Main findings
A central estimate of 260 drink drive deaths in 2013; the difference from 2012 is not statistically significant

Provisional estimates for 2013 show that between 230 and 290 people were killed in accidents in Great Britain where at least one driver was over the drink drive limit.

- Although the estimated number of deaths rose to 260 in 2013 from 230 in 2012, due to the uncertainty in the estimates this rise is not statistically significant.

- Around 15 per cent of all deaths in reported road traffic accidents involved at least one driver over the limit.

- The number of seriously injured casualties in drink drive accidents decreased by 8 per cent from 1,200 in 2012 to 1,100 in 2013.

- The total number of casualties of all types in drink drive accidents for 2013 was 8,290, down 17 per cent on the 2012 figure.

- In 2013/14, 5.9 per cent of drivers admitted to driving when they thought that they might have been over the drink drive limit.

- In 2013/14, 0.7 per cent of drivers admitted to driving when they thought that they might be under the influence of illegal drugs.
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Uncertainty
These statistics, especially the number of fatalities, are subject to considerable uncertainty. This means that it is impossible to be sure of the precise number of casualties, so ranges and confidence intervals are used throughout the publication.

About this release
This publication presents estimates of casualties arising from reported accidents involving at least one motor vehicle driver or rider over the legal alcohol limit for driving, in Great Britain in 2013. Figures are derived from the Stats19 forms completed by the police plus toxicology data for road fatalities from coroners and procurators fiscal.
• The current best estimate of the number of deaths in drink drive accidents for 2013 is 260. This represents about 15 per cent of all deaths in reported road accidents in 2013. The figure is 30 casualties higher than in 2012, but, for the reasons outlined below, this change is not statistically significant.

Chart 1: Casualties in reported drink drive accidents in comparison with overall casualties: GB 2013

• The fatalities figure is based on coroners’ and procurators’ fiscal reports for only around third of the drivers who were killed in road traffic accidents in 2013. At a 95% confidence interval, the final figure could be between 230 and 290 fatalities. Therefore the final figure, which will be based on reports on around 70 per cent of drivers who died in road accidents, may be substantially different from this provisional estimate.

Chart 2: Killed casualties in reported drink drive accidents: GB 2003 to 2013; error bars show 95% confidence intervals

Definitions

Drink drive accident: A reported incident on a public road in which someone is killed or injured, where at least one of the motor vehicle drivers or riders involved met one of these criteria:

• refused to give a breath test specimen when requested by the police (other than when incapable of doing so for medical reasons)

• failed a roadside breath test by registering above 35 micrograms of alcohol per 100ml of breath

• died and was subsequently found to have more than 80 milligrams of alcohol per 100ml of blood

Drink drive casualties: All road users killed or injured in drink drive accidents.
As it stands, the 95% confidence interval for the 2012 and 2013 fatality figures overlap. This means that **although there is a change in the central estimate of fatalities, this change is not statistically significant**, and the change may reflect differences from the coroners’ and procurators’ fiscal reports on fatalities that have not been returned, or differences in the drivers who died later than 12 hours after the accident, rather than a genuine increase in the number of people who died in drink drive accidents. **As the number of deaths fall, missing data create larger uncertainties in the estimates.**

The number of seriously injured casualties in drink drive accidents **decreased by 8 per cent** from 1,200 in 2012 to 1,100 in 2013. This figure, if confirmed in the final statistics due to be released in August 2015, is the lowest number of seriously injured casualties on record. Similarly, the number of killed or seriously injured (KSI) casualties, which is provisionally at 1,360 for 2013, **will also be the lowest on record.** The reduction in seriously injured and KSI casualties from the 2012 levels are statistically significant.

**Chart 3: Killed or seriously injured (KSI) casualties in reported drink drive accidents: GB 2003 to 2013; error bars show 95% confidence intervals**

2005-2009 average is the baseline for the **Strategic Framework for Road Safety Outcomes.**

**2005-2009 average**

Drink drive casualties compared to the 2005-2009 average:

- Killed: 43%
- Serious: 38%
- KSI: 39%
- All casualties: 40%
- Accidents: 37%

**Detailed statistics...**

- Reported drink drive accidents and casualties since 1979, Great Britain, table **RAS51001**

- Final figures for casualties in drink drive accidents in 2013 will be released in August 2015.

- Reported road casualties by road user type and severity, Great Britain, table **RAS30001**
Table RAS51001: Casualties in reported drink drive accidents: GB 1979 to 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>95% CI lower</th>
<th>95% CI upper</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>95% CI lower</th>
<th>95% CI upper</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>12,460</td>
<td>19,470</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>21,490</td>
<td>31,430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>11,860</td>
<td>18,570</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>7,970</td>
<td>20,420</td>
<td>29,830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>17,040</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>19,160</td>
<td>27,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>12,070</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>8,010</td>
<td>20,660</td>
<td>30,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>11,430</td>
<td>17,130</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>18,610</td>
<td>26,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>4,790</td>
<td>11,540</td>
<td>17,320</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>19,410</td>
<td>27,390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>11,460</td>
<td>17,260</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>6,810</td>
<td>19,380</td>
<td>27,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>11,510</td>
<td>16,940</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>6,440</td>
<td>16,860</td>
<td>26,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>10,560</td>
<td>15,560</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>17,670</td>
<td>24,470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>10,190</td>
<td>14,520</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>16,860</td>
<td>24,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>14,390</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>4,790</td>
<td>17,670</td>
<td>24,470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>9,650</td>
<td>13,210</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>4,090</td>
<td>15,550</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>8,530</td>
<td>11,690</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>3,610</td>
<td>13,610</td>
<td>17,880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>7,890</td>
<td>10,790</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td>12,770</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>7,160</td>
<td>9,480</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>11,780</td>
<td>14,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>7,330</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>11,780</td>
<td>15,160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>7,590</td>
<td>10,180</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>12,450</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td>10,870</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>13,450</td>
<td>17,040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>10,710</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>13,310</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>7,840</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>12,610</td>
<td>15,580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>13,980</td>
<td>16,910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>9,410</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>14,990</td>
<td>18,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>9,780</td>
<td>12,270</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>15,550</td>
<td>18,780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>10,620</td>
<td>13,150</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>16,760</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>15,820</td>
<td>18,990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>9,890</td>
<td>11,210</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>14,060</td>
<td>16,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>8,060</td>
<td>10,080</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>12,760</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>7,430</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>11,850</td>
<td>14,370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>7,520</td>
<td>9,290</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>11,850</td>
<td>14,020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>6,980</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>10,970</td>
<td>12,990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>8,050</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>10,150</td>
<td>12,030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>8,210</td>
<td>9,690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>6,690</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>8,420</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>5,460</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>8,510</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>5,710</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>8,290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Estimates are rounded to the nearest ten.
2. Upper and lower range for fatalities based on the 95% confidence interval.
• The total number of casualties of all types in drink drive accidents for 2013 is 8,290, down 17 per cent on the 2012 figure.

• There were an estimated 250 fatal drink drive accidents in 2013. If this figure is confirmed in the final figures later this year, it will be the highest number of fatal drink drive accidents since 2009. However, as with the fatal casualty figures above, this total is subject to considerable uncertainty and the change from 2012 is not statistically significant.

• In contrast, the total number of drink drive accidents of all severities fell by 14 per cent to 5,710 in 2013. This means that around 4 per cent of all reported road traffic accidents in 2013 involved at least one driver over the drink limit. This is also the lowest number of drink drive accidents on record.

• Detailed reporting on drink drive accidents and casualties started in 1979. At that time, there were around 1,640 fatalities in drink drive accidents in a total of 6,352 road deaths in all accidents. Figures for 2012 and 2013 are more than six times lower than in 1979, a significant reduction.

• Overall road deaths have similarly fallen over this timescale – down to 1,713 in 2013, a 73 per cent decrease. However, drink drive deaths have had larger falls, down by 84 per cent since 1979. Rather than accounting for a quarter of all road deaths, as they did in 1979, drink drive deaths now account for around 15 per cent of all road fatalities.

• The total number of drink drive casualties has fallen by 74 per cent since 1979.

• The provisional estimates for 2013 indicate that the number of fatalities have fallen by 43 per cent and number of KSI casualties have fallen by 40 per cent in comparison with the 2005 – 2009 average.

• As outlined in the Department’s response to the consultation on drink drive statistics (available here), we will release two sets of provisional figures each year. The first set will usually be published in August of the following year (e.g. August 2015 for data pertaining to 2014) and will only contain an upper and lower bound for the fatalities estimate. The second set, this publication, will be published in February two years later (e.g. February 2016 for data pertaining to 2014). The second provisional figures will contain a central estimate, plus a 95% confidence interval. The final data will be released in August two years later (e.g. August 2016 for data pertaining to 2014). Likewise, the final figures will contain a central estimate plus a 95% confidence interval.
• As the Department’s response to the consultation was published in December 2014, the first provisional figures for 2013 have never been published. These figures are included here for transparency and completeness.

• The first provisional figures for 2013 indicate that the number of fatalities in drink drive accidents were somewhere between 210 and 310 deaths. The estimate would also have given the number of people who were killed or seriously injured in drink drive accidents were between 1,310 and 1,420 (with 1,100 people seriously injured). There were 8,290 casualties of all severities in drink drive accidents in 2013.

Chart 4: First provisional estimate of drink drive deaths: GB 2003 to 2013; error bars show 95% confidence intervals and the fan shows the estimate for 2013

Uncertainty in the estimates

• Due to the nature of the data used to create these estimates, there is considerably more uncertainty in the number of fatalities and fatal accidents than any other severity level. The reason for this is that, of the 1,713 deaths in 2013, 933 of the fatalities were vehicle drivers themselves. In the accidents where there was a fatality that was not a driver, we are confident that all of the drivers would have been breath-tested at the scene or at a later point (for instance, in hospital). Therefore, in the majority of these specific cases the police record of the accident contains all the information required to decide if any driver in the accident were over the drink drive limit.

• However, of the 1,583 fatal accidents involving at least one motor vehicle, 920 (58 per cent of the total) resulted in the death of one or more drivers or riders of motor vehicles. Information about the blood alcohol content (BAC) level for the drivers who died is required from coroners and procurators fiscal to know whether anyone involved in these accidents was over the drink drive limit.
• It is impossible to be absolutely sure about the BAC level of every driver involved in reported accidents without a coroners’ report for each driver who died. At each stage of publication (first and second provisional, and the final data) we do not know the BAC level for some of the drivers. This is partly because it takes time to receive coroners’ reports (we had 251 reports for the 2013 first provisional and 340 reports for the 2013 second provisional), but also because there are some reports that are never returned, and some drivers died too long after the accident to allow the coroner to get a reliable BAC reading (we use a 12 hour cut off; any driver who died later than 12 hours after the accident is removed from the analysis). Typically we would expect to receive, match and have usable data for 60-70 per cent of drivers.

• Unlike the other data collected and published on road accidents, therefore, the number of casualties in drink drive accidents is based on only a sample of data, rather than a complete set of all reported accidents. We therefore have to make assumptions about the drivers without BAC level data. These assumptions are based on the drivers for whom we do have BAC level data. However, we cannot be certain that exactly the same proportion of the unknown drivers were over the limit as the known drivers. This is where the uncertainty in the estimates comes from. The smaller the set of known drivers we have, the greater the uncertainty as it becomes increasingly possible that the unknown drivers have a different set of characteristics from the known drivers. For instance, the provisional data provided for 2011 indicated that 19 per cent of the drivers were over the limit, based on 329 forms from 1,040 drivers who were killed. By the time the final data were processed, though, this had fallen to 15 per cent (based on 666 forms, so just over double the sample size). This is reason that the number of fatalities has been revised so significantly between provisional statistics and final statistics in recent years – in most years the BAC levels for drivers received after the provisional statistics were published tend to be lower than for the drivers used to create the provisional statistics. This meant that the provisional statistics were overestimating the total number of drivers over the drink drive limit in comparison with the final estimates.

• The best way of dealing with and representing uncertainty is to provide a range of values or confidence intervals around a central estimate. The new method that is being reported now is to give just a range of values for the first provisional estimate, as this minimises the risk of producing a central estimate that will have to be revised by a significant amount, as has been done in recent years. The second provisional
and final statistics include a central estimate, plus a 95% confidence interval. The confidence interval gives a range in which we are 95 per cent confident that the ‘true’ value falls¹.

- In theory, the range provided should narrow from the first provisional through the second provisional and to the final figures. Depending on how the percentage of drivers over the BAC level changes, the actual values covered by the range might change as well. This can be noted in the 2013 figures: the first provisional range is between 210 and 310 deaths, and the second provisional is between 230 and 290 deaths, with a best estimate of 260 deaths. In this case, only the range has narrowed but the values covered have not substantially altered. This is because the failure rate has remained fairly static between the first and second provisional – starting at 18.3 per cent and rising slightly to 18.5 per cent.

- The number of casualties who are seriously or slightly injured is less uncertain than the number of fatalities. Whereas 59 per cent of all fatalities in 2013 occurred in an accident where at least one motor vehicle driver died, only 1.1 per cent of serious injuries and 0.3 per cent of slight injuries occurred with the death of a driver. For these severity types, therefore, almost all of the drink drive information comes from breath tests rather than coroners’ reports, meaning that the uncertainty drops to almost negligible levels.

¹ Technically, it indicates that if many samples of the same population were drawn, 95% of the results would fall between the confidence interval values.
Self-reported drink and drug driving

This section presents data from the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW). Since 2009, the CSEW has asked respondents to state (anonymously) whether they have driven when they believed that they were over the legal alcohol limit or under the influence of illegal drugs.

Self-reported drink driving

- In 2013/14, 5.9 per cent of drivers admitted to driving when they thought that they might have been over the drink drive limit. This proportion has remained broadly unchanged over recent years, and the 2013/14 figure is not statistically significantly different from the results from any year since 2010/11.

- Of those who have driven when over the limit in the last year, the majority (almost two-thirds of all people who had driven when drunk, or 3.6 per cent of all drivers) did so ‘once or twice’ in the year. Around 1.4 per cent of all drivers had driven when drunk once or twice a month or more frequently.

- Men are more likely to drink and drive than women. In 2013/14, 8.1 per cent of men admitted to driving when over the limit at least once. In comparison, 3.5 per cent of women admitted to the same offence. This difference is statistically significant.

Self-reported drug driving

- In 2013/14, 0.7 per cent of drivers admitted to driving when they thought that they might be under the influence of illegal drugs. Although this is a statistically significant lower figure than the 1.3 per cent in 2010/11, it is not significantly different from the figures for 2011/12 and 2012/13.

- Of those people who had been under the influence of drugs whilst driving, 48 per cent (or 0.3 per cent of all drivers) had driven ‘once or twice’ in the year. A further 17 per cent (or 0.1 per cent of all drivers) had driven once or twice a week, or more frequently.

- Almost 3.5 times more men drove whilst under the influence of illegal drugs than women, with 1.1 per cent of men reporting this compared with 0.3 per cent of women.
• One major difference between drink and drug driving is the number of drivers who either drink alcohol or use illegal drugs at all, irrespective of driving whilst under the influence. **Around 82 per cent of all drivers admitted to drinking alcohol at some point in the last 12 months. In contrast, only 5.6 per cent of drivers admitted to taking illegal drugs at some point in the last 12 months.** This finding is unsurprising as we would expect a smaller proportion of the population to undertake an illegal activity than a legal activity.

• However, this also means that it might be more appropriate to look at the trends in drug driving for just the section of drivers who have taken illegal drugs, rather than all drivers, as they make up such a small proportion of the general population.

• On this basis, **of the drivers who have taken illegal drugs at all in the last 12 months, 11.3 per cent had driven under the influence of illegal drugs at least once in the last year. In comparison, 6.8 per cent of the drivers who had drunk alcohol at all in the last year reported that they had also driven when over the legal alcohol limit.**

• This suggests that although drivers are less likely to drive under the influence of drugs than alcohol, in general, **but the group of drivers who do take illegal drugs at all are more likely to drive under the influence of drugs and do so more frequently.**

### Self-reported drink and drug driving by age

• In both cases, over the period 2011/12 to 2013/14, **the age group that is most likely to offend is 20-24 year olds,** with drivers in their late 20s just behind in both groups, and under 20 for drugs.

• **Around 9.1 per cent of drivers in their 20s admitted to drink driving,** in comparison with **6.6 per cent of drivers aged under 20, 6.5 per cent of drivers in their 30s,** and around **5.6 per cent of drivers aged 40 or greater.**

• **Around 1.5 per cent of drivers in their 20s admitted to drug driving.** Drivers under the age of 20 offended at same rate, whereas **0.9 per cent of drivers in their 30s** and **0.3 per cent of older drivers** admitted to driving under the influence of illegal drugs.

---

**Detailed statistics...**

• Further statistics and tables on self-reported drink and drug driving can be found in tables RAS51101 to RAS51104 [here](#).
• These figures indicate that driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs is mostly a problem in younger, rather than older, drivers. However, continuous monitoring of the figures will be required to assess whether the problem remains in the cohorts (i.e. whether young drivers who offend today continue to offend when they get into the older age groups) or whether it is an aged-related problem (i.e. whilst drivers offend at younger ages, they then stop offending as they get older).

Chart 5: Percentage of drivers who drove under the influence of alcohol or illegal drugs by age: England and Wales 2011/12 to 2013/14 average

Trends over time in self-reported drink and drug driving

• These figures are based on a sample survey, covering around 15,000 to 25,000 drivers each year. Given that the proportion of drivers who admit to driving while under the influence of either alcohol or drugs is low, the sample sizes for the estimates are very small. This introduces considerable uncertainty and sampling error into the figures, and caution is required when making year on year comparisons.

• Although there is an apparent fall in the level of drink driving (green line) from 2011/12 to 2013/14, the error bars for all three years overlap. This means that we cannot be confident that the downward trend is genuine and therefore we have to regard the level of drink driving as remaining unchanged.

• Similarly, the confidence interval for 2013/14 figure for drug driving (blue line) overlap with every year except 2010/11. So we can conclude that although the level of drug driving has decreased from that year, it has been fairly steady in the years since.

• It seems likely, therefore, that any changes observed over the last three years are probably as a result of sampling errors and randomness in the respondents selected rather than actual changes in real life behaviour. As more data are collected and additional years are added to
the series it will become easier to separate out real changes from random fluctuations in the responses.

**Chart 6: Percentage of drivers who drove under the influence of alcohol or illegal drugs: England and Wales 2010/11 to 2013/14; error bars show 95% confidence intervals**

Limitations of the data

Drink drive casualty figures

Information on whether any driver was over the blood alcohol content (BAC) limit comes from two sources:

- **Breath test results** on the police recorded accident data are used to identify accidents in which a surviving driver or rider was breath tested at the roadside. If the driver or rider refused to provide a breath test specimen, then they are considered to have failed the test unless they were recorded as unable to do so for medical reasons.

- **Coroner / procurator fiscal toxicology data** are used to identify any road accident fatalities who die within 12 hours of an accident and were over the BAC limit.

As discussed in the section on uncertainty in the drink drive casualty estimates above, there are a greater proportion of fatalities in accidents where we need to rely on toxicology data for drivers than for other casualty severity types. This means that the level of uncertainty is much greater for fatalities than other severities.

The 95% confidence interval around estimates demonstrate whether changes in casualty numbers between years is statistically significant or not. Table RAS51001 includes the lower and upper estimates of fatalities at the 95% confidence limit since 2000. These figures show that despite some apparent falls between 2010 and 2012 and a rise in 2013, none of these changes are
statistically significant. In practice, therefore, the number of fatalities has remained unchanged since 2010.

**Self-reported drink and drug driving**

The Crime Survey for England and Wales results are based on a sample of 16 – 59 year olds within the general household population. The results are weighted to ensure they best reflect a profile of the general population.

### Background notes

As with all sample surveys, the results are subject to random fluctuation, particularly when broken down into small age groups. The commentary and tables include standard statistical tests and confidence intervals for the overall figures, but most trends or differences amongst individual age groups shown in the accompanying tables have not been tested for statistical significance and should be treated with caution.

There may also be issues with accurate recall and self-reporting from respondents, particularly in relation to illegal or illicit behaviours. In addition, respondents may not be able to make an accurate assessment of whether they were over the legal alcohol limit when they drove.

### Under-reporting of road casualties and other data sources

The estimates in this release are based only on those road accidents which are reported to the police. Comparisons of road accident reports with death registrations show that very few, if any, road accident fatalities are not reported to the police. However, it has long been known that a considerable proportion of non-fatal casualties are not known to the police. The data used as the basis for these statistics are therefore not a complete record of all personal injury road accidents, and this should be borne in mind when using and analysing the figures.

For more information about the extent of under-reporting see the article entitled “Survey data on road accidents” [here](#).

In addition, the Office for National Statistics Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) includes questions on people’s own admission of driving whilst over the legal alcohol limit or under the influence of drugs. The latest CSEW results for drink and drug driving show that the proportion of drivers who admitted driving whilst over the legal alcohol limit in the past year has been broadly unchanged since 2010/11. This finding broadly reflects the finding in this release, that drink drive casualty numbers have also been relatively stable since 2010.
The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW)

The CSEW (formerly known as the British Crime Survey) is a long-running household survey of adults aged 16 and over, resident in England and Wales. It collects data on experiences and perceptions of crime via a face-to-face interview. Since 2009, it has included questions asking people whether they have driven whilst over the legal alcohol limit or under the influence of drugs.

Between 35,000 and 50,000 people were interviewed for the survey in each year 2009/10 to 2013/14. Around half the sample underwent a self-completion module towards the end of the interview, including the questions on drink and drug driving.

Responsibility for the survey passed from the Home Office (HO) to the Office for National Statistics (ONS) in 2012. Further technical information about the survey, including a copy of the questionnaire, can be found here.

Other published outputs from the CSEW can be found here.

Both the estimates of casualties in drink drive accidents and the Crime Survey for England and Wales are designated National Statistics. National Statistics are produced to high professional standards as set out in the Code of Practice for Official Statistics. They undergo quality assurance reviews to ensure that they meet customer needs.

National Statistics assessment report 4 covered the Department for Transport’s road safety statistics. The report and letter confirming that the statistics were designated as National Statistics are available here. The statistics were reassessed during 2013 and the report, number 258, was published at the link above on the 25th July 2013.

Details of Ministers and officials who receive pre-release access to these statistics up to 24 hours before release and a full list of definitions used to produce these statistics can be found here.

National Statistics are produced to high professional standards as set out in the Code of Practice for Official Statistics. They undergo quality assurance reviews to ensure that they meet customer needs. The first assessment report, number 4, and letter confirming that the statistics have been designated as National Statistics are available here: www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk/assessment/assessment/assessment-reports/index.html. The statistics were reassessed during 2013 and the report, number 258, was published at the link above on the 25th July 2013.

Details of Ministers and officials who receive pre-release access to these statistics up to 24 hours before release and a full list of definitions used to produce these statistics can be found here: www.gov.uk/transport-statistics-notes-and-guidance-road-accident-and-safety.