



ALCOHOL PURCHASE STUDY*

**2011 Spring Follow-up to November 2010 Study
June 15, 2011**

**Paul C. Friday, Ph. D.
Diana Weigle
Department of Criminal Justice**

* This project was funded by the Division of Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities, and Substance Abuse Services/N.C. Department of Health and Human Services through an award from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. It is administered by the Center for Youth, Family, & Community Partnerships at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

UNDERAGE ALCOHOL PURCHASE STUDY

This is the follow-up to the purchase study done in Mecklenburg County in October/November 2010. The purpose of the studies is to determine if any of the establishments that sold in October, 2010 would sell again. Each had been visited by a representative of the Drug Free Coalition, informed that someone in their store sold without checking for identification, and were given information on Best Practices regarding the sale of alcohol.

The same pool of students at UNC Charlotte who attempted the purchases in October was used again for this follow-up. All students were required to be at least 21 years of age yet look under age. All buyers were asked to buy a 6-pack of a domestic beer without voluntarily offering identification. If asked, they were instructed to say they did not have any on them.

31 establishments (20.8%) of the October sample of Mecklenburg County establishments with AK-Malt Beverage Off-Premise permits sold. 28 were re-visited.[†]

39.3% (N= 11) of the establishments that sold in October 2010 also sold again in April/May 2011

Table 1 Percent of Sales 2010-2011

| Attempt Outcome | High-Risk Stores - Follow-up 2010 | High-Risk Stores - Follow-up 2011* |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| A sale was made without ID | 15 (30.6%) | 8 (28.6%) |
| ID was asked for, none provided, sale anyway | 9 (18.4%) | 3 (10.7%) |
| Total Sales | 24 (49.0%) | 11 (39.3%) |
| ID asked for, no sale | 25 (51%) | 17 (60.7%) |
| Number of Attempts | 49 | 28 |

* Two stores were not re-contacted; at one the clerk and buyer knew each other

Our efforts to keep the issue of underage drinking in the forefront of store managers' trainings has appeared to have had some effect overall as demonstrated by the total number in the county that did not sell in 2010, and the reduced number of establishments selling a second time. None-the-less, having 39% re-sell, while better than 49%, tells us that we need to find more or different ways to address the problem.

[†] At one establishment the clerk and buyer knew each other; one was closed at the time of the attempt and no notation was made as to why the other establishment was not approached.

Problem Areas

As found in the fall report, the establishments most likely to sell without checking for identification continue to be convenience stores that do not sell gas. This has been true for all of the studies. In this fall report study 47.8% of convenience stores without gas sold and with this follow-up – 41.7% sold again without checking.

In this study and for all of the previous studies, the type of establishment most likely to sell without checking for identification are convenience stores that do not sell gas. However, two of three supermarkets also sold again.

Table 2 Sales by Outlet type

| Sale without ID | | TypeOutlet | | | | Total |
|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------|--------|
| | | Convenience (with gas) | Convenience (without gas) | Supermarket | Drugstore/ pharmacy | |
| No | Count | 9 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| | Percent | 75.0% | 58.3% | 33.3% | .0% | 60.7% |
| Yes | Count | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 11 |
| | Percent | 25.0% | 41.7% | 66.7% | 100.0% | 39.3% |
| Total | Count | 12 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 28 |
| | Percent | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Zip codes

A few zip codes show higher proportion of sales. Since the stores were selected at random, not all zip codes are reflected and some have more stores than others, but the following table shows that of all the attempts and a given zip code.

To note:

28208 – 3 sales of 4 establishments

Table 3 Sales by Zip Code

| | | | Sale | | Total |
|---------|-------|------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | No | Yes | |
| ZipCode | 28105 | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | | % within ZipCode | 100.0% | .0% | 100.0% |
| | 28202 | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | | % within ZipCode | 66.7% | 33.3% | 100.0% |
| | 28204 | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | | % within ZipCode | .0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| 28205 | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 | |

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | % within ZipCode | 66.7% | 33.3% | 100.0% |
| 28206 | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | % within ZipCode | 66.7% | 33.3% | 100.0% |
| 28208 | Count | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| | % within ZipCode | 25.0% | 75.0% | 100.0% |
| 28211 | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | % within ZipCode | 100.0% | .0% | 100.0% |
| 28216 | Count | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | % within ZipCode | 50.0% | 50.0% | 100.0% |
| 28217 | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | % within ZipCode | 66.7% | 33.3% | 100.0% |
| 28227 | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | % within ZipCode | 100.0% | .0% | 100.0% |
| 28262 | Count | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| | % within ZipCode | .0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| 28269 | Count | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| | % within ZipCode | 100.0% | .0% | 100.0% |
| 28273 | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | % within ZipCode | 100.0% | .0% | 100.0% |
| Total | Count | 17 | 11 | 28 |
| | % within ZipCode | 60.7% | 39.3% | 100.0% |