the charge
2. When authorization for the charge is obtained from the prosecutor
3. In a pre-trial settlement by the judge
4. When the jury convicts of the lesser included offense
5. When the judge finds the defendant guilty of a lesser offense
6. Other
8. DK, no guess
9. NA
0. No second, third, or fourth ranked response

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS
77	75	79	77
82	81	82	85
94	94	96	85
82	75	96	77
2	0	0	15
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0

V38 R38 Why Charges Reduced (Q18. For what reason(s) do you feel drunk driving charges are most often reduced?)

TL=60-63 Responses=4 MD=0,9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
84	81	89	85	1. Lack of sufficient or convincing evidence to obtain a conviction on the original charge
96	96	96	92	2. Desire to reduce the court load by obtaining a guilty plea
83	81	82	92	3. Special treatment of some persons charged with drunk driving
6	4	14	0	4. Other: reference to judge and/or jury's identification with the defendant and reluctance to invoke mandatory penalties which accompany a DUIL conviction
3	0	3	15	5. Other: reference to use of plea to a lesser offense as legal maneuver to postpone hearing of case until such time when the evidence is stagnant, witnesses are unavailable, etc.
1	0	3	0	6. Other: reference to defendant's previous driving record; no prior violations increases the likelihood of obtaining a reduced charge
9	6	11	15	7. Other codable response:

        Judge policy.
        Judges non-acceptance of breathalyzer results.
        Prosecutors too lazy.
        Unwillingness of judge to accept guilty plea-
          later finding guilty of lesser charge.
        Poor judges & pros's in 15th District Court.
        Witnesses fail to show up or officers sick.
        Driver obtained a lawyer.
        City Att. has own side legal practice & reduces
          caseload so he may handle civil cases.

TS	AA	Y	WS	
4	2	7	8	8. Other checked, but not specified
*1	*1	0	0	9. NA
				0. No second, third, or fourth ranked response

V39 R39 Reduction Frequency (Q19. Do you personally feel that charges are reduced too often, about right, or less often than they should be?)   TL=64 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
90	94	86	85	1. Too often
9	6	11	15	2. About right
1	0	4	0	3. Less often than they should be
0	0	0	0	4. DK, no opinion
0	0	0	0	9. NA

V40 R40 Why Reduction Feeling (Q19a. Why do you feel that way?)   TL=65 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

Why charges are reduced too often:

TS	AA	Y	WS	
15	13	15	29	1. Experiential-respondent has seen it happen too many times
21	33	0	14	2. Drunk drivers are a serious hazard to other drivers; the legal consequences of drunk driving should not be adulterated by reducing the charge
12	15	10	0	3. The police do not make drunk driving arrests without good evidence & a person should be tried for the offense charged at the time of arrest. The officer is in the best position to know what that charge should be.
13	7	25	14	4. Reductions encourage recidivist drunk drivers
9	7	10	14	5. Reductions are not systematic & equal. They are too often the result of the defendant's social & financial status rather than of evidentiary factors of the particular case.
24	20	35	14	6. Other codable response

Other codable response (cont'd).
  They are reduced too often because of courts.
  Prosecutors are inclined to lessen their workload by taking reductions; judges also tend to clear their dockets by processing cases more promptly through bargaining.
  Lazy prosecutors.
  Because the attorneys are afraid to try a case.
  Because they are!!
  Mostly when the jury takes pity on the defendant for various reasons & reduces a good DUIL to impaired.
  Too much willingness to take guilty plea to lessen offense. Charge reduced or dismissed due to technicality in procedure rather than poor evidence.
  Court will not convict on original.
  Present DUIL laws are not enforced stringently enough.
  Because not enough judges to handle caseload.
  The charges wouldn't have to reduced if the court system wasn't so over loaded, in any case.
  Anytime a lawyer is hired the prosecutor wants to reduce as he feels the individual is already paying (i.e., lawyers fee).
  Court officials & prosecutor's do not always realize what the policeman has for evidence because of communications.
  Because courts do not want the heavy caseload.
  Courts are too over loaded.
  Because you should not be drinking and driving.

3	3	0	14	7.	Each case must be judged on its own merits. Most reductions result from weak cases of driving behavior at the time the person was stopped or because the BAC was too low
3	3	5	0	8.	It takes so long for a case to be processed through the legal system; the person should not have to pay the full penalty at the end
*27	*13	*8	*6	9.	NA

V41 **R41 .15% BAC Too High?** (Q20. Do you feel that the present presumptive limit of .15% BAC is too high, about right, or too low for DUIL?)   TL=66 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
55	64	36	61	1.	Too high
34	26	46	39	2.	About right
11	9	18	0	3.	Too low
0	0	0	0	8.	DK, no guess
0	0	0	0	9.	NA

V42 **R42 Age Effect** (Q21. Some people say that the effects of drinking the same amount of alcohol in the same amount of time are not the same for everyone, depending on certain conditions. In your opinion, how important are each of the following conditions in affecting how a person feels or acts after drinking? His age?) TL=67 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
25	13	36	46	1.	Very important
52	59	46	39	2.	Somewhat important
22	28	14	15	3.	Not very important
1	0	4	0	4.	Not at all important
0	0	0	0	8.	DK, no guess
0	0	0	0	9.	NA

V43 R43 <u>Empty Stomach Effect</u> (Q21b. If he drinks on an empty stomach) TL=68 W=1 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
77	77	81	69	1. Very important
20	23	15	23	2. Somewhat important
2	0	4	8	3. Not very important
0	0	0	0	4. Not at all important
0	0	0	0	8. DK, no guess
*1	0	*1	0	9. NA

V44 R44 <u>Weight Effect</u> (Q21c. How much he weighs) TL=69 W=1 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
52	49	71	23	1. Very important
43	47	21	69	2. Somewhat important
5	4	7	8	3. Not very important
0	0	0	0	4. Not at all important
0	0	0	0	8. DK, no guess
0	0	0	0	9. NA

V45 R45 <u>Bolting Effect</u> (Q21d. If he bolts his drinks) TL=70 W=1 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
49	45	63	39	1. Very important
38	41	30	39	2. Somewhat important
11	9	7	23	3. Not very important
2	4	0	0	4. Not at all important
0	0	0	0	8. DK, no guess
*1	0	*1	0	9. NA

V46 R46 <u>Feelings Effect</u> (Q21e. How he is feeling (sad, tired, nervous, etc.)) TL=71 W=1 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
37	40	36	31	1. Very important
43	47	29	54	2. Somewhat important
19	11	36	15	3. Not very important
1	2	0	0	4. Not at all important
1	2	0	0	8. DK, no guess
0	0	0	0	9. NA

V47 R47 <u>Change Drinks Effect</u> (Q21f. If he changes from one kind of drink to another) TL=72 W=1 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
25	25	25	31	1. Very important
38	36	39	46	2. Somewhat important
31	34	29	23	3. Not very important
5	6	7	0	4. Not at all important
0	0	0	0	8. DK, no guess
0	0	0	0	9. NA

V48 R48 <u>Marijuana Effect</u> (Q21g. If he is smoking marijuana) TL=73 W=1 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
61	60	63	61	1. Very important
24	25	19	31	2. Somewhat important
11	11	11	8	3. Not very important
3	4	4	0	4. Not at all important
1	0	4	0	8. DK, no guess
*2	*1	*1	0	9. NA

V49 R49 <u>Strong drug Effect</u> (Q21h. If he is using some strong drug like LSD) TL=74 W=1 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
79	79	79	77	1. Very important
11	13	4	15	2. Somewhat important
7	6	11	8	3. Not very important
2	2	4	0	4. Not at all important
1	0	4	0	8. DK, no guess
0	0	0	0	9. NA

V50 **R50 Effect of Others** (Q21i. How the people he is with are acting) TL=74 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
18	17	21	15	1. Very important
37	41	21	54	2. Somewhat important
33	36	32	23	3. Not very important
12	6	25	8	4. Not at all important
0	0	0	0	8. DK, no guess
0	0	0	0	9. NA

V51 **R51 Habitual Effect** (Q21j. If he is used to drinking alcoholic beverages) TL=76 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
43	40	50	39	1. Very important
50	55	39	54	2. Somewhat important
7	6	11	8	3. Not very important
0	0	0	0	4. Not at all important
0	0	0	0	8. DK, no guess
0	0	0	0	9. NA

V52 **R52 Medicine Effect** (Q21k. If he is taking medicine for some sickness) TL=77 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
66	70	57	69	1. Very important
30	28	32	31	2. Somewhat important
3	2	7	0	3. Not very important
1	0	4	0	4. Not at all important
0	0	0	0	8. DK, no guess
0	0	0	0	9. NA

V53 **R53 Percent Drinking Cases** (Q22. Out of all the cases of all kinds which you have handled in the past year, in what percent would you estimate drinking was a contributing factor?) See Also V131 TL=78-79 W=2 MD=98,99

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY.

Percentiles

	TS	AA	Y	WS
10.	15	11	36	16
30.	30	25	58	31
50.	50	37	66	50
70.	60	50	75	64
90.	75	65	85	75

97. 97-100
98. DK, no guess
99. NA

V54 **R54 Alcoholic Percentages** (Q23. Out of every 100 adults in Washtenaw County, how many would you guess are alcoholics or have serious drinking problems?)   See Also V132 TL=80-81 W=2 MD=98,99

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY.

Percentiles

	TS	AA	Y	WS
10.	2	2	3	2
30.	5	5	7	5
50.	10	7	10	10
70.	15	10	23	18
90.	30	25	60	42

97. 97-100
98. DK, no guess
99. NA

V55 **R55 Alcoholism Success** (Q24. How often do you think persons with serious drinking problems are able to overcome these problems?) TL=82 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
1	2	0	0	1. Almost always
6	4	14	0	2. Most of the time
22	23	18	31	3. About half the time
52	59	39	54	4. Only occasionally
17	11	29	15	5. Almost never
1	2	0	0	8. DK, no guess
0	0	0	0	9. NA

V56 R56 Agency Names (Q25. Do you know the names of any agencies or organizations in Washtenaw County which offer help for drinking problems. Q25a. Which organizations do you know about?) TL=83-85 Responses=3
MD=9

CODE UP TO THREE RESPONSES

Percentages			
TS	AA	Y	WS
10	14	4	8
69	76	55	69
0	0	0	0
3	4	0	8
3	4	0	8
11	16	4	8
7	4	15	0
28	20	37	38

1. WCCA
2. AA
3. Ozone House, Free Clinic
4. Social Service Agencies
5. Mental Health Agencies
6. Crisis Clinic
7. Hospitals
8. Other response:
    Alcohol Safety Action Program.
    Antabuse program.
    Antabuse.
    Court Antabuse treatment
    Washtenaw County Antabuse Alcohol Program. Utilizes a medication to discourage drinking by causing nausea; also meetings are held for group therapy and a blood check for alcohol content.
    Antabuse program.
    Antabuse program, administered by the court.
    Court program.
    Antabuse program.
    Court Antabuse program.
    Court probation Antabuse program.
    Court probation Antabuse program.
    Court Antabuse program.
    Washtenaw County Jail.
    Several churches.
    SOS, Police Department.
    SOS.
    Antabuse program.
    Antabuse-on the judges orders, etc.
    Antabuse, churches
    Students Offering Support (SOS); Veteran Administration.
    Aid to citizens.
    WASAP.

*4	*3	*1	0
23	18	37	15

9. NA
0. No, no organization mentioned; no second or third response

V57 R57 Most Effective Agency (Q25b. Which of these organizations do you feel is the most effective in working with people who have drinking problems?) TL=86 MD=9

Percentages			
TS	AA	Y	WS
7	8	4	9
31	42	33	18
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
1	3	4	0
0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0
15	11	17	27

1. WCCA
2. AA
3. Ozone House; Free Clinic
4. Social Service Agencies
5. Mental Health Agencies
6. Crisis Clinic
7. Hospitals
8. Other response:
    Antabuse
    Probation Department.
    Washtenaw County Antabuse Alcohol Program.
    Antabuse program.
    Court.
    Court.
    Court Antabuse program.

V57 R57 Most Effective Agency (Other response con'td)

Police Department-due to sheer volume has
experience.
Antabuse.
Churches.
WASAP.

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
*21	*15	*4	*2	9.	NA
40	37	42	45	0.	Inap., knows no helping organizations or DK which is most effective

V58 R58 Agency Suggested (Q25c. Have you ever suggested to anyone you have picked up that he could get help at one of these places? Q25d. Which place or places?)

CODE UP TO THREE RESPONSES   TL=87-89 Responses=3 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
3	4	4	0	1.	WCCA
37	39	36	31	2.	AA
0	0	0	0	3.	Ozone House; Free Clinic
1	0	0	8	4.	Social Service Agencies
0	0	0	0	5.	Mental Health Agencies
1	2	0	0	6.	Crisis Clinic
3	2	8	0	7.	Hospitals
21	14	20	46	8.	Other response:

ASAP.
Antabuse program.
Antabuse.
County Department.
The Antabuse program.
Doctor.
Church and doctor.
Court program.
Court probation Antabuse program.
Court probation Antabuse program.
Antabuse.
Antabuse, churches.
WASAP.
Churches.

TS	AA	Y	WS		
*7	*4	*3	0	9.	NA
52	53	56	39	0.	Knows no helpful organizations, or never suggested an agency; no second, third response

V59 R59 ASAP Activities (Q26. What activities of the Washtenaw Alcohol Safety Action Program have you heard about?)   TL=90-93 Responses=4

CODE UP TO FOUR RESPONSES

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
4	6	0	8	1.	Increased police enforcement
13	13	7	23	2.	Roadside breath tests
22	9	37	38	3.	Antabuse drug
0	0	0	0	4.	Public information campaign
3	2	0	15	5.	Treatment services for problem drinkers
0	0	0	0	6.	Strict court sentences
0	0	0	0	7.	Strict driver license rules
0	0	0	0	8.	Driver course
9	11	3	15	9.	Other

Surveys of people; checking of accident reports
for alcohol.
Surveys.
Financing.
Talked with & observed officers in program from AAPD.
Surveys.
Arresting those which would normally be arrested.
Federal grant program.
Surveys.

TS	AA	Y	WS		
62	72	54	39	0.	No, nothing: DK, NA; no second, third or fourth response

V60 R60 <u>Enforcement Effect</u> (Q27. How effective do you think each of the following methods would be in reducing the drinking driver problem? Q27a. Greater police enforcement of drunk driving laws.) TL=94 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
46	43	61	23	1.	Very effective
46	47	36	61	2.	Somewhat effective
9	9	4	15	3.	Not very effective
0	0	0	0	4.	Not at all effective
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
0	0	0	0	9.	NA

V61 R61 <u>Education Effect</u> (Q27b. A large-scale public information campaign.) TL=95 W=1 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
18	9	25	39	1.	Very effective
46	53	39	31	2.	Somewhat effective
35	38	32	31	3.	Not very effective
1	0	4	0	4.	Not at all effective
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
0	0	0	0	9.	NA

V62 R62 <u>Treatment Effect</u> (Q27c. Improved treatment services for problem drinkers.) TL=96 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
36	28	46	46	1.	Very effective
45	49	43	31	2.	Somewhat effective
16	19	11	15	3.	Not very effective
3	4	0	8	4.	Not at all effective
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
0	0	0	0	9.	NA

V63 R63 <u>Penalties Effect</u> (Q27d. More severe penalties for convicted drunk drivers.) TL=97 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
71	70	79	61	1.	Very effective
25	26	14	39	2.	Somewhat effective
4	4	7	0	3.	Not very effective
0	0	0	0	4.	Not at all effective
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
0	0	0	0	9.	NA

V64 R64 <u>Antabuse Effect</u> (Q27e. Having convicted drunk drivers use a pill which causes them to be sick if they drink alcohol.) TL=98 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
32	31	32	39	1.	Very effective
29	23	42	23	2.	Somewhat effective
30	31	25	39	3.	Not very effective
8	15	0	0	4.	Not at all effective
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*1	*1	0	0	9.	NA

V65 R65 <u>DAD Courses Effect</u> (Q27f. Special alcohol-education courses for convicted drunk drivers.) TL=99 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
26	21	32	31	1. Very effective
34	35	32	39	2. Somewhat effective
37	44	32	15	3. Not very effective
3	0	4	15	4. Not at all effective
0	0	0	0	8. DK
*1	*1	0	0	9. NA

V66 R66 <u>Random Check Effect</u> (Q27g. Police using random road checks to find drivers who have been drinking.) TL=100 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
34	26	39	54	1. Very effective
43	51	39	15	2. Somewhat effective
20	23	18	15	3. Not very effective
3	0	4	15	4. Not at all effective
0	0	0	0	8. DK
0	0	0	0	9. NA

V67 R67 <u>First Preferred Approach</u> (Q28. Which of the seven approaches to reducing the drinking driver problem would you most like to see used in Washtenaw County?) TL=101 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
17	15	18	23	1. Greater police enforcement of drunk driver laws
4	2	4	15	2. A large-scale public information campaign
11	13	7	8	3. Improved treatment services for problem drinkers
54	56	54	46	4. More severe penalties for convicted drunk drivers
9	11	4	8	5. Having convicted drunk drivers use a pill which causes them to be sick if they drink alcohol
1	0	4	0	6. Special alcohol-education courses for convicted drunk drivers
4	2	11	0	7. Police using random road checks to find drivers who have been drinking
0	0	0	0	8. DK
*1	*1	0	0	9. NA

V68 R68 <u>Second Preferred Approach</u> (Q28a. And which would be your second preferred choice?) TL=102 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
21	19	25	23	1. Greater police enforcement of drunk driver laws
10	13	4	8	2. A large-scale public information campaign
7	6	7	15	3. Improved treatment services for problem drinkers
21	25	11	31	4. More severe penalties for convicted drunk drivers
14	13	18	8	5. Having convicted drunk drivers use a pill which causes them to be sick if they drink alcohol
7	10	7	0	6. Special alcohol-education courses for convicted drunk drivers
18	13	29	15	7. Police using random road checks to find drivers who have been drinking
0	0	0	0	8. DK
*1	*1	0	0	9. NA

V69 R69 <u>Best Main Approach</u> (Q29. In trying to reduce the number of alcohol-related traffic accidents, where should more effect be placed?) TL=103 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
34	40	29	23	1. Trying to educate the public never to drink before driving
66	60	71	77	2. Trying to educate the public as to how much they can safely drink & to stick to these limits before driving
0	0	0	0	8. DK
*1	*1	0	0	9. NA

V70 R70 Help Drunk Pedestrians (Q30. How much special effort do you think should be made to help drunk pedestrians avoid being hit by an automobile (for example, having warning signs or extra lighting near bars, or special patrols to assist drunk pedestrians?) TL=104 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS
4	4	7	0
31	29	32	39
21	25	18	8
43	41	43	54
0	0	0	0
*2	*2	0	0

1. A lot of effort
2. Some effort
3. Only a little effort
4. No special effort at all
8. DK
9. NA

V71 R71 Previous Training (Q31. Have you had any special training in the drinking driver problem?) TL=105 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS
26	23	33	23
74	77	67	77
0	0	0	0
*5	*4	*1	0

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

V72 R72 Training Source (Q31a. Where have you had that training?)   TL=106-107 Responses=2 MD=0,9

CODE UP TO TWO RESPONSES

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS
3	0	4	15
1	0	0	8
9	13	7	0
1	2	0	0
2	4	0	0
8	6	15	0
3	2	7	0
1	0	4	0
*6	*5	*1	0
74	77	67	77

1. Alcohol Safety Action Program
2. Michigan Department of Health
3. Michigan State University's Highway Traffic Safety Center
4. Huron High School
5. Ann Arbor Police Department
6. Police Academy
7. On the job experience
8. Eastern Michigan University
9. NA
0. No second response; or inap., has not had any special training

V73 R73 Training Topics (Q31b. What aspects of the drinking driver problem did your training cover?) TL=108-112

CODE UP TO 5 RESPONSES   Responses=5 MD=0,9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS
22	22	22	23
21	18	30	15
17	16	15	23
11	8	11	23
2	4	0	0
0	0	0	0
*5	*9	*1	0
74	77	67	77

1. Physiological/psychological effects of drinking
2. The relationship between excessive drinking & traffic accidents
3. The nature & relative importance of alcoholism as a social problem
4. The effectiveness of various treatment approaches
5. Breathalyzer training, knowledge of laws pertaining to the drunk driving & identification of drunk drivers
8. DK
9. NA
0. No second, third, fourth, or fifth response; or inap., has not had any special training

-17-

V74 R74 Training Needs (Q32. On what aspects of the drinking driver problem would you like to have (more) training?) TL=113-117 Responses=5 MD=0,9

CODE UP TO FIVE RESPONSES

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
49	54	41	42	1. Physiological/psychological effects of drinking
48	48	45	50	2. The relationship between excessive drinking & traffic accidents
24	31	14	17	3. The nature & relative importance of alcoholism as a social problem
41	40	36	50	4. The effectiveness of various treatment approaches
1	2	0	0	5. Legal aspects of effective prosecution of the drunk driver ·
0	0	0	0	8. DK
*8	*1	*6	*1	9. NA
				0. No second, third, fourth or fifth response

V75 R75 Not Deny Right (Q33. No person should be denied the right to drive if he needs his car to get to work.) TL=118 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
12	7	26	0	1. Agree strongly
12	17	7	0	2. Agree somewhat
18	17	7	46	3. Disagree somewhat
58	59	59	54	4. Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8. DK
*1	0	*1	0	9. NA

V76 R76 Should Lose License (Q34. Persons who drive after drinking too much should lose their licenses) TL=119 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
77	79	78	69	1. Agree strongly
18	17	22	15	2. Agree somewhat
4	4	0	15	3. Disagree somewhat
0	0	0	0	4. Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8. DK
*1	0	*1	0	9. NA

V77 R77 Should Go to Jail (Q35. Persons who drive after drinking too much should go to jail.) TL=120 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
77	81	74	69	1. Agree strongly
18	15	22	23	2. Agree somewhat
3	2	4	8	3. Disagree somewhat
1	2	0	0	4. Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8. DK
*1	0	*1	0	9. NA

V78 R78 Bars Provide Transp. (Q36. Taverns & bars should be required to provide transportation for customers who get too drunk to drive safely) TL=121 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
14	10	30	0	1. Agree strongly
20	11	30	31	2. Agree somewhat
25	29	11	39	3. Disagree somewhat
41	50	30	31	4. Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8. DK
*2	*1	*1	0	9. NA

V79 R79 Bars Limit Drinks (Q37. Bartenders should limit the number of drinks that they will serve to customers who plan to drive) TL=122 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
29	21	44	31	1. Agree strongly
40	41	30	54	2. Agree somewhat
20	25	19	8	3. Disagree somewhat
11	13	7	8	4. Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8. DK
*1	0	*1	0	9. NA

-18-

V80 R80 <u>Bars Provide Test</u> (Q38. Breath-testing devices should be available in taverns & bars for customer's use in determining whether they have exceeded legal BAC limits)

TL=123   MD=9

Percentages			
TS	AA	Y	WS
10	6	19	8
34	43	22	23
24	23	26	23
32	29	33	46
0	0	0	0
*1	0	*1	0

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

V81 R81 <u>Police Patrol Bars</u> (Q39. The police should patrol more around bars & taverns at night)   TL=124   MD=9

Percentages			
TS	AA	Y	WS
16	9	33	8
51	57	41	46
27	28	22	31
7	6	4	15
0	0	0	0
*1	0	*1	0

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

V82 R82 <u>Police Patrol Party</u> (Q40. The police should patrol more around places where people are having parties at night)   TL=125   MD=9

Percentages			
TS	AA	Y	WS
9	4	22	0
41	34	44	61
38	49	22	23
13	13	11	15
0	0	0	0
*1	0	*1	0

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

V83 R83 <u>Record All Alcohol</u> (Q41. All alcohol-related convictions should be entered on a driver's record whether or not they are related to driving (e.g., "drunk & disorderly")   TL=126   MD=9

Percentages			
TS	AA	Y	WS
32	32	41	16
28	28	26	31
20	21	15	31
19	19	19	23
0	0	0	0
*1	0	*1	0

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

V84 R84 <u>Special Plates</u> (Q42. Drivers convicted of alcohol-related traffic accidents should have special plates on their cars so they can be easily identified) TL=127 MD=9

Percentages			
TS	AA	Y	WS
18	15	22	23
20	23	26	0
33	36	19	54
28	26	33	23
0	0	0	0
*1	0	*1	0

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

V85 R85 <u>Revoke Drunk Plates</u> (Q43. The license plates of vehicles owned by persons convicted of drunk driving should be suspended or revoked) TL=128   MD=9

Percentages			
TS	AA	Y	WS
53	45	78	31
17	21	7	23
16	19	4	31
14	15	11	15
0	0	0	0
*1	0	*1	0

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

V86 R86 <u>Test All Accidents</u> (Q44. Breath tests to determine blood alcohol concentrations should be required in all reported accidents)   TL=129   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
21	21	22	15	1.	Agree strongly
23	25	19	23	2.	Agree somewhat
35	35	33	39	3.	Disagree somewhat
22	19	26	23	4.	Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*2	*1	*1	0	9.	NA

V87 R87 <u>Tests Increase Arrests</u> (Q45. On the whole, the legal use of breath test evidence has served to increase the number of persons convicted of drunk driving) TL=130 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
60	61	56	61	1.	Agree strongly
29	31	22	39	2.	Agree somewhat
8	6	15	0	3.	Disagree somewhat
3	2	7	0	4.	Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*2	*1	*1	0	9.	NA

V88 R88 <u>Test on Road</u> (Q46. Use of balloon breath tests on the road instead of breathalyzer breath tests at the station would greatly simplify the police officer's task in seeking to apprehend drunk drivers) TL=131   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
19	10	41	8	1.	Agree strongly
42	48	26	54	2.	Agree somewhat
26	31	15	31	3.	Disagree somewhat
13	11	19	8	4.	Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*2	*1	*1	0	9.	NA

V89 R89 <u>More Police Patrols</u> (Q47. There should be more police enforcement of drinking-driver laws at times & places where alcohol-related accidents are most likely to happen)   TL=132   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
31	27	37	31	1.	Agree strongly
61	67	52	61	2.	Agree somewhat
8	6	11	8	3.	Disagree somewhat
0	0	0	0	4.	Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*3	*2	*1	0	9.	NA

V90 R90 <u>Medical Treatment</u> (Q48. Drivers convicted of drunk driving & found to be problem drinkers should be required to submit to medical treatment)   TL=133   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
57	50	67	61	1.	Agree strongly
26	27	22	31	2.	Agree somewhat
13	21	4	0	3.	Disagree somewhat
4	2	7	8	4.	Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*2	*1	*1	0	9.	NA

V91 R91 <u>Raise Rates</u> (Q49. Insurance companies should automatically raise the insurance rates of drivers convicted of drunk driving)   TL=134   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
54	60	59	23	1.	Agree strongly
25	25	19	39	2.	Agree somewhat
11	11	7	15	3.	Disagree somewhat
10	4	15	23	4.	Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*2	*1	*1	0	9.	NA

V92 R92 Cancel Collision (Q50. Insurance companies should cancel the collision insurance policies of drivers convicted of drunk driving)   TL=135   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
23	17	41	8	1.	Agree strongly
28	42	7	15	2.	Agree somewhat
27	27	22	39	3.	Disagree somewhat
22	13	30	39	4.	Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*2	*1	*1	0	9.	NA

Percentages V93 R93 Alcoholism Disease (Q51. Alcoholism is a disease)
TL=136   MD=9

TS	AA	Y	WS		
59	56	67	54	1.	Agree strongly
23	27	19	15	2.	Agree somewhat
9	10	4	15	3.	Disagree somewhat
10	8	11	15	4.	Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*2	*1	*1	0	9.	NA

V94 R94 Drunk Not Responsible (Q52. Since a drunk person is not in full control of his actions, he should not be held responsible for violating the law while drunk)
TL=137   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
3	2	7	0	1.	Agree strongly
1	0	0	8	2.	Agree somewhat
1	0	4	0	3.	Disagree somewhat
95	98	89	92	4.	Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*2	*1	*1	0	9.	NA

V95 R95 Counseling Not Jail (Q53. It is better to place those arrested while driving "under the influence" on probation & into a counseling or treatment program than it is to put them in jail)   TL=138   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
16	10	22	31	1.	Agree strongly
27	27	30	23	2.	Agree somewhat
30	35	22	31	3.	Disagree somewhat
26	29	26	15	4.	Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*2	*1	*1	0	9.	NA

V96 R96 Punish Not Counsel (Q54. What is needed by most problem drinkers who drive after drinking is more severe punishments, not counseling by psychologists & social workers)   TL=139   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
15	17	19	0	1.	Agree strongly
39	35	50	31	2.	Agree somewhat
36	39	23	54	3.	Disagree somewhat
10	10	8	15	4.	Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*3	*1	*2	0	9.	NA

V97 R97 Alcoholics Can Stop (Q55. Alcoholics could stop drinking if they really wanted to)   TL=140   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
17	8	30	31	1.	Agree strongly
36	42	30	23	2.	Agree somewhat
26	31	15	31	3.	Disagree somewhat
21	19	26	15	4.	Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*2	*1	*1	0	9.	NA

V98 R98 **Most DAD Not Caught** (Q56. Most drunk driving is not detected by the police.)   TL=141   MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
48	42	48	69	1. Agree strongly
37	37	44	23	2. Agree somewhat
15	21	7	8	3. Disagree somewhat
0	0	0	0	4. Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8. DK
*2	*1	*1	0	9. NA

V99 R99 **Govt.Not Help** (Q57. The government's job is to catch & punish drunk drivers; anything further that is done for problem drinkers should be by private organizations such as Alcoholics Anonymous or special clinics.)TL=142 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
12	10	19	8	1. Agree strongly
28	32	27	15	2. Agree somewhat
42	46	27	54	3. Disagree somewhat
18	12	27	23	4. Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8. DK
*5	*3	*2	0	9. NA

V100 R100 **Govt.Should Help** (Q58. The government should help keep drunk drivers off the road even if it means spending money to provide medical & psychological help.)   TL=143   MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
22	15	37	15	1. Agree strongly
45	50	26	61	2. Agree somewhat
26	29	22	23	3. Disagree somewhat
7	6	11	0	4. Disagree strongly
1	0	4	0	8. DK
*2	*1	*1	0	9. NA

V101 R101 **Effect Not Likely** (Q59. No matter how much effort is invested, there is not likely to be much effect on the drunk driver problem.)   TL=144   MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
10	4	19	15	1. Agree strongly
31	33	33	15	2. Agree somewhat
36	37	22	61	3. Disagree somewhat
23	25	26	8	4. Disagree strongly
0	0	0	0	8. DK
*3	*2	*1	0	9. NA

V102 R102 **Drinking Status** (Q60. At the present time, which of the following do you consider yourself to be?)   TL=145   MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
13	10	18	15	1. Total abstainer
30	23	43	31	2. Very light drinker
29	39	11	31	3. Fairly light drinker
26	29	25	15	4. Moderate drinker
1	0	0	8	5. Fairly heavy drinker
1	0	4	0	6. Heavy drinker
*1	*1	0	0	9. NA

V103 R103 <u>Specific DAD Rules</u> (Q61. Some people say you should never drink before driving. Others say moderate drinking before driving is completely acceptable. How about you? Do you have any specific rules for yourself as to how much you can drink before driving?) TL=146 W=2 MD=99

MAKE A CARD FOR ANY SECOND RESPONSE

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
17	19	19	0	10. Never drinks before driving
3	2	0	10	11. No more than 1 drink before driving
8	9	9	0	12. No more than 2 drinks
8	11	0	10	13. No more than 3 drinks
4	4	5	0	14. No more than 4 drinks
1	0	5	0	15. No more than 5 drinks
1	2	0	0	16. No more than 6 drinks
0	0	0	0	17. No more than 7 drinks
9	11	5	10	18. No more than 8 drinks
1	0	0	10	19. Limits drinking before driving (nonspecific as to limit)
0	0	0	0	21. Waits less than 1 hour after drinking
9	9	5	20	22. Waits 1-1.9 hours after drinking
0	0	0	0	23. Waits 2 or more hours after drinking
0	0	0	0	29. Waits before driving (nonspecific as to how long)
4	2	9	0	31. Have someone else drive
0	0	0	0	32. Takes public transportation or taxi
0	0	0	0	41. Drives only if not too tired
4	4	5	0	42. Drives only if feels capable, not dizzy
0	0	0	0	43. Drives more carefully, more slowly
1	0	0	10	51. Depend on how much he has eaten, depends on whether just eaten
0	0	0	0	52. Depends on how far he has to go
0	0	0	0	53. Depends on driving conditions
0	0	0	0	60. Other codable response
0	0	0	0	70. Yes, have rules, but no codable response
31	28	38	30	80. No, no rules
*4	*2	*1	*2	99. NA
				00. Inap.; a total abstainer

V104 R104 <u>Education</u> (Q62. How many years of school or college have you completed?) TL=147 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
38	25	61	39	1. 12 grades (high school diploma)
38	40	21	61	2. 1-3 years college or trade or business school
20	29	14	0	3. 4 years college (bachelor's degree)
4	6	4	0	4. 1 or more years of graduate work (beyond bachelor's degree)
*1	*1	0	0	9. NA

V105 R105 <u>Years of Service</u> (Q63. How many years have you been serving as a law enforcement officer?) TL=148 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
13	17	7	8	1. Fewer than 12 months
55	54	61	46	2. 1-5 years
20	15	18	46	3. 6-10 years
5	10	0	0	4. 11-15 years
4	4	7	0	5. 16-20 years
2	0	7	0	6. More than 20 years
*1	*1	0	0	9. NA

V106 R106 <u>Present Duties</u> (Q64. What are your present primary duties?)   TL=149 MD=9

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">Percentages</td></tr>
<tr><td>TS</td><td>AA</td><td>Y</td><td>WS</td></tr>
<tr><td>77</td><td>75</td><td>79</td><td>85</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>8</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>13</td><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>8</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>4</td><td>7</td><td>8</td></tr>
<tr><td>*1</td><td>*1</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>

1. Road patrol
2. Foot patrol
3. Command
4. Other
      Traffic.   School safety officer &
      Breathalyzer operator.   juvenile court liaison.
      Traffic radar enforce-   A little of everything.
      ment.
9. NA

V107 R107 <u>Hours in Court</u> (Q65. In the average month, about how many hours do you spend in court at trials or waiting for trials?) See also V136   TL=150-151 W=2 MD=99

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY.

98. 98-100
88. DK
99. NA

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Percentiles</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>TS</td><td>AA</td><td>Y</td><td>WS</td></tr>
<tr><td>10.</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>3</td></tr>
<tr><td>30.</td><td>10</td><td>8</td><td>15</td><td>10</td></tr>
<tr><td>50.</td><td>12</td><td>10</td><td>20</td><td>16</td></tr>
<tr><td>70.</td><td>18</td><td>12</td><td>30</td><td>20</td></tr>
<tr><td>90.</td><td>30</td><td>20</td><td>42</td><td>26</td></tr>
</table>

V108 R108 <u>% DAD Court Time</u> (Q65a. About what percent of this time would you say is spent on drunk driving cases?)
      See also V137, V138   TL=152-153 W=2 MD=88,99

CODE ACTUAL NUMBER. IF RANGE IS GIVEN, CODE MIDPOINT ROUNDING TO ODD WHEN NECESSARY.

88. DK
99. NA
00. Inap., 0 hours spent in court (Q65)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Percentiles</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>TS</td><td>AA</td><td>Y</td><td>WS</td></tr>
<tr><td>10.</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>30.</td><td>7</td><td>5</td><td>10</td><td>6</td></tr>
<tr><td>50.</td><td>10</td><td>10</td><td>24</td><td>10</td></tr>
<tr><td>70.</td><td>25</td><td>20</td><td>43</td><td>32</td></tr>
<tr><td>90.</td><td>50</td><td>40</td><td>78</td><td>86</td></tr>
</table>

V109 R109 <u>Alcohol Fatal %-7</u> (R17 Collapsed)   TL=155   MD=9

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">Percentages</td></tr>
<tr><td>TS</td><td>AA</td><td>Y</td><td>WS</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>10</td><td>6</td><td>19</td><td>8</td></tr>
<tr><td>9</td><td>7</td><td>4</td><td>23</td></tr>
<tr><td>20</td><td>25</td><td>19</td><td>8</td></tr>
<tr><td>24</td><td>26</td><td>15</td><td>31</td></tr>
<tr><td>30</td><td>26</td><td>37</td><td>31</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>6</td><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>*1</td><td>0</td><td>*1</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>

1. 01-19%
2. 20-34%
3. 35-49%
4. 50%
5. 51-65%
6. 66-80%
7. 81-100%
8. DK
9. NA

V110 R110 <u>Alcohol Nonfatal %-7</u> (R18 Collapsed) TL=156 MD=9

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">Percentages</td></tr>
<tr><td>TS</td><td>AA</td><td>Y</td><td>WS</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>12</td><td>11</td><td>11</td><td>15</td></tr>
<tr><td>16</td><td>23</td><td>4</td><td>15</td></tr>
<tr><td>19</td><td>21</td><td>18</td><td>15</td></tr>
<tr><td>22</td><td>21</td><td>25</td><td>23</td></tr>
<tr><td>23</td><td>19</td><td>29</td><td>31</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>4</td><td>11</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>

1. 01-19%
2. 20-34%
3. 35-49%
4. 50%
5. 51-65%
6. 66-80%
7. 81-100%
8. DK
9. NA

Percentages	V111 R111 Alcohol Fatal/Nonfatal Ratio (R17/R18) TL=157 MD=9

TS	AA	Y	WS	
3	0	11	0	1. Less than .5
15	15	15	15	2. .5-.79
23	23	26	15	3. .8-.99
28	23	33	39	4. 1.0
3	6	0	0	5. 1.01-1.19
12	15	4	15	6. 1.2-1.49
16	19	11	15	7. 1.5-9.99
*1	0	*1	0	9. DK, NA on one or both

Percentages	V112 R112 Safe/Legal Ratio (R23/R24) TL=158 MD=9

TS	AA	Y	WS	
14	16	8	18	0. Less than .5
57	59	54	55	1. .5-.999
17	18	15	18	2. 1.0
3	2	8	0	3. 1.001-1.499
3	0	8	9	4. 1.5-1.999
5	6	4	0	5. 2.0-2.999
1	0	4	0	6. 3.0-9.999
0	0	0	0	7. 10.0-99.998
*6	*2	*2	*2	9. DK, NA on one or both

Percentages	V113 R113 Accident 3 Drinks-8 (R26 Collapsed) TL=159 MD=0

TS	AA	Y	WS	
8	6	17	0	1. No or small increased chance of accident
33	32	22	58	2. 1.50-2.49
29	30	35	17	3. 2.50-5.49
11	12	13	0	4. 5.50-10.49
5	6	0	8	5. 10.50-25.49
8	10	9	0	6. 25.50-50.49
5	4	0	17	7. 50.50-100.49
1	0	4	0	8. Over 100.49
0	0	0	0	9. DK
9	*3	*5	*1	0. NA

Percentages	V114 R114 Accident 6 Drinks-8 (R27 Collapsed) TL=160 MD=0

TS	AA	Y	WS	
1	0	4	0	1. No or small increased chance of accident
4	2	8	0	2. 1.50-2.49
34	33	31	46	3. 2.50-5.49
27	27	27	27	4. 5.50-10.49
9	8	11	9	5. 10.50-25.49
10	12	8	9	6. 25.50-50.49
10	14	8	0	7. 50.50-100.49
2	0	4	9	8. Over 100.49
2	4	0	0	9. DK
*6	*2	*2	*2	0. NA

Percentages	V115 R115 Accident 9 Drinks-8 (R28 Collapsed) TL=161 MD=0

TS	AA	Y	WS	
1	0	4	0	1. No or small increased chance of accident
0	0	0	0	2. 1.50-2.49
7	8	8	0	3. 2.50-5.49
44	45	42	46	4. 5.50-10.49
13	10	15	18	5. 10.50-25.49
7	6	8	9	6. 25.50-50.49
22	24	19	18	7. 50.50-100.49
4	4	4	9	8. Over 100.49
2	4	0	0	9. DK
*6	*2	*2	*2	0. NA

Percentages	V116 R116 DAD Arrests/Cases %-7 (R29 Collapsed) TL=162 MD=9

TS	AA	Y	WS	
5	6	0	8	1. 0-4%
17	18	8	31	2. 5-19%
21	22	24	15	3. 20-39%
17	18	16	15	4. 40-60%
13	14	20	0	5. 61-79%
17	10	28	23	6. 80-95%
9	12	4	8	7. 96-100%
1	2	0	0	8. DK
*3	*2	*1	0	9. NA
*2	0	*2	0	0. Inap.,no drinking driver cases

Percentages	V117 R117 Refusals Prosecuted %-7 (R32 Collapsed) TL=163 MD=9

TS	AA	Y	WS	
5	2	8	8	1. 0-4%
8	8	13	0	2. 5-29%
8	8	8	8	3. 30-59%
14	16	0	31	4. 60-89%
14	18	0	23	5. 90-94%
16	22	8	8	6. 95-96%
34	23	63	23	7. 97-100%
2	4	0	0	8. DK
*6	*2	*4	0	9. NA

Percentages	V118 R118 Drive Revoked %-7 (R33 Collapsed) TL=164 MD=9

TS	AA	Y	WS	
2	0	7	0	1. 0-14%
1	2	0	0	2. 15-32%
4	4	7	0	3. 33-49%
30	28	32	31	4. 50-64%
28	34	18	23	5. 65-79%
28	30	18	39	6. 80-94%
7	2	18	8	7. 95-100%
0	0	0	0	8. DK
0	0	0	0	9. NA

Percentages	V119 R119 Police Reductions %-7 (R34 Collapsed) TL=165 MD=9

TS	AA	Y	WS	
23	19	29	23	1. 0-8%
30	33	29	23	2. 9-27%
17	23	4	23	3. 28-44%
7	8	11	0	4. 45-55%
2	2	4	0	5. 56-72%
15	8	21	31	6. 73-91%
3	4	4	0	7. 92-100%
2	4	0	0	8. DK
*1	*1	0	0	9. NA

Percentages	V120 R120 Prosecutor Reductions %-7 (R35 Collapsed) TL=166 MD=9

TS	AA	Y	WS	
1	0	4	0	1. 0-8%
12	6	22	15	2. 9-27%
20	26	15	8	3. 28-44%
27	25	30	31	4. 45-55%
15	15	11	23	5. 56-72%
14	17	7	15	6. 73-91%
9	9	7	8	7. 92-100%
2	2	4	0	8. DK
*1	0	*1	0	9. NA

V121 R121 .15+ Reductions %-7 (R36 Collapsed) TL=167 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
6	6	11	0	1. 0-8%
22	21	25	23	2. 9-27%
21	28	14	8	3. 28-44%
20	21	14	31	4. 45-55%
11	9	11	15	5. 56-72%
12	9	14	15	6. 73-91%
4	4	7	0	7. 92-100%
3	2	4	8	8. DK
0	0	0	0	9. NA

V122 R122 1st Reduction Place (R37 First ranked response) TL=168 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
4	2	7	8	1. At the station prior to seeking authorization of the charge
16	17	14	15	2. When authorization of the charge is obtained from the prosecutor
70	75	61	69	3. In a pre-trial settlement by the judge
9	6	18	0	4. When the jury convicts of the lesser included offense
1	0	0	8	5. When the judge finds the defendant guilty of a lesser offense
0	0	0	0	8. DK
0	0	0	0	9. NA (on the whole question)

V123 R123 2nd Reduction Place (R37 Second ranked response) TL=169 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
6	7	7	0	1. At the station prior to seeking authorization of the charge
23	26	11	39	2. When authorization of the charge is obtained from the prosecutor
16	15	21	8	3. In a pre-trial settlement by the judge
36	28	54	31	4. When the jury convicts of the lesser included offense
1	0	0	8	5. When the judge finds the defendant guilty of a lesser offense
0	0	0	0	8. DK
0	0	0	0	9. NA (on whole question)
17	23	7	15	0. No second ranked response

V124 R124 3rd Reduction Place (R37 Third ranked response) TL=170 MD=9

Percentages				
TS	AA	Y	WS	
10	13	7	0	1. At the station prior to seeking authorization from the prosecutor
37	32	50	31	2. When authorization of the charge is obtained from the prosecutor
5	4	7	8	3. On a pre-trial settlement by the judge
				4. When the judry convicts of the lesser included offense
25	26	18	39	5. When the judge finds the defendant guilty of a lesser offense
0	0	0	0	8. DK
0	0	0	0	9. NA
22	25	18	23	0. No third ranked response

V125 R125 4th Reduction Place (R37 4th ranked response)

TL=171   MD=9

TS	AA	Y	WS	
56	53	57	69	1. At the station prior to seeking authorization of the charge from the prosecutor
5	6	7	0	2. When authorization of the charge is obtained from the prosecutor
2	0	7	0	3. In a pre-trial settlement by the judge
12	15	7	8	4. When the jury convicts of the lesser included offense
0	0	0	0	5. When the judge finds the defendant guilty of a lesser offense
0	0	0	0	8. DK
0	0	0	0	9. NA
25	26	21	23	0. No 4th ranked response

V126 R126 Why Reduction 1st (R38 1st ranked response)

TL=172   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
15	13	18	15	1. Lack of sufficient or convincing evidence to obtain a conviction on the original charge
67	73	61	54	2. Desire to reduce the court load by obtaining a guilty plea
11	9	7	23	3. Special treatment of some persons charged with drunk driving
3	2	7	0	4. Other: reference to judge &/or by jury's identification with the defendant & reluctance to invoke mandatory penalties which accompany a DUIL conviction
1	0	0	8	5. Other: reference to use a plea to a lesser offense as a legal manuever to postpone hearing of the case until such time as the evidence is stagnant, witnesses are unavailable, etc.
0	0	0	0	6. Other: reference to defendant's previous driving record, no prior violations increases the likelihood of obtaining a reduced charge
2	2	4	0	7. Other codable response
1	0	4	0	8. "Other" checked, but not specified
0	0	0	0	9. NA (on whole question)

V127 R127 Why Reduction 2nd (R38 2nd Ranked response)

TL=173   MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
18	15	25	15	1. Lack of sufficient or convincing evidence to obtain a conviction on the original charge
19	17	21	23	2. Desire to reduce the court load by obtaining a guilty plea
38	45	29	31	3. Special treatment of some persons charged with drunk driving
1	0	4	0	4. Other: reference to judge &/or jury's identification with the defendant & reluctance to invoke mandatory penalties which accompany a DUIL convictions
2	0	4	8	5. Other: reference to use of plea to a lesser offense as a legal manuever to postpone hearing of the case until such time as the evidence is stagnant, witnesses are unavailable, etc.
1	0	4	0	6. Other: reference to defendant's previous driving record, no prior violations increases the likelihood of obtaining a reduced charge
3	2	4	8	7. Other codable response
1	0	0	8	8. "Other" checked, but not specified
0	0	0	0	9. NA (on whole question)
16	21	11	8	0. No 2nd ranked response

V125 R125 **4th Reduction Place** (R37 4th ranked response)

TL=171 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
56	53	57	69	1.	At the station prior to seeking authorization of the charge from the prosecutor
5	6	7	0	2.	When authorization of the charge is obtained from the prosecutor
2	0	7	0	3.	In a pre-trial settlement by the judge
12	15	7	8	4.	When the jury convicts of the lesser included offense
0	0	0	0	5.	When the judge finds the defendant guilty of a lesser offense
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
0	0	0	0	9.	NA
25	26	21	23	0.	No 4th ranked response

V126 R126 **Why Reduction 1st** (R38 1st ranked response)

TL=172 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
15	13	18	15	1.	Lack of sufficient or convincing evidence to obtain a conviction on the original charge
67	73	61	54	2.	Desire to reduce the court load by obtaining a guilty plea
11	9	7	23	3.	Special treatment of some persons charged with drunk driving
3	2	7	0	4.	Other: reference to judge &/or by jury's identification with the defendant & reluctance to invoke mandatory penalties which accompany a DUIL conviction
1	0	0	8	5.	Other: reference to use a plea to a lesser offense as a legal manuever to postpone hearing of the case until such time as the evidence is stagnant, witnesses are unavailable, etc.
0	0	0	0	6.	Other: reference to defendant's previous driving record, no prior violations increases the likelihood of obtaining a reduced charge
2	2	4	0	7.	Other codable response
1	0	4	0	8.	"Other" checked, but not specified
0	0	0	0	9.	NA (on whole question)

V127 R127 **Why Reduction 2nd** (R38 2nd Ranked response)

TL=173 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
18	15	25	15	1.	Lack of sufficient or convincing evidence to obtain a conviction on the original charge
19	17	21	23	2.	Desire to reduce the court load by obtaining a guilty plea
38	45	29	31	3.	Special treatment of some persons charged with drunk driving
1	0	4	0	4.	Other: reference to judge &/or jury's identification with the defendant & reluctance to invoke mandatory penalties which accompany a DUIL convictions
2	0	4	8	5.	Other: reference to use of plea to a lesser offense as a legal manuever to postpone hearing of the case until such time as the evidence is stagnant, witnesses are unavailable, etc.
1	0	4	0	6.	Other: reference to defendant's previous driving record, no prior violations increases the likelihood of obtaining a reduced charge
3	2	4	8	7.	Other codable response
1	0	0	8	8.	"Other" checked, but not specified
0	0	0	0	9.	NA (on whole question)
16	21	11	8	0.	No 2nd ranked response

V128 **R128 Why Reduction 3rd** (R38 3rd ranked response)
TL=174 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
41	49	32	31		1. Lack of sufficient or convincing evidence to obtain a conviction on the original charge
9	4	14	15		2. Desire to reduce the court load by obtaining a guilty plea
25	19	36	31		3. Special treatment of some persons charged with drunk driving
1	2	0	0		4. Other: reference to judge &/or jury's identification with the defendant & reluctance to invoke mandatory penalties which accompany a DUIL convictions
0	0	0	0		5. Other: reference to use of plea to a lesser offense as a legal manuever to postpone hearing of the case until such time as the evidence is stagnant, witnesses are unavailable, etc.
0	0	0	0		6. Other: reference to defendant's previous driving record, no prior violations increases the likelihood of obtaining a reduced charge
3	2	4	8		7. Other codable response
0	0	0	0		8. "Other" checked, but not specified
0	0	0	0		9. NA (on whole question)
20	25	14	15		0. No 3rd ranked response

V129 **R129 Why Reduction 4th** (R38, 4th ranked response)
TL=175 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS		
9	2	14	23		1. Lack of sufficient or convincing evidence to obtain a conviction on the original charge
0	0	0	0		2. Desire to reduce the court load by obtaining a guilty plea
7	6	11	8		3. Special treatment of some persons charged with drunk driving
1	0	4	0		4. Other: reference to judge &/or jury's identification with the defendant & reluctance to invoke mandatory penalties which accompany a DUIL convictions
0	0	0	0		5. Other: reference to use of plea to a lesser offense as a legal manuever to postpone hearing of the case until such time as the evidence is stagnant, witnesses are unavailable, etc.
0	0	0	0		6. Other: reference to defendant's previous driving record, no prior violations increases the likelihood of obtaining a reduced charge
0	0	0	0		7. Other codable response
2	2	4	0	2	8. "Other" checked, but not specified
0	0	0	0		9. NA (on whole question)
81	90	68	69		0. No 4th ranked response

V130 **R130 Effects Info.Index** (Sum of R43, R44, R51 recoded to 1=2, 2 or 8=1, 3 or 4=0, 0 or 9=9) TL=176 MD=9

Percentages

TS	AA	Y	WS	
0	0	0	0	0. Entirely wrong-did not know that drinking on an empty stomach, body weight, & experience are at least "somewhat important" in affecting how alcohol affects behavior
1	0	4	0	1.
3	2	0	15	2.
11	11	7	15	3. Partially correct, including DK all 3 items
31	36	26	23	4.
31	30	26	39	5.
24	21	37	8	6. Entirely correct-knew all 3 factors are very important
*1	0	*1	0	9. NA on 1 or more items

V131 R131 Drinking Cases %-7 (R53 Collapsed) TL=177 MD=9

Percentages					
TS	AA	Y	WS		
2	4	0	0	1.	0-8%
21	32	0	15	2.	9-27%
22	26	11	23	3.	28-44%
16	17	15	15	4.	45-55%
22	15	13	13	5.	56-72%
14	4	35	15	6.	73-91%
1	0	4	0	7.	92-100%
2	2	4	0	8.	DK
*2	0	*2	0	9.	NA

V132 R132 Alcoholic %-7 (R54 Collapsed) TL=178 MD=9

Percentages					
TS	AA	Y	WS		
16	21	11	8	1.	1-3%
22	23	18	31	2.	4-5%
30	32	25	31	3.	6-10%
14	13	14	15	4.	11-20%
11	9	14	8	5.	21-30%
3	2	4	8	6.	31-50%
3	0	11	0	7.	51-95%
1	0	4	0	8.	DK
0	0	0	0	9.	NA

V133 R133 No.Effective CM (number of countermeasures rated "very effective" in R60-R66) TL=179 MD=9

Percentages					
TS	AA	Y	WS		
12	15	4	15	0.	None
16	19	11	15	1.	One
25	26	29	8	2.	Two
19	19	18	23	3.	Three
14	11	18	15	4.	Four
5	4	7	8	5.	Five
9	4	14	15	6.	Six
1	2	0	0	7.	Seven
0	0	0	0	9.	NA on 3 or more items

V134 R134 Deterrence CM Score (number of strong agreements (1) in R76, R77, R81-86, R89, R92, R96) TL=180-181 MD=99

Percentages					
TS	AA	Y	WS		
4	4	7	0	0.	None
10	10	4	23	1.	One
14	15	4	31	2.	Two
20	21	19	15	3.	Three
19	21	15	15	4.	Four
14	15	11	15	5.	Five
10	8	19	0	6.	Six
7	4	15	0	7.	Seven
2	2	4	0	8.	Eight
0	0	0	0	9.	Nine
0	0	0	0	10.	Ten
1	0	4	0	11.	Eleven
*2	*1	*1	0	99.	NA on 4 or more items

V135 R135 Alc.Help CM Score (number of strong agreements (1) in R90, R95, & R100) TL=182 MD=9

Percentages					
TS	AA	Y	WS		
34	44	22	15	0.	None
43	39	41	69	1.	One
17	15	26	8	2.	Two
5	2	11	8	3.	Three
*2	*1	*1	0	9.	NA on 2 or more items

V136 **R136 Monthly Hours in Court-7** (R107 Collapsed) TL=183
MD=9

Percentages					
TS	AA	Y	WS		
4	2	7	8	0.	No hours
10	16	4	0	1.	1-4 hours
14	18	7	15	2.	5-9 hours
28	40	7	23	3.	10-14 hours
16	12	22	15	4.	15-19 hours
17	12	19	31	5.	20-28 hours
9	0	26	8	6.	29-42 hours
2	0	7	0	7.	43-64 hours
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*4	*3	*1	0	9.	NA

V137 **R137 DAD Monthly Court Time %-7** (R108 Collapsed)
TL=184 MD=9

Percentages					
TS	AA	Y	WS		
32	39	19	31	1.	0-8%
42	41	44	39	2.	9-27%
10	12	7	8	3.	28-44%
8	6	15	0	4.	45-55%
2	2	4	0	5.	56-72%
5	0	7	23	6.	73-91%
1	0	4	0	7.	92-100%
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
*3	*2	*1	0	9.	NA

V138 **R138 DAD Monthly Court Hours-7** (R108 X R107) TL=185
MD=9

Percentages					
TS	AA	Y	WS		
6	4	7	8	0.	No hours
69	82	48	61	1.	.01-4.49 hours
14	14	15	15	2.	4.50-9.49 hours
4	0	15	0	3.	9.50-14.49 hours
2	0	4	8	4.	14.50-19.49 hours
4	0	11	8	5.	19.50-28.49 hours
0	0	0	0	6.	28.50-42.49 hours
0	0	0	0	7.	42.50-64.49 hours
0	0	0	0	8.	DK
				9.	NA