Journal of Safety Research 62 (2017) 181–184

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Safety Research

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jsr

Trends in teen driver licensure, driving patterns and crash involvement in the United States, 2006–2015☆

Ruth A. Shults, [a,*] Allan F. Williams [b]

[a] Division of Unintentional Injury Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 4770 Buford Highway, NE, MS F-62, Atlanta, GA 30341, USA
[b] LLC, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 2 March 2017
Received in revised form 28 April 2017
Accepted 21 June 2017
Available online 04 July 2017

Keywords:
Adolescent
Teenagers
Licensure
Automobile driving
Motor vehicle crashes

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The Monitoring the Future (MTF) survey provides nationally-representative annual estimates of licensure and driving patterns among U.S. teens. A previous study using MTF data reported substantial declines in the proportion of high school seniors that were licensed to drive and increases in the proportion of nondrivers following the recent U.S. economic recession. *Method:* To explore whether licensure and driving patterns among U.S. high school seniors have rebounded in the post-recession years, we analyzed MTF licensure and driving data for the decade of 2006–2015. We also examined trends in teen driver involvement in fatal and nonfatal injury crashes for that decade using data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System and National Automotive Sampling System General Estimates System, respectively. *Results:* During 2006–2015, the proportion of high school seniors that reported having a driver's license declined by 9 percentage points (11%) from 81% to 72% and the proportion that did not drive during an average week increased by 8 percentage points (44%) from 18% to 26%. The annual proportion of black seniors that did not drive was consistently greater than twice the proportion of nondriving white seniors. Overall during the decade, 17- and 18-year-old drivers experienced large declines in fatal and nonfatal injury crashes, although crashes increased in both 2014 and 2015. *Conclusions:* The MTF data indicate that licensure and driving patterns among U.S. high school seniors have not rebounded since the economic recession. The recession had marked negative effects on teen employment opportunities, which likely influenced teen driving patterns. Possible explanations for the apparent discrepancies between the MTF data and the 2014 and 2015 increases in crashes are explored. *Practical applications:* MTF will continue to be an important resource for clarifying teen driving trends in relation to crash trends and informing strategies to improve teen driver safety.

Published by Elsevier Ltd.

1. Introduction

In a 2013 report, Shults and Williams published results of the Monitoring the Future (MTF) surveys showing teen driver licensure and driving trends among 12th grade students in the United States during 1996–2010 (Shults & Williams, 2013). They reported that the proportion of high school seniors that were licensed to drive declined by 12 percentage points from 85% to 73% and the proportion that did not drive during an average week increased by 7 percentage points from 15% to 22% during the 15-year period. Most of the decline in licensure and increase in nondrivers occurred during 2006–2010. The authors concluded that the recent economic recession likely influenced licensure and driving patterns among high school seniors and encouraged use of the MTF data to monitor teen driving patterns as the economy recovered.

The U.S. recession began in December 2007 and officially ended in June 2009, although economic weakness continued for several years (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). This report updates the MTF licensure and driving data, concentrating on the decade of 2006–2015, and summarizes the trends in teen driver involvement in fatal and nonfatal injury crashes for that decade. This time span allows teen licensure, driving patterns, and crash involvement to be examined before and after the recession.

2. Methods

Monitoring the Future is a self-administered survey completed each spring by U.S. high school students (Miech, Johnston, O'Malley, Bachman, & Schulenberg, 2016). The survey uses a multi-stage sampling procedure to produce a representative sample of seniors in the

☆ Disclaimer: the findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention/the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.
This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: rshults@cdc.gov (R.A. Shults).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2017.06.013
0022-4375/Published by Elsevier Ltd.

48 contiguous states. Students are randomly given one of six survey forms. Some of the survey questions are included on all six forms, whereas others are included on only one form. Students complete the pencil and paper survey during school hours (Bachman, Johnston, & O'Malley, 2014). During 2006–2015, between 13,015 and 15,132 high school seniors attending between 120 and 136 public or private schools completed the survey. Response rates, measured as the quotient of the attained sample divided by the number of enrolled students provided by schools, ranged from 79% to 85% (Miech et al., 2016). Throughout the decade, approximately 95% of respondents were either 17 or 18 years old (personal communication, Timothy Perry, 2017). Further details about the survey methods and limitations are available elsewhere (Bachman et al., 2014; Miech et al., 2016).

For this report, 2006–2012 MTF data were accessed from the annual reference volumes at http://monitoringthefuture.org/pubs.html#refvols, and 2013–2015 data were provided by MTF staff (personal communication, Timothy Perry, 2016). The licensure question read, "Do you have a driver's license?" The question was included in only one of six forms, and therefore, responses were based on annual sample sizes of 1980 to 2356. The driving question read, "During an average week, how much do you usually drive a car, truck, or motorcycle?" This question was included on all six questionnaire forms and responses were based on annual sample sizes ranging from 11,998 to 14,089. Results reported by race include only students who identified as "Black or African American" or "White (Caucasian)," which consistently represented approximately 81% of all respondents. All other analyses include students of all reported races and ethnicities. Confidence intervals for the proportions and p-values for differences in proportions were estimated using the method described in Appendix A of the 2012 MTF reference volume (Bachman et al., 2014).

Data on 17- and 18-year-old drivers who were involved in a fatal or nonfatal injury crash during 2006–2015 were obtained from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) and the National Automotive Sampling System General Estimates System (GES), respectively. Both surveillance systems are maintained by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA, 2016a). FARS is a census of fatal traffic crashes occurring on public roads in the U.S. FARS defines a fatal crash as one in which at least one vehicle occupant or nonoccupant (e.g., bicyclist or pedestrian) involved in the crash died within 30 days of the crash (NHTSA, 2016b). GES contains a nationally representative sample of approximately 60,000 crashes selected from the >5 million annual police reported crashes involving property damage, injury, or death. GES records the injury status of occupants and nonoccupants based on the crash incident police report (NHTSA, 2016b). We restricted analyses to drivers of passenger vehicles (i.e., cars, sport utility vehicles, pickup trucks, and vans).

3. Results

3.1. Monitoring the future licensure and driving trends

During 2006–2015, the proportion of high school seniors that reported having a driver's license declined by 9 percentage points (11%) from 81% to 72% (Table 1). Licensure among black seniors was consistently lower compared with white seniors and did not decline significantly over the decade, whereas declines were statistically significant for the total population, males, females, and white seniors.

The proportion of high school seniors that did not drive during an average week increased over the decade by 8 percentage points (44%) from 18% to 26% (Table 2). As with licensure, the proportion of nondrivers varied by both gender and race, with proportions of nondrivers nearly always significantly higher among females and blacks compared with males and whites, respectively (Table 2). The annual proportion of black seniors that did not drive was consistently greater than twice the proportion of nondriving white seniors. In 2015, 4 in 10 (41%) black seniors did not drive during an average week.

Table 1
Proportion of U.S. high school seniors that had a driver's license, by gender and race, Monitoring the Future, 2006–2015.

	Total % (95% CI)[a]	Male % (95% CI)	Female % (95% CI)	White % (95% CI)	Black % (95% CI)
Year					
2006	81 (78, 83)	85 (82, 87)	77 (74, 79)	89 (87, 90)	68 (59, 75)
2007	77 (75, 80)	82 (78, 84)	74 (70, 77)	86 (84, 89)	60 (52, 68)
2008	78 (76, 80)	83 (80, 86)	74 (70, 77)	88 (86, 90)	57 (50, 64)
2009	75 (72, 77)	80 (77, 83)	70 (66, 73)	84 (82, 86)	65 (56, 72)
2010	73 (71, 75)	78 (75, 81)	68 (65, 72)	84 (82, 86)	61 (54, 67)
2011	72 (70, 74)	75 (72, 78)	70 (67, 73)	83 (80, 85)	57 (50, 64)
2012	75 (73, 77)	79 (76, 82)	71 (68, 74)	85 (83, 87)	62 (55, 68)
2013	73 (70, 76)	75 (72, 78)	72 (69, 75)	85 (83, 87)	61 (53, 68)
2014	73 (70, 76)	75 (72, 78)	71 (68, 74)	85 (83, 87)	57 (50, 64)
2015	72 (69, 75)	75 (72, 78)	69 (66, 72)	82 (79, 85)	65 (58, 71)

[a] 95% CI: confidence interval.

3.2. Teen driver fatal and nonfatal injury crash involvement

Trends in fatal and nonfatal injury crash (injury crash) involvement were similar for drivers aged 17 and 18 years, although 18-year-olds were consistently involved in more crashes than 17-year-olds (Figs. 1 and 2). Fatal crash involvement declined steadily through 2013 for both ages, with reductions of 58% for 17-year-olds and 50% for 18-year-olds, and increased during both 2014 and 2015. Injury crash involvement declined most rapidly between 2006 and 2009 for both ages, with reductions of 35% for 17-year-olds and 28% for 18-year-olds. Injury crash involvement reached lows for both ages in 2013 and increased during 2014 and 2015. Overall during the decade of 2006–2015, 17-year-old drivers experienced a 50% decline in fatal crash involvement and 26% decline in injury crash involvement. Likewise, 18-year-old drivers experienced a 45% decline in fatal crash involvement and 25% decline in injury crash involvement.

4. Discussion

During the decade of 2006–2015, the proportion of U.S. high school seniors that had a driver's license decreased substantially and the proportion that did not drive in an average week increased substantially. Neither licensure nor driving patterns in this population has rebounded in the post-recession years.

The U.S. economic recession had disproportionate and lingering negative effects on teen employment opportunities (Fogg, Harrington, & Khatiwada, 2016; Soergel, 2015), which likely influenced teen driving patterns (Highway Loss Data Institute, 2015). The proportion of 16–19-year-olds who were employed declined from a pre-recession level of 37% in January 2006 to 25% in June 2010, a full year after the official end of the recession (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017).

Table 2
Proportion of U.S. high school seniors that did not drive during an average week, by gender and race, Monitoring the Future, 2006–2015.

	Total % (95% CI)[a]	Male % (95% CI)	Female % (95% CI)	White % (95% CI)	Black % (95% CI)
Year					
2006	18 (16, 19)	15 (13, 16)	20 (19, 22)	11 (10, 12)	30 (26, 33)
2007	20 (19, 22)	17 (15, 18)	23 (22, 25)	12 (11, 13)	37 (34, 41)
2008	21 (20, 22)	17 (16, 19)	24 (23, 26)	13 (11, 14)	36 (32, 39)
2009	22 (20, 23)	18 (16, 19)	25 (24, 26)	14 (12, 15)	34 (30, 39)
2010	22 (21, 24)	18 (17, 20)	26 (24, 28)	14 (13, 15)	37 (33, 41)
2011	24 (23, 25)	21 (20, 23)	26 (24, 28)	15 (14, 16)	38 (53, 41)
2012	23 (22, 24)	20 (19, 22)	25 (23, 27)	15 (14, 16)	39 (35, 43)
2013	22 (21, 23)	20 (19, 22)	24 (23, 26)	13 (12, 14)	40 (36, 44)
2014	25 (24, 26)	22 (21, 24)	27 (25, 29)	14 (13, 15)	41 (37, 45)
2015	26 (25, 27)	23 (22, 25)	28 (26, 30)	15 (14, 16)	41 (37, 45)

[a] 95% CI: confidence interval.