

**A Rank Based Social Norms Model of How People Judge Their Levels of Drunkenness Whilst Intoxicated**

Reference: Moore, S. C., Wood, A. M., Moore, L., Shepherd, J., Murphey, S., & Brown, G. D. A. (in press). A rank based social norms model of how people judge their levels of drunkenness whilst intoxicated. *BMC Public Health*.

**Keywords: Alcohol, Risk, Social Norms, Decision by Sampling, Relative Rank Hypothesis**

**Conflict of interest: None**

Final version as submitted, pre-proofing, the copy of record and copyright reside with the journal.

## Abstract

### Background:

A rank based social norms model predicts that drinkers' judgements about their drinking will be based on the rank of their breath alcohol level amongst that of others in the immediate environment, rather than their actual breath alcohol level, with lower relative rank associated with greater feelings of safety. This study tested this hypothesis and examined how people judge their levels of drunkenness and the health consequences of their drinking whilst they are intoxicated in social drinking environments.

### Methods:

Breath alcohol testing of 1,862 people (mean age=26.96 years; 61.86% male) in drinking environments. A subset (N =400) also answered four questions asking about their perceptions of their drunkenness and the health consequences of their drinking (plus background measures).

### Results:

Perceptions of drunkenness and the health consequences of drinking were regressed on: (a) breath alcohol level, (b) the rank of the breath alcohol level amongst that of others in the same environment, and (c) covariates. Only rank of breath alcohol level predicted perceptions: How drunk they felt ( $b$  3.78, 95% CI 1.69 5.87), how extreme they regarded their drinking that night ( $b$  3.7, 95% CI 1.3 6.20), how at risk their long-term health was due to their current level of drinking ( $b$  4.1, 95% CI 0.2 8.0) and how likely they felt they would experience liver cirrhosis ( $b$  4.8. 95% CI 0.7 8.8). People were more influenced by more sober others than by more drunk others.

### Conclusion:

Whilst intoxicated and in drinking environments, people base judgements regarding their drinking on how their level of intoxication ranks relative to that of others of the same gender around them, not on their actual levels of intoxication. Thus, when in the company of others who are intoxicated, drinkers were found to be more likely to underestimate their own level of drinking, drunkenness and

1 associated risks. The implications of these results, for example that increasing the numbers of sober  
2 people in night time economies could improve subjective assessments of drunkenness, are discussed.

3

# 1 **A Rank Based Social Norms Model of How People Judge their Levels of Drunkenness Whilst** 2 **Intoxicated**

3  
4 Excessive alcohol consumption places drinkers' health at risk both in the long term and during the  
5 drinking episode [1]. In the drinking episode intoxication can lead to risk taking behaviours such as  
6 unsafe sex, driving a motor vehicle while intoxicated, criminal or social misdemeanors of varying  
7 levels of seriousness, and continuation of drinking until ataxia, coma and even death occur [2, 3].  
8 Mis-estimations of the degree of personal intoxication may contribute to such behaviours, leading a  
9 person to believe that they are able to undertake a task safely when they are not, or to believe that  
10 they can continue drinking without becoming dangerously intoxicated. Understanding how people  
11 judge their drunkenness whilst intoxicated, how their current state of intoxication impacts on their  
12 health, and how such estimates can be systematically biased, is an important first step towards  
13 designing environments and honing interventions to reduce excessive drinking and drunken mis-  
14 behaviour. However, whilst much research has focused on how people evaluate the heaviness of their  
15 drinking [e.g., 4, 5-7], this research is normally conducted with participants whilst they are sober,  
16 and little is known about how people evaluate their drunkenness whilst actually under the influence  
17 of alcohol and in a drinking environment. The importance of this becomes greater where there are  
18 concentrations of drinkers, a phenomenon which has increased in UK cities that have been focal  
19 points for concentrated development of the night time economy, leading to a high density of licensed  
20 premises.

21 Whilst intoxicated, people might be assumed to judge their levels of drunkenness based  
22 solely on how much they have actually drunk. This intuitive "actual intoxication" approach is  
23 perhaps a partial motivation for calls to increase the availability of information on the amount of  
24 alcohol consumed, for example through mandatory labeling of bottles with alcohol units [8].

1           We propose in contrast a rank based social norms model, which we test in a sample of  
2 intoxicated individuals through modeling the relationship between people’s objective drunkenness  
3 (based on breath alcohol concentration, BrAC, measured using an alcometer) and their ratings of  
4 their drunkenness, as well as the relationship between their BrAC and the attitudes they held at that  
5 moment about the health consequences of their drinking. Specifically we hypothesize that when  
6 drinking alcohol amongst others people’s perception of their own level of drunkenness is influenced  
7 by the perception of their level of inebriation relative to others in their immediate vicinity. Our focus  
8 is on social drinking and we make no reference to alcohol consumption that occurs in isolation. The  
9 “actual intoxication” approach neglects existing social norms research which indicates that – at least  
10 whilst individuals are sober – people are highly influenced by their perceptions of how their levels of  
11 drinking compare to those of others within their reference groups [e.g., 4, 5-7]. Whilst this  
12 conclusion has been established for sober individuals, the same may not hold for real world settings  
13 (i.e., for intoxicated individuals in drinking environments).

14           First, it is not clear whether drinkers compare their levels of intoxication to the actual levels  
15 of intoxication of those in the same drinking environment, or to their incorrect beliefs about the  
16 levels of intoxication of others. Generally, social norms research has shown that people have an  
17 inaccurate impression of how much others drink - possibly being motivated by a desire to self-  
18 enhance through seeing themselves as relative lower drinkers - and that it is this inaccurate  
19 impression that affects judgements of the heaviness of actual drinking [4, 7]. However such research,  
20 conducted with sober participants in non-drinking environments requires participants to rely on  
21 memory to make comparisons, and this involvement of memory may lead to biased judgements  
22 about personal drinking [9]. In contrast, people can actually observe the intoxication levels of others  
23 whilst in drinking environments [10], providing opportunities for people to be more influenced by  
24 the actual rather than remembered states of others. The physical presence of others may reduce the  
25 biasing effect of memory.

1           Second, it is also not clear whether: (a) comparisons to others would bias the basic  
2 relationship between objective and subjective drunkenness (such that subjective drunkenness would  
3 be predicted by both objective drunkenness and social comparisons), or (b) the relationship between  
4 objective and subjective drunkenness is wholly based on comparisons to others (such that when  
5 statistically controlling for social comparisons there would no longer be a relationship between  
6 objective and subjective drunkenness).

7           Third, the cognitive mechanisms through which people compare their level of drinking to that  
8 of others are not known. In making specific predictions for this study, we were guided by  
9 independent research from psychophysics which focuses on how people judge the magnitude of  
10 stimuli [see 11]. Such research is directly relevant as it concerns how people make subjective  
11 judgements (here, drunkenness) based on objective magnitudes (here, objective intoxication).  
12 Historically, such research has followed a path of initially assuming that people are influenced by the  
13 actual magnitude of the stimuli [here, actual intoxication, see 12], subsequently assuming people are  
14 influenced by how a stimulus differs from some measure of central tendency [here, for example, how  
15 one's intoxication differs from the average intoxication within the environment, 13], and finally  
16 showing that people are only sensitive to how a stimuli ranks within the environment [here, how  
17 one's drinking ranks within the immediate environment, see 11]. The rank hypothesis has been  
18 supported in a variety of other psychophysiological [14-16] and social [17-21] domains. Such a  
19 perspective raises the possibility that individuals in drinking environments may base the estimates of  
20 the heaviness of their drinking wholly on how their level of intoxication ranks relative to that of  
21 others (rather than rank based comparisons providing an additive bias). Showing that common  
22 mechanisms apply in different areas furthers the development of a more unified and integrated  
23 psychology [22] where the same cognitive mechanisms are shown to operate across multiple  
24 domains.

1 Fourth, if people do compare themselves to others, it is not clear whether their judgements of  
2 their own intoxication would be equally, more, or less influenced by people who drink more than  
3 they do relative to those who drink less. The alcohol and social norms literature suggests that sober  
4 people have a tendency to over-estimate how much others drink, this effect being consistent with a  
5 self-enhancement bias motivated by a desire to see one's consumption as relatively lower [e.g., 4, 7].  
6 This might suggest that people would be more influenced by those who drink more than they do  
7 themselves. However, it is again not clear that findings based on sober individuals in classroom or  
8 home settings would generalize straightforwardly to intoxicated individuals in real world  
9 environments. In such real world settings more sober people may be more salient, leading to a  
10 greater relative comparison to those who have drunk less. It is also not clear which comparisons a  
11 self-enhancement bias may predispose; when sober people focus on general alcohol consumption it  
12 may seem preferable to drink less, whereas whilst in a "party" mood and intoxicated in a drinking  
13 environment it may seem preferable to drink relatively more. Thus the very self-enhancement biases  
14 that predispose comparisons to heavier drinking people in sober environments may predispose  
15 comparisons to lower level drinkers in real world ones.

16 In this study we examine for the first time how people judge their drunkenness and the health  
17 consequences of their drinking whilst they are intoxicated in social drinking environments. The focus  
18 on health was motivated by recent calls for more social norms research to focus on perceptions of the  
19 health consequences of personal levels of drinking in addition to simply perceptions of the heaviness  
20 of drinking [9, 23]. Based on previous social norms research we hypothesize that such judgements  
21 will be influenced by how the individual compares themselves to others. As such others are salient in  
22 this environment we further hypothesize that people will be influenced by how the individual's  
23 intoxication ranks amongst the actual levels of intoxication of others in the environment. Finally,  
24 based on independent research from cognitive science [11, 12], we hypothesize that judgements will  
25 be wholly based on how the individual's intoxication compares to others in the environment, and that

1 these comparisons will be rank based, arising from the same cognitive mechanisms used to judge  
2 psychophysical stimuli. We have developed no specific hypothesis as to whether people will be more  
3 influenced by those who are more or less intoxicated and leave this test as exploratory.

4

5

## Method

6

### Participants and Procedure

7 This research was a component of a larger twenty-four month study [24], twelve months of which  
8 involved a large scale street survey. The data collection reported here was undertaken in busy night  
9 time environments characterised by a high density of premises licensed for the on-site sale and  
10 consumption of alcohol. Full project details and instrument validation are published elsewhere [10,  
11 24, 25]. The study was scrutinised and approved by the Cardiff Dental School Research Ethics  
12 Committee. The survey involved two pairs of surveyors who approached every seventh individual  
13 walking past designated sampling landmarks (central locations through which a high volume of  
14 pedestrians would pass). We estimate the median group size was four [26] and therefore selection of  
15 every seventh individual would mean we were less likely to consecutively select individuals from the  
16 same social group. Individuals were approached and asked to participate. Those who consented  
17 breathed into alcometers, calibrated to  $\pm 3\mu\text{g}$  alcohol/100 ml breath, which recorded respondents'  
18 objective BrAC. Participants were also asked what time they began drinking alcohol that evening  
19 (from which session duration was derived), and completed the Fast Alcohol Screening Test (FAST)  
20 which is used to assess respondents' historical levels of risky alcohol consumption [27]. The  
21 sampling strategy attempted to ensure that a representative sample was approached and all those  
22 approached were deemed eligible to participate unless they were at work (e.g. police officers).  
23 Surveys were typically conducted between 8pm and 3am on Friday and Saturday evenings. Verbal  
24 consent to participate was requested from each participant and all study participants were told that  
25 they could stop participating at any time. In total, alcometer reading, gender, and location



1 information were recorded for 1,862 people across four locations (63.2% were male, consistent with  
2 the gender composition of the areas sampled [28]). These participants were part of the wider study  
3 programme. In addition, 669 participants were invited to answer additional questions specifically for  
4 the current study. Five hundred and thirty four participants (80%) consented to participate and 477  
5 completed the key four questions (set out below). There were no significant differences in BrAC  
6 between those who responded to all four questions and those who completed three or fewer ( $t < 0.1$ ).  
7 Of these 477 participants, 39 did not provide gender information and 38 did not answer the  
8 covariation questions (e.g., FAST test, time starting drinking etc.). This left a usable study sample of  
9 400 participants who completed all relevant measures (representing a 60% response rate from those  
10 asked to participate).

11 Four questions were administered to assess perceived drunkenness and potential health risks  
12 of the current levels of drinking; (1) *drunkenness* ("how drunk are you right now, on a 1 (totally  
13 sober) to 10 (completely drunk) scale?"), (2) *extreme drinking* ("how extreme has your drinking been  
14 tonight, on a 1 (not at all) to 10 (completely extreme) scale?"), (3) *risk to long-term health* ("if you  
15 drank as much as you have tonight every week how likely is it that you will damage your health in  
16 the next 15 years, on a 1 (definitely will not) to 10 (definitely will) scale?"), and (4) *risk of liver*  
17 *cirrhosis* ("if you drank as much as you have tonight every week how likely is it that you will get  
18 cirrhosis of the liver in the next 15 years, on a 1 (definitely will not) to 10 (definitely will) scale" .  
19 The key question used to test the theory was the first, with the second used to replicate the finding  
20 with alternate wording that stressed personal drunkenness as a function of that respondent's history  
21 of alcohol use. The third question assessed the subsidiary question of how people judge the long term  
22 health risks associated with their drinking whilst intoxicated, supported by the fourth which aimed to  
23 show that the same results can apply to assessment of risk on a specific as well as a general health  
24 evaluation.

1           The study therefore made use of two sets of data. All those from whom BrAC was recorded  
2 were used in the ranking process. A subset of these participants also completed the risk judgement  
3 questions and it was their responses that were used to test hypotheses on the relationship between  
4 rank (relative to the larger pool of respondents) and judgements. Finally, our hypotheses were  
5 specific to drinkers in the drinking environment. Therefore respondents who yielded a BrAC of  
6 0µg/100ml were not eligible for inclusion in the rank-judgement analyses, although they were  
7 included in the larger pool from which rank was determined as they were present in the same  
8 environment.

9           All aspects of the research presented here were scrutinised and approved by the Medical and  
10 Dental Research Ethics Committee, Cardiff University prior to data collection.

11

12 **Analytic Strategy**

13 We tested whether participants' judgements were predicted by BrAC rank within a reference group  
14 using established statistical procedures developed for this purpose elsewhere [9, 29]. Using the  
15 whole sample of 1,862 people, we first created eight reference groups based on all combinations of  
16 gender and the four locations, on the assumption that these are the people with whom participants  
17 would compare. We included gender in the definition of reference group given the considerable  
18 differences in drinking style by gender [30]. On average, the reference group size was 231.75  
19 respondents (min = 142, max = 343). For each person within our study group (N = 400), we next  
20 calculated a new variable for each individual representing the rank of an individual's BrAC within  
21 the reference group through the formula;

$$R_i = \frac{(i - 1)}{(n - 1)} \quad (1)$$

22 where the number of respondents who yielded a BrAC lower than that of the individual ( $i - 1$ ) was  
23 compared with the total number of people within that individual's reference group ( $n - 1$ ) to provide

1 a relative rank score ( $R_i$ ) normalised between 0 and 1. The primary test, conducted separately for  
2 each of the four outcome questions, involved simultaneously regressing outcome on both BrAC and  
3 rank BrAC, including covariates. These covariates critically included how the person's intoxication  
4 differed from the average intoxication of those around them, in order to rule out this rival  
5 explanation of how relative comparisons are made. Only rank BrAC was hypothesised to predict  
6 each outcome.

7 *Control Variables.* Several variables (which may have had a confounding effect) were assessed for  
8 use as covariates in a planned sensitivity analysis. Session duration might have an independent effect  
9 with those who had been drinking longest over-estimating the effects of alcohol through fatigue.  
10 Also included was the time of survey which was reduced to before and after 11pm, a time that  
11 denotes a transition from drinking in regular pubs to nightclubs and so distinguishes between early  
12 evening and late night drinkers. Finally, FAST scores, which indicate patterns of risky drinking [27,  
13 31], were included as these capture drinkers' historical levels of harmful drinking.

14

15

## Results

16 Descriptive data of participants' responses on all measures are presented in Table 1. Figure 1 is a  
17 histogram of all respondents' BrACs by gender, excluding those who did not yield a positive BrAC.  
18 BrAC was normally distributed for those who recorded a positive BrAC score, and ranged from less  
19 than  $19\mu\text{g}/100\text{ml}$  breath to  $> 100\mu\text{g}$ . The average participant had drinking levels in excess of  
20 standard UK and US drink driving limits ( $35\mu\text{g}/100\text{ml}$ ), with 10% of the most intoxicated drinkers  
21 surveyed yielding an average BrAC of  $106.4\mu\text{g}/100\text{ml}$  ( $n = 183$ ). On average, participants saw  
22 themselves as moderately drunk and moderately at risk (scoring 4.5 to 6.4 on the 10 point scale).  
23 Men (mean BrAC =  $52.3\mu\text{g}/100\text{ml}$ ,  $SD = 30.0$ ) yielded higher alcometer scores than women (mean  
24 BrAC =  $43.0\mu\text{g}/100\text{ml}$ ,  $SD = 27.8$ ;  $t = 6.64$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and a one-way ANOVA yielded a significant  
25 main effect of location on BrAC ( $F(1, 1,860) = 44.0$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). These differences by gender and

1 location indicate that there was sufficient variation between the reference groups for rank BrAC and  
2 BrAC to provide meaningfully different measures. There was an association between rank BrAC and  
3 BrAC ( $\rho = 0.95, p < 0.001$ ). We therefore used the variance inflation factor (VIF) to assess  
4 collinearity between the explanatory variables BrAC and  $R_i$ . The  $VIF_i$  is given by  $(1 - R^2_i)^{-1}$  where  
5  $R^2_i$  is the  $R^2$  from regressing the  $i$ th independent variable on all other independent variables. The VIF  
6 shows how much the variance of the coefficient estimate is being inflated by multicollinearity. A  
7  $VIF_i > 10$  indicates harmful collinearity [32]. In this case a VIF of 7.71 was observed.

8  
9 INSERT TABLE 1 AND FIGURE 1 HERE

10  
11 Regression models were used to test hypotheses (see Table 2), with separate models for  
12 perceived drunkenness, extreme drinking, general health risks, and risk of cirrhosis of the liver.  
13 Model 1 shows that when the perceptions were regressed only on BrAC, there was a robust positive  
14 association in each. Those who were more intoxicated believed their health was at greater risk.  
15 Model 2 similarly shows that when the perceptions were regressed only on the rank of BrAC, there  
16 was again a positive association. Those who were ranked more highly in terms of intoxication  
17 believed their health was at greater risk. Model 1 explained less variance for all outcome measures  
18 than Model 2. The key test of the hypothesis is presented in Model 3, where the perceptions are  
19 jointly regressed on both BrAC and rank BrAC (controlling for the distance between the person's  
20 BrAC and the mean of the reference group). The results are consistent across outcomes measures:  
21 only rank retains a significant positive relationship with outcomes. Taken together this suggests that  
22 when intoxicated and in a drinking environment, people's judgements of their drunkenness (and the  
23 attendant health consequences) are only influenced by the rank of their BrAC, such that a lower  
24 relative rank corresponds with an under-appreciation of their level of intoxication. Any apparent  
25 zero-order relationship between BrAC and the judgements is apparently due to BrAC acting as a

1 proxy for rank BrAC, as controlling for the latter removes the relationship. Model 4 presents a  
2 sensitivity analysis, repeating the tests in Model 3 whilst adjusting the exposure-outcome effect  
3 estimate for potential confounds (duration of drinking, time of assessment, gender, age, and FAST  
4 scores). The results remained the same whilst controlling for these variables.

5

6

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

7

8 To test whether people were more influenced by those who ranked above or below them, the  
9 regressions in Model 2 were re-run but with the rank amongst the eight location by gender categories  
10 formed through a version of Equation 1 with additional parameters:

11

$$12 \quad SR_i = 0.5 + \frac{(i-1) - \eta(n-i)}{2[(i-1) + \eta(n-i)]} \quad (2)$$

13

14 Through Equation 2 it is possible to find the value of  $\eta$  that explains any variance in the outcome  
15 variables (perceived risk and intoxication) best;  $\eta > 1$  indicates an upward bias and that drinkers are  
16 more influenced by more intoxicated drinkers whereas  $\eta < 1$  indicates a downward bias and that  
17 respondents are more influenced by more sober drinkers [33]. To determine the value of  $\eta$  an  
18 iterative process was used in which values of  $\eta$  from 0.01 to 5 in 0.01 steps were regressed onto  
19 outcomes. The value of  $\eta$  yielding the greatest  $R^2$  value was then selected for each outcome. For all  
20 judgements respondents were more influenced by those who were more sober: perceived  
21 drunkenness  $\eta = 0.70$ , extreme drinking  $\eta = 0.14$ , long-term health  $\eta = 0.17$  and liver cirrhosis  $\eta =$   
22  $0.21$ . In other words introducing sober people into a drinking environment would be predicted to  
23 have greater impact on judgements, making people feel more at risk and more intoxicated, compared  
24 to the effect on decreasing feelings of riskiness one might expect if very intoxicated people were

1 introduced into the environment. It appears that drinkers are more self-aware of their own level of  
2 intoxication when in the presence of those who are sober.

3

4

### **Discussion**

5 The study sheds new light on how people judge their drunkenness and the health consequences of  
6 their drinking whilst actually intoxicated in real world drinking environments. In such situations the  
7 relationship between actual intoxication and drinking perceptions was accounted for by how the  
8 person's consumptions ranked amongst others. Thus, using the same cognitive processes as used in  
9 other psychophysical judgements, perceptions of one's intoxication appear to arise from comparison  
10 to others. People are also more influenced by those who are more sober than them, relative to those  
11 who are more intoxicated.

12 The research builds on previous social norms work by indicating that people's judgements of  
13 their alcohol use depend on their perception of how intoxicated other people are. The study expands  
14 on knowledge by: (a) extending the social norms perspective to judgements made whilst intoxicated  
15 in drinking environments; (b) showing that in such settings people are influenced by the actual rather  
16 than imagined behaviour of others; (c) showing that in this context people are more influenced by  
17 those who drink less (whilst in social norms research using sober subjects, people tend to  
18 underestimate their relative drinking, suggesting a greater focus on those who drink more); and (c)  
19 consistent with one other paper [9], suggesting that when comparing to others, people are influenced  
20 by the rank position relative to others.

21 The finding that people are specifically sensitive to rank position suggests that a basic  
22 evolutionary mechanism may be implicated. Animals, ranging from crayfish to monkeys, are  
23 generally very sensitive to rank position within a hierarchy [34], and in the clinical literature there is  
24 increasing realisation that mental disorders may partially arise from a mis-regulation of mechanisms  
25 that were adaptive in the evolutionary past [35]. Specifically, whilst high sensitivity to rank position

1 (including hypervigilance, lower appetite, reduced sexual behaviour, and general withdrawal  
2 amongst those of low rank) would have conferred a survival advantage in the evolutionary past, such  
3 hard wired tendencies may influence people in negative ways in modern society [36-39]. On the  
4 basis of the results described here, we suggest that an inbuilt sensitivity to rank position amongst  
5 others can maladaptively lead people to assume they are less drunk and at risk than they actually are  
6 if they rank low amongst other drinkers. Such rank sensitivity may also explain why drinking  
7 increases in a society; if everyone drank another 10 units per week, no one would believe themselves  
8 to be at more at risk of alcohol related disorder as their rank positions would remain the same. Future  
9 research could usefully examine whether this rank sensitivity can be harnessed through intervention;  
10 asking whether, for example, telling people how they rank amongst a broader reference population  
11 (e.g., "you are in the top 5% of drinkers") would decrease drinking more than the dominant social  
12 norms intervention approach of telling people how much more they drink than the average or typical  
13 person. Consistently, the "nudge" [40] approach of behavioural economics suggests that greater  
14 behavioural change occurs when information is presented in line with people's natural ways of  
15 processing information. Given that people are influenced by more sober others, a further "nudge"  
16 maybe achievable by increasing the mix of consumers in drinking environments, incentivising the  
17 presence of more sober people, for example through soft drink pricing, or by attracting a more  
18 diverse population of entertainment seekers, or by introducing a range of 'capable guardians' such as  
19 street pastors, taxi marshalls and city ambassadors who, in addition to their formal roles, would also  
20 act as sober comparators with which at risk drinkers would compare themselves. More research is  
21 needed here since research on behavioural strategies to reducing misuse at the point of sale is very  
22 limited [25]. However, it is clear from the findings of the present study that alcohol harm reduction  
23 strategy should capitalise on knowledge that people in drinking environments make decisions to  
24 drink more on the basis of their observation of people around them.

1 All studies that study alcohol use in context face numerous difficulties, challenges and are  
2 therefore limited. This is usually offset by the considerable advantages of studying behaviour in situ.  
3 Never-the-less, this paper has several limitations. First, the operationalization of a social network  
4 here assumes those in the same environment who are consuming alcohol influence one another. This  
5 may not be consistent with the generic social network approach, in as far that many of those in this  
6 study probably have no social relationship. However, those surveyed will have been aware of other  
7 people's presence at least visually. Given the marked effect of alcohol on appearance, such as  
8 alcohol-related ataxia, visual cues will play an important role in the formation of judgements. This  
9 does warrant further investigation and studies might consider the ecology of influences from  
10 immediate social groups through to those in the same venue and environment. Furthermore, the  
11 measure for rank intoxication could potentially be subject to less measurement error than the more  
12 objective BrAC and this is a concern when measures are correlated [41], as is the case here.  
13 However, theoretically the expectation that rank outperforms absolute measures is robust [11, 12, 15,  
14 16] and in areas where measurement error is less likely a factor (such as large scale comparisons  
15 between rank income and absolute income in predicting well-being [29]) rank performs similarly.  
16 We are therefore confident that the effects reported here are genuine. Nevertheless, the matter  
17 warrants further attention and research could partially address this through manipulating the context  
18 in which measures are taken such that the expectation is that rank would systematically vary.

19 Finally, while this paper is primarily interested in the manner in which context, or the  
20 reference set comprised of other drinkers, informs judgements of being at risk from alcohol  
21 consumption, there are obvious links with the traditional literature on perceptions of intoxication  
22 generally. For example, self-rated intoxication becomes less accurate as the level of intoxication  
23 increases [42]. Certainly the factors that govern drinkers' choices regarding further alcohol  
24 consumption are many and intertwine in complex ways; possibly only a few are amenable to  
25 intervention. The environment is one factor that is modifiable and it is encouraging to note that



1 changes in licensed premises density correspond with changes in the prevalence of outcomes, such as  
2 violence and excessive alcohol consumption, that are related to both alcohol and poor decision  
3 making [43]. A high density of licensed premises would mean fewer alternative venues that do not  
4 sell alcohol and therefore a greater density of drinkers in those environments. A logical next step is  
5 therefore to consider the distribution of drinkers in environments varying by premises density as a  
6 potential feature that links alcohol use with excessive consumption and harm.

7

## References

1. Room R, Babor, T., Rehm, J.: **Alcohol and public health.** *Lancet* 2005, **365**:519–530.
2. Leigh BC: **Peril, chance, adventure: concepts of risk, alcohol use and risky behavior in young adults.** *Addiction* 1999, **94**:371-383.
3. Perkins HW: **Surveying the damage: A review of research on consequences of alcohol misuse in college populations.** *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 2002:91-100.
4. Perkins HW, Haines MP, Rice R: **Misperceiving the college drinking norm and related problems: A nationwide study of exposure to prevention information, perceived norms and student alcohol misuse.** *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 2005, **66**(4):470-478.
5. Downs WR: **A Panel Study of Normative Structure, Adolescent Alcohol-Use and Peer Alcohol-Use.** *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 1987, **48**(2):167-175.
6. Moreira MT, Smith LA, Foxcroft D: **Social norms interventions to reduce alcohol misuse in University or College students.** *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2009(3).
7. Baer JS, Stacy A, Larimer M: **Biases in the Perception of Drinking Norms among College-Students.** *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 1991, **52**(6):580-586.
8. Webster-Harrison PJ, Barton AG, Sanders HP, Anderson SD, Dobbs F: **Alcohol awareness and unit labelling.** *Journal of Public Health Medicine* 2002, **24**(4):332-333.
9. Wood AM, Brown GDA, Maltby J: **Social norm influences on evaluations of the risks associated with alcohol consumption: Applying the rank based Decision by Sampling model to health judgments.** *Alcohol and Alcoholism* 2012, **47**:57-62.
10. Perham C, Moore SC, Shepherd J, Cusens B: **Identifying drunkenness in the night-time economy.** *Addiction* 2007, **102**:377-380.
11. Stewart N, Chater N, Brown GDA: **Decision by sampling.** *Cognitive Psychology* 2006, **53**(1):1-26.

- 1 12. Stewart N, Brown GDA, Chater N: **Absolute identification by relative judgment.**  
2 *Psychological Review* 2005, **112**(4):881-911.
- 3 13. Helson H: **Adaptation-Level as Frame of Reference for Prediction of Psychophysical**  
4 **Data.** *American Journal of Psychology* 1947, **60**(1):1-29.
- 5 14. Risky DR, Parducci A, Beauchamp GK: **Effects of Context in Judgments of Sweetness**  
6 **and Pleasantness.** *Perception & Psychophysics* 1979, **26**(3):171-176.
- 7 15. Parducci A: **Category Judgment - a Range-Frequency Model.** *Psychological Review* 1965,  
8 **72**(6):407-418.
- 9 16. Parducci A, Wedell DH: **The Category Effect with Rating-Scales - Number of Categories,**  
10 **Number of Stimuli, and Method of Presentation.** *Journal of Experimental Psychology-*  
11 *Human Perception and Performance* 1986, **12**(4):496-516.
- 12 17. Melrose K, Brown GDA, Wood AM: **Am I abnormal? Relative rank and social norm**  
13 **effects in judgments of anxiety and depression symptom severity.** *Journal of Behavioral*  
14 *Decision Making* 2013, **26**:174-184.
- 15 18. Wood AM, Boyce CJ, Moore SC, Brown GDA: **An evolutionary based social rank**  
16 **explanation of why low income predicts mental distress: A 17 year cohort study of**  
17 **30,000 people.** *Journal of Affective Disorders* 2012, **136**:882-888.
- 18 19. Wood AM, Brown GDA, Maltby J, Watkinson P: **How are personality judgments made?**  
19 **A cognitive model of reference group effects, personality scale responses, and**  
20 **behavioral reactions.** *Journal of Personality* 2012, **80**:1275-1311.
- 21 20. Maltby J, Wood AM, Vlaev I, Taylor M, J., Brown GDA: **Effects on the perceived health**  
22 **benefits of exercise: The exercise rank hypothesis.** *Journal of Sport & Exercise*  
23 *Psychology* 2012, **34**:828-841.
- 24 21. Wood AM, Brown GDA, Maltby J: **Thanks but I'm used to better: A relative rank model**  
25 **of gratitude.** *Emotion* 2011, **11**:175-180.

- 1 22. Sternberg RJ, Grigorenko EL: **Unified psychology**. *American Psychologist* 2001,  
2 **56**(12):1069-1079.
- 3 23. Lewis TF, Thombs DL: **Perceived risks and normative beliefs as explanatory models for**  
4 **college student alcohol involvement: An assessment of a campus with conventional**  
5 **alcohol control policies and enforcement practices**. *NASPA Journal* 2005, **42**:202-222.
- 6 24. Moore SC, Brennan I, Byrne E, Moore SN, Shepherd J, Moore L: **Study protocol. The**  
7 **reduction of intoxication and disorder in premises licensed to serve alcohol: An**  
8 **exploratory randomised controlled trial**. *BMC Public Health* 2010, **10**:607.
- 9 25. Brennan I, Moore SC, Byrne E, Murphy S: **Interventions for disorder and severe**  
10 **intoxication in and around licensed premises, 1989–2009**. *Addiction* 2011, **106**(4):706-  
11 713.
- 12 26. Moore SC, Flajšlik M, Rosin PL, Marshall D: **A particle model of crowd behavior:**  
13 **Exploring the relationship between alcohol, crowd dynamics and violence**. *Aggression*  
14 *and Violent Behavior* 2008, **13**(6):413-422.
- 15 27. Hodgson R, Alwyn T, John B, Thom B, Smith A: **The fast alcohol screening test**. *Alcohol*  
16 *and Alcoholism* 2002, **37**(1):61-66.
- 17 28. Moore SC, Pernham NR, Shepherd J, Cusens B: **The prevalence of alcohol intoxication in**  
18 **the night-time economy**. *Alcohol & Alcoholism* 2007, **42**:629-634.
- 19 29. Boyce CJ, Brown GDA, Moore SC: **Money and Happiness: Rank of Income, not Income,**  
20 **Affects Life Satisfaction**. *Psychological Science* 2010, **21**:471-475.
- 21 30. Nolen-Hoeksema S: **Gender differences in risk factors and consequences for alcohol use**  
22 **and problems**. *Clinical Psychology Review* 2004, **24**(8):981-1010.
- 23 31. Moore SC, Cusens B: **Delay discounting predicts increase in blood alcohol level in social**  
24 **drinkers**. *Psychiatry Research* 2010, **179**(3):324-327.
- 25 32. Kennedy P: **A Guide to Econometrics**: MIT press; 2003.

- 1 33. Brown GDA, Gardner J, Oswald AJ, Qian J: **Does wage rank affect employees' well-being?**  
2 *Industrial Relations* 2008, **47**:355-389.
- 3 34. Sapolsky RM: **Social status and health in humans and other animals.** *Annual Review of*  
4 *Anthropology* 2004, **33**:393-418.
- 5 35. Taylor PJ, Gooding P, Wood AM, Tarrier N: **The role of defeat and entrapment in**  
6 **depression, anxiety, and suicide.** *Psychological Bulletin* 2011, **137**:391-420.
- 7 36. Taylor PJ, Gooding PA, Wood AM, Johnson J, Pratt D, Tarrier N: **Defeat and entrapment**  
8 **in schizophrenia: The relationship with suicidal ideation and positive psychotic**  
9 **symptoms.** *Psychiatry Research* 2010, **178**:244-248.
- 10 37. Taylor PJ, Wood AM, Gooding P, Tarrier N: **Appraisals and suicidality: The mediating**  
11 **role of defeat and entrapment.** *Archives of Suicide Research* 2010, **14**:236-247.
- 12 38. Taylor PJ, Wood AM, Gooding P, Tarrier N: **Prospective predictors of suicidality: Defeat**  
13 **and entrapment lead to changes in suicidal ideation over time.** *Suicide and Life*  
14 *Threatening Behaviour* 2011, **41**:297-306.
- 15 39. Taylor PJ, Wood AM, Gooding PA, Johnson J, Tarrier N: **Are defeat and entrapment best**  
16 **defined as a single construct?** *Personality and Individual Differences* 2009, **47**:795-797.
- 17 40. Thaler R, Sunstein C: **Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and**  
18 **Happiness.**: New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 2008.
- 19 41. Phillips AN, Smith GD: **How independent are “independent” effects? Relative risk**  
20 **estimation when correlated exposures are measured imprecisely.** *Journal of Clinical*  
21 *Epidemiology* 1991, **44**(11):1223-1231.
- 22 42. Werch CE: **Perception of intoxication and blood alcohol concentration of drinkers in**  
23 **social settings.** *International Journal of Addiction* 1990, **25**:253-262.
- 24 43. Campbell CA, Hahn RA, Elder R, Brewer R, Chattopadhyay S, Fielding J, Naimi TS,  
25 Toomey T, Lawrence B, Middleton JC: **The effectiveness of limiting alcohol outlet density**

1 **as a means of reducing excessive alcohol consumption and alcohol-related harms.**

2 *American journal of preventive medicine* 2009, **37**(6):556-569.

3

1 Table 1

2 *Descriptive statistics of study variables for those included in the analyses on judgement (N = 400)*

---

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Proportion</b>	
	<b>or Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Perceived drunkenness	4.48	1.98
Extreme drinking	4.53	2.26
Long-term health	6.40	3.21
Liver cirrhosis	6.17	3.32
BrAC ( $\mu\text{g}$ alcohol/100 ml breath)	47.31	27.71
Session duration (hours)	5.36	3.62
Proportion surveyed after 11pm	0.60	-
Proportion male	0.64	-
FAST	6.18	3.49
Age (years)	26.28	8.78

---

3

Table 2

*Results of the Multiple Regressions Predicting Perceptions of Drunkenness and Attendant Health Risks from BrAC, rank BrAC, and covariates*

Model	Predictor	Perceived Drunkenness			Extreme Drinking			Long-term Health			Liver Cirrhosis		
		<i>b</i>	$\beta$	$\pm 95\%$ CI (b)	<i>b</i>	$\beta$	$\pm 95\%$ CI (b)	<i>b</i>	$\beta$	$\pm 95\%$ CI (b)	<i>b</i>	$\beta$	$\pm 95\%$ CI (b)
1	Intercept	2.93***		2.61, 3.25	3.29***		2.91, 3.67	5.03***		4.46, 5.60	4.84***		4.25, 5.44
	BrAC	0.03***	.45	0.03, 0.04	0.03***	.32	0.02, 0.03	0.03***	.23	0.02, 0.07	0.03***	.23	0.02, 0.04
	$R^2 = 0.20$				$R^2 = 0.10$			$R^2 = 0.05$			$R^2 = 0.05$		
2	Intercept	2.78***		2.45, 3.11	3.14***		2.75, 3.53	4.76***		4.18, 5.32	4.49***		3.88, 5.09
	$R_i$	<b>3.42***</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>2.83, 4.01</b>	<b>2.77***</b>	<b>.34</b>	<b>2.07, 3.47</b>	<b>3.19***</b>	<b>.28</b>	<b>2.14, 4.25</b>	<b>3.38***</b>	<b>.28</b>	<b>2.27, 4.49</b>
	$R^2 = 0.22$				$R^2 = 0.12$			$R^2 = 0.08$			$R^2 = 0.08$		
3	Intercept	1.68*		0.26, 3.11	1.95*		0.26, 3.65	5.59***		3.03, 8.14	5.82***		3.16, 8.48
	BrAC	-0.01	-.07	-0.03, 0.02	-0.01	-.14	-0.04, 0.01	-0.01	-.10	-0.05, 0.03	-0.02	-.13	-0.06, 0.03
	$R_i$	<b>3.90***</b>	<b>.54</b>	<b>1.81, 5.00</b>	<b>3.79**</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>1.31, 6.26</b>	<b>4.27*</b>	<b>.37</b>	<b>0.35, 8.18</b>	<b>4.89*</b>	<b>.41</b>	<b>0.83, 8.96</b>
	Group Mean	0.02	.09	-0.01, 0.05	0.03	.09	-0.01, 0.06	-0.01	-.04	-0.07, 0.04	-0.03	-.07	-0.08, 0.03
	$R^2 = 0.23$				$R^2 = 0.12$			$R^2 = 0.08$			$R^2 = 0.09$		
4	Intercept	0.87		-0.73, 2.48	0.91		-1.00, 2.82	3.71*		0.83, 6.59	3.39*		0.40, 6.37
	BrAC	-0.01	-.11	-0.03, 0.01	-0.02	-.22	-0.04, 0.01	-0.02	-.17	-0.06, 0.02	-0.03	-.21	-0.07, 0.02
	$R_i$	<b>3.78***</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>1.69, 5.87</b>	<b>3.73**</b>	<b>.46</b>	<b>1.25, 6.20</b>	<b>4.07*</b>	<b>.35</b>	<b>0.18, 7.96</b>	<b>4.75*</b>	<b>.40</b>	<b>0.73, 8.77</b>
	Group Mean	0.03	.13	-0.001, 0.07	0.03	.12	-0.01, 0.07	-0.02	-.05	-0.08, 0.04	-0.02	-.06	-0.08, 0.04
	<b>Duration</b>	<b>0.09***</b>	<b>.15</b>	<b>0.04, 0.14</b>	<b>0.09**</b>	<b>.14</b>	<b>0.03, 0.15</b>	<b>0.09*</b>	<b>.10</b>	<b>0.001, 0.18</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>.03</b>	<b>-0.06, 0.12</b>
	After 11pm	0.30	.07	-0.05, 0.65	0.28	.06	-0.14, 0.70	0.44	.07	-0.19, 1.06	0.64	.09	-0.01, 1.29
	Male	-0.24	-.06	-0.66, 0.18	-0.20	-.04	-0.70, 0.30	0.04	.01	-0.70, 0.78	-0.20	-.03	-0.97, 0.57



FAST	-0.01	-.02	-0.06, 0.04	0.07*	.11	0.01, 0.14	0.16**	.17	0.06, 0.25	0.21***	.22	0.12, 0.31
Age (years)	0.003	.01	-0.02, 0.02	-0.001	.00	-0.02, 0.02	0.03	.08	-0.01, 0.06	0.04*	.10	0.001, 0.07
	$R^2 = 0.26$			$R^2 = 0.16$			$R^2 = 0.12$			$R^2 = 0.14$		

---

Note: \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

## **Abbreviations**

µg – Micrograms

BrAC – Breath Alcohol Content

CI – Confidence Interval

FAST – Fast Alcohol Screening Test

ml – Millilitre

Ri – Relative Rank Score

VIF – Variance Inflation Factor

## **Declarations**

### **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

Ethical approval was provided by the Cardiff University Dental School's Research Ethics Committee. All participants provided written and informed consent.

### **Consent for publication**

Not applicable

### **Availability of data and materials**

The datasets analysed for the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

### **Competing Interests**

The authors declare no competing interests.

## **Funding**

Funded by UK Medical Research Council (Grant G0701758 and MC\_UU\_12017), the Economic and Social Research council (RES-062-23-2462, ES/K002201/1 and ES/K00588X/1) and the European Foundation for Alcohol Research, European Research Advisory Board (EA0904). The research was further supported by DECIPHer, a UKCRC Public Health Research Centre of Excellence, which receives funding from the British Heart Foundation, Cancer Research UK, Medical Research Council, the Welsh Government and the Wellcome Trust (WT087640MA), under the auspices of the UK Clinical Research Collaboration. Funders had no role in the design of the study, analysis or interpretation of the data.

### **Author's contribution**

All authors contributed to the preparation of the manuscript. SCM, AW and GDAB designed the study, SCM, SM, LM and JPS contributed to the original proposal from which the current research was developed. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

### **Acknowledgements**

We thank Ellie Byrne, Susan Moore and Iain Brennan for support, and Eugene Rourke, Emma Westlake and other surveyors who helped with data collection. We also thank Jon Heron for his statistical advice.

## Figure

Figure 1. Histogram of breath alcohol scores for all respondents who yielded a BrAC greater than zero and were included in the judgement analyses (N = 400)

