

BEHAVIOR DATA SYSTEMS, Ltd.

ABSTRACT FROM THE NHTSA-SPONSORED RESEARCH PROJECT ENTITLED “ASSESSMENT OF CLASSIFICATION INSTRUMENTS DESIGNED TO DETECT ALCOHOL ABUSE” (DOT HS 807 475, December, 1988)
Authors: C.L. Popkin, C.H. Kannenberg, J.H. Lacey, and P.F. Waller. Sponsoring Agency: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Washington, D.C. 20590.

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Consequently, no instrument could be recommended without reservation (DOT HS 807 475, December, 1988).

This report (DOT HS 807 475, December 1988) identifies and evaluates instruments currently in use to assess substance abuse problems in driving while impaired (DWI) offenders. “Assessment instruments currently in use were assembled on the basis of a survey of state programs and contacts with professionals active in the field” pg. 21.

The following instruments were reviewed and evaluated: Addiction Severity Index (**ASI**), Alcohol Use Inventory (**AUI**), **CAGE** (Cut Down, Annoyed, Guilty, Eye-opener), Craig Analysis of the Substance Abuse Syndrome (**CASAS**), Driver Risk Inventory, (**DRI**), Hopkins 20 Question Test, Life Activities Inventory (**LAI**), MacAndrew MMPI Scale (**MAC**), Minnesota assessment of Chemical Health (**MACH**), Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test (**MAST**), Modified Criteria-National Council on Alcoholism Diagnosis (**MOD-CRIT**), Mortimer Filkins Test (Court Procedures for Identifying Problem Drinkers), and Substance Abuse Like Circumstances Evaluation/Automated Drinking Evaluation (**SALCE/ADE**).

Ratings abstracted from page 68 of DOT HS 807 475, December 1988.

“3.4 Evaluation of Assessment Instruments” (Page 68)

The ratings are grouped into the following categories:

GOOD:	DRI (Driver Risk Inventory) MAC (in MMPI)
AVERAGE:	AUI, ASI, CAGE, MACH, MAST, MORTIMER-FILKINS, SALCE/ADE
POOR:	CASAS, LAI, MOD-CRIT, New Hopkins 20 Questions

“The research team reviewed all of the information available and evaluated the instruments by placing them into one of four categories -- poor, average, moderately good, and excellent...None of the instruments were judged to be excellent...However, two instruments rated to be moderately good and a few others rated as average...” pg. x.

THE FOLLOWING QUOTATIONS PERTAINING TO THE DRIVER RISK INVENTORY OR DRI HAVE BEEN ABSTRACTED FROM DOT HS 807 475, December 1988.

“This instrument (DRI) appears to be by far the most carefully constructed from a psychometric standpoint” pg. 37.

“It was developed specifically for screening convicted drunk drivers, presumably for purposes of disposition decisions.” pg. 38.

“Reliability is well established and validity is based on the instrument’s relationship to other established measures.” pg. 38.

“One of the scales is designed to detect irresponsible driving and provides an assessment for driver risk, a particularly useful feature for evaluating the DWI offender that does not exist in any other instrument we reviewed.” pg. 38.

“In settings where it has been adopted as the primary screening instrument for processing convicted drunk drivers, substance abuse counselors have reported that it improves the quality of their decisions while making their task less time-intensive.” pg. 38.

“Of the instruments reviewed, this test is the most carefully constructed.” pg. 38.

REFERENCE: ASSESSMENT OF CLASSIFICATION INSTRUMENTS DESIGNED TO DETECT ALCOHOL ABUSE DOT HS 807 475, December 1988).
Authors: C.L. Popkins, C. H. Kannenberg, J. H. Lacey, and P. F. Waller. **Sponsoring Agency: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Washington, D.C.**

This document is available through the National Technical Information Service,
Springfield, VA 22161.