



Published in final edited form as:

JAMA Pediatr. 2014 July 1; 168(7): 618–624. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.5300.

Marijuana-Using Drivers, Alcohol-Using drivers and Their Passengers: Prevalence and Risk Factors Among Underage College Students

Jennifer M. Whitehill, PhD^{(1),(2),(4)}, Frederick P. Rivara, MD, MPH^{(1),(2),(3)}, and Megan A. Moreno, MD, MEd, MPH^{(2),(3)}

⁽¹⁾Harborview Injury Prevention and Research Center (HIPRC), University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

⁽²⁾Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

⁽³⁾Center for Child Health Behavior & Development, Seattle Children's Hospital, Seattle, Washington

⁽⁴⁾Department of Public Health, School of Public Health and Health Sciences, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts

Abstract

Importance—Driving after marijuana use increases the risk of a motor vehicle crash. Understanding this behavior among young drivers and how it may differ from alcohol-related driving behaviors could inform prevention efforts.

Objective—To describe prevalence, sex differences, and risk factors associated with underage college students' driving after using marijuana, driving after drinking alcohol, or riding with a driver using these substances.

Design, Setting, Participants—Cross-sectional telephone survey of a random sample of 315 first-year college students (aged 18-20 years) from 2 large public universities, who were participating in an ongoing longitudinal study. At recruitment, 52.8% of eligible individuals consented to participate; retention was 93.2% one year later when data for this report was collected.

Main Outcome Measure(s)—Self-reported past-28-day driving after marijuana use, riding with a marijuana-using driver, driving after alcohol use, and riding with an alcohol-using driver.

Results—In the prior month, 20.3% of students had used marijuana. Among marijuana-using students, 43.9% of males and 8.7% of females drove after using marijuana ($p < 0.001$) and 51.2% of male and 34.8% of female students rode as a passenger with a marijuana-using driver ($p = 0.21$). Most students (65.1%) drank alcohol, and among this group 12.0% of male students and 2.7% of female students drove after drinking ($p = 0.01$), with 20.7% and 11.5% ($p = 0.07$), respectively, reporting riding with a drinking driver. Controlling for demographics and substance use behaviors,

driving after substance use was associated with at least a 2-fold increase in risk of being a passenger with another user; the reverse was also true. A 1% increase in the reported percentage of friends using marijuana was associated with a 2% increased risk of riding with a marijuana using driver (95% CI=1.01-1.03). Among students using any substances, past 28-day use of only marijuana was associated with a 6.24-fold increased risk of driving after substance use compared to using only alcohol (95% CI=1.89-21.7).

Conclusions and Relevance—Driving and riding after marijuana use is common among underage, marijuana-using college students. This is concerning given recent legislation that may increase marijuana availability.

INTRODUCTION

Concerns about drug-impaired driving are of increasing importance in the United States, where state laws that reduce or remove penalties for marijuana are becoming more common. Acute use of cannabis approximately doubles the risk of a motor vehicle crash,^{1,2} so maintaining road traffic safety despite a potential increase in marijuana use is a critical challenge.^{3,4} Marijuana possession has been decriminalized in 14 states and 2 states have recently legalized marijuana possession and recreational use for those at least 21 years old.

The issue of marijuana-impaired driving is particularly salient for young drivers, for whom the combination of inexperience and substance use elevates crash risk.⁵⁻⁷ Youth younger than 21 are at the highest risk of involvement in a fatal motor vehicle crash.⁸ They are also the age group most likely to use marijuana.⁹ Nationally, cannabis was involved in 12% of fatal crashes among 16-20 year olds.¹⁰

College students are a population at increased risk of substance-related risk behaviors, such as impaired driving.¹¹ For the 66% of American youth that attend post-secondary education,¹² college often represents a time of increased exposure to¹³ and experimentation with marijuana and other substances.¹⁴ Marijuana use increases after high school for youth who attend 4-year colleges compared to youth who do not.¹⁵ Marijuana is second only to alcohol for substances most abused by this population.¹⁶ Compared to female students, males are more likely to use substances,¹⁷⁻¹⁹ drive after drinking, and be killed in an alcohol-related motor vehicle crash (MVC).²⁰⁻²² Findings of previous studies suggest that male students are twice as likely as female students to drive while high on marijuana and 20% more likely to ride with a marijuana-using driver.²³

Because public health measures have reduced alcohol-related MVCs and reported episodes of drinking and driving,^{20,21} understanding how marijuana-related driving behaviors are similar or different from alcohol-related driving behaviors may help inform prevention efforts. The prevalence of driving or riding as a passenger after alcohol use has been established in other college studies,²⁴⁻²⁶ but how this compares to driving after marijuana or riding with a marijuana-using driver is limited to a single-institution study conducted before the surge in legislation that has increased availability of marijuana.²² Accordingly, the purpose of our study was: (1) to describe prevalence and gender differences in underage college students' driving after marijuana use and riding as a passenger with a marijuana-using driver; (2) to examine risk factors for marijuana-impaired driving or riding, and (3) to

compare both prevalence and risk factors for marijuana-related driving behaviors with those for alcohol-related driving behaviors.

METHODS

Setting and Recruitment

Data for this study were obtained from an ongoing longitudinal study of college students' substance use at 2 large state universities in Wisconsin and Washington State. Incoming first-year students were randomly selected, and recruited via postcards, emails, and phone calls. To be eligible, participants had to be 18 or 19 years old by the beginning of the 2011-2012 academic year. Students were excluded if they had been on the university's campus for early-enrollment programs. Oral consent was obtained by telephone for all students. All study procedures were approved by the institutional review boards at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Seattle Children's Research Institute, Seattle, Washington.

Data Collection

Participants completed a telephone interview with a trained research assistant at least once a year, beginning with a baseline interview during the summer before starting college. All interviews included questions about substance use frequency and quantity. The follow-up interview was conducted one year later between May 15, 2012 and September 20, 2012. In this interview, questions were added to assess driving after substance use. This report focuses on cross-sectional data collected during the summer 2012 interview.

Measures

Demographic information for students, including sex and race, was obtained during the baseline interview. Exact age was not ascertained because all participants were in the same first-year student cohort and a narrow age range (18 or 19 years old) was part of the inclusion criteria.

Substance use—Participants reported past 28-day substance use in response to the question, "Have you used (marijuana or alcohol) in the past 28 days?" Individuals who reported using a substance within the past 28 days were interviewed using the Timeline Followback method²⁷ to ascertain the number of days each substance was used during this period. We used the responses to generate continuous variables for each participant, indicating the number of days the participant reported using marijuana only, alcohol only, or both.

Alcohol users were asked how many drinks they had on each day that they used alcohol, with one drink defined according to National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) standards (12oz. of beer, 5 oz. of wine, or 1.5 oz. of hard liquor). Based on the responses, we generated counts of the number of days that female students had more than 4 drinks and male students had more than 5 drinks. We defined these days as heavy episodic (binge) drinking days and counted the number of binge and non-binge drinking days. The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT)²⁸ was administered to students to

screen for problematic alcohol use in the past year. We followed commonly-used clinical scoring guidelines: scores of 8 to 12 for female students or 8 to 14 for male students were considered indicative of hazardous drinking, and scores of 13 or more for female students or 15 or more for male students signified potential alcohol dependence.²⁹

Students who reported substance use were asked how old they were when they first tried the substance. All students were asked to report the percentages of their friends who use marijuana and use alcohol.

Driving or riding after substance use—Outcomes were assessed by asking, “In the past 28 days, how many times have you ridden as a passenger in a vehicle driven by someone who had been using marijuana?” A similar question was asked about being a passenger with an alcohol-using driver. Past 28-day use of alcohol or marijuana prompted the interviewer to ask, “In the past 28 days, how many times have you driven after using that substance?” Responses to both the riding and driving questions were ordinal (0, 1, 2-3, 4-5, or 6 times), but were coded as binary (0 or 1) in this analysis.

To assess exposure to the risk of driving after substance use, we asked participants if they (1) held a driver license, and (2) kept a car at school. We also asked students about frequency of seatbelt use (always, mostly, sometimes, rarely, never) because seatbelt-wearing has a well-established relationship to motor vehicle-related risk-taking.^{20,30} The distribution was heavily skewed towards always wearing a seatbelt, so this variable was dichotomized to measure whether or not participants always wear their seat belts.

Statistical Analysis

We first examined differences by sex and university in means and proportions for all variables using t-tests for continuous data and chi-squared tests for categorical data. We examined the prevalence of driving after substance use and riding with a substance-using driver among the all respondents and separately among those using substances in the past 28 days. Chi-squared tests were used to examine differences in prevalence between alcohol and marijuana-related driving behaviors.

We conducted regression analyses for four outcomes: driving after marijuana use, riding with a driver who used marijuana, driving after alcohol use, and riding with driver who used alcohol. To assess which factors were associated with the outcomes of interest, we used Poisson regression with robust standard errors to estimate relative risk (RR).³¹ We first examined bivariate associations, selecting predictors based on the literature about driving after drinking and substance use behavior, followed by multivariable regression. Factors that were non-significant in the initial multivariable model were not retained in the final model.

For the outcome of driving after marijuana use, we examined the following covariates: sex, seat belt use, university, age at first marijuana use, number of days using marijuana in the past 28 days, whether the respondent rode as a passenger with marijuana-using driver, and whether the respondent drove after alcohol use. This same basic model was used to predict riding with a marijuana-using driver, with driving after marijuana use and percent of friends using marijuana entered as covariates. A similar approach was taking for alcohol-related

outcomes, with an additional binary variable for positive AUDIT screen (8). We used a fifth regression model to compare how using marijuana, alcohol, or both substances in the past 28 days contributed the risk of driving after any substance use. All analyses were conducted using Stata 12/SE software (Stata Corp.).

RESULTS

Of 640 incoming college freshman approached, 338 (52.8% response rate) consented to be in the study, and 315 participants (93.2% retention rate) completed the follow up interview at the end of their first year. All participants were between the ages of 18 and 20 years. The sample was 56.2% female and 75.6% White (Table 1). Approximately 60% of the sample was from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Differences between the study population and those who refused were not significant for gender ($p=0.32$) or university ($p=0.16$), the 2 items we could assess among refusers. There were more participants from minority groups among the Washington sample (44.5%) compared to Wisconsin (10.9%) ($p<0.001$), but no differences in sex ($p=0.63$). Past 28-day prevalence of alcohol use was higher for Wisconsin (79.0%) compared to Washington (65.4%) ($p=0.01$), but there was no significant difference in prevalence of marijuana use or use of both substances. There were no significant differences in driving or riding after substance use by university.

A greater proportion of male than female students engaged in substance use and risky driving behavior (Table 1). Past 28-day prevalence of marijuana use was 29.7% for male and 13.0% for female students, and the past 28-day prevalence of alcohol use was 66.7% for male and 63.8% for female students. Prevalence of having used both marijuana and alcohol on the same day was 23.2% for male and 8.5% for female students.

Marijuana-related behavior

Driving after marijuana use—Among all students, the prevalence of driving after marijuana use was 6.3% (Table 2). Among current (past-28-day) marijuana users, 43.9% of male and 8.7% of female students drove after using marijuana. The risk of driving after marijuana was highest for those who rode with a marijuana-using driver ($RR=5.72$; $CI=1.84-17.80$) and for those who drove after drinking ($RR=2.45$; $CI=1.39-4.31$) while an older age at first marijuana use was associated with a lower risk ($RR=0.78$; $CI=0.63-0.97$) (Table 3). Each 1-year increase in the age of first marijuana use was associated with a 22% reduction in the risk of driving after marijuana use.

Riding with a marijuana-using driver—Among all students the prevalence of riding with driver who had used marijuana was 13.0%. The proportion of students who rode with a marijuana-using driver was higher for the subset of students who used marijuana in the past 28 days compared to the sample as a whole. For marijuana-using students, a greater proportion of male than female students (51.2% vs 34.8%) rode with a driver who had used marijuana. The risk of riding with a marijuana-using driver was increased for those drove after marijuana ($RR=4.42$; $CI=2.40-8.14$). For each 1% increase in the reported percentage of friends who use marijuana, students were 2% more likely to ride with a marijuana-using driver ($CI=1.01-1.03$). This translates into a 3.2-fold increase in the risk of riding with a marijuana-using driver for a 50% increase in the estimated number of friends using

marijuana. Report of always wearing a seatbelt was associated with reduced risk (RR=0.55; CI=0.33-0.91).

Alcohol-related behaviors

Driving after alcohol use—The prevalence of driving after drinking was 4.4% among all students, 6.8% among the subpopulation of students who used alcohol in the past 28 days, and significantly higher for male than for female students ($p=0.01$) (Table 2). Regression models showed 2 statistically significant risk factors for driving after drinking: riding with a drinking driver (RR=7.24; CI=2.45-21.35) and the number of non-binge drinking days (RR=1.15; CI=1.09-1.22) (Table 4). Reported always wearing a seatbelt was associated with a much-reduced risk (RR=0.20; CI=.09-0.48).

Riding with an alcohol-using driver—For riding with a drinking driver, driving after drinking was the strongest risk factor (RR=4.73; CI=2.54-8.08). The number of binge drinking days increased risk of riding with a drinking driver (RR=1.12; CI=1.08, 1.17) somewhat more than the number of non-binge drinking days (RR=1.07; CI=1.01, 1.13).

Comparisons between marijuana-related and alcohol-related behaviors

The chi-squared tests comparing marijuana-related and alcohol-related behaviors (see proportions in Table 2) showed that among the full sample, there was no significant difference in the proportion who drive after marijuana use compared to after alcohol use ($p=0.29$) or who ride with a driver using each substance ($p=0.63$). However, among students who use substances, marijuana users have a higher prevalence of driving ($p=0.005$) and riding ($p<0.001$) after marijuana use compared to alcohol users driving or riding after alcohol use.

Among students who report past 28-day use of either substance, 29.5% reported riding with a substance-using driver compared to 6.7% of students who did not report substance use ($p<0.001$). The multivariate model to assess contribution from each substance type or combination to the risk of driving after any substance use (Table 5) showed that compared to using alcohol alone in the past 28 days, using only marijuana showed a substantial increase in the risk of driving after substance use (RR=6.24; CI=1.89-21.17) when controlling for sex, days of substance use, reported seat belt use, and AUDIT score. Using marijuana and alcohol was not associated with a statistically significant difference in risk. In this model, an increase in the number of days on which any substance as was used was associated with increased risk of driving after substance use (RR=1.06; CI=1.03-1.09), as was having a positive AUDIT score (RR=2.86; CI=1.07-7.65).

DISCUSSION

This study found that underage male college students who used marijuana in the past 28 days had a high prevalence of driving after marijuana use and riding with a marijuana-using driver. This was more than double the prevalence of driving or riding after alcohol-use among current alcohol users. Our findings were consistent with other studies demonstrating that for alcohol, the behaviors of driving after substance use and riding with friends who

have been using are strongly associated.³² Driving after drinking also increased the risk of driving after marijuana use. An older age of first marijuana use was associated with a 20% reduction in the risk of driving after marijuana for each year increment in the age of first use. As expected, a higher percentage of the respondent's friends reported to be using marijuana indicated an increased risk of riding with a marijuana-using driver.

Our finding that using only marijuana increased the risk of substance impaired driving is logically consistent with other studies indicating that driving after marijuana use is perceived as safer than driving after alcohol use²³ and done more frequently.^{33,34} Our data also suggest that, similar to many risk behaviors, peers have a strong role in influencing behavior related to driving after substance use; individuals who rode with a marijuana-using driver were over 5 times more likely to drive after marijuana use.

It could be beneficial to have effective strategies to combat the myth that driving after marijuana use is safe and change social norms towards having a safe ride home not only for alcohol use, but for any substance use episode. The CRAFFT screening tool, named for the first letters of key words in the 6 screening questions (*Car, Relax, Alone, Forget, Friends, Trouble*), is a validated instrument that can help pediatric providers identify patients who might benefit from counseling about the risk of marijuana-impaired driving.³⁵ Further research will be needed to understand whether such counseling is effective. In the changing policy environment surrounding marijuana, it will be important to continue to follow the trends both in arrests and self-reports, particularly among adolescent populations whose driving skills are still being developed.

Our study had limitations. Study participants were not different from refusers on the variables we could measure, but unmeasured differences could bias the results. The response rate of 52.8% is not unusual for studies of college students. Although the sample is representative of the colleges from which the data was drawn, it is not representative of all colleges. The small number of nonwhite students in our sample may mean that the risks identified in this study may not be representative of all college populations.

Our ascertainment of all variables was limited to self-report, creating the possibility for recall and social desirability bias. The TimeLine FollowBack method used in the study is well-validated for helping to avoid the bias that comes with the passing of time since the event in question.³⁶⁻³⁸ Participants were informed that we obtained a federal certificate of confidentiality for the study, which we hope helped them feel comfortable disclosing behaviors related to alcohol and drug use. Prior work with college students suggests that self-reported substance-related risk behavior are valid compared to other data sources.³⁹

An additional limitation is that we did not assess time between substance use and driving, level of impairment, or motor vehicle crash incidence. Because we did not ask about how many hours each episode of substance use lasted, we defined binge drinking as consuming 4 or 5 drinks in a day. This differs from the NIAAA definition of binge drinking as 4 or 5 drinks in two hours, so we may have overestimated the number of days in which NIAAA-defined binge drinking occurred. We ascertained whether alcohol and marijuana were used on the same day, but not whether they were used concurrently.

The number of marijuana-using individuals in our sample may have limited our ability to detect certain associations between risk factors and driving or riding after use of this substance. Although our results indicate that driving and riding after marijuana varies by sex, our data did not permit us to examine how sex may modify the relationship between risk factors and driving or riding after marijuana use. These outcomes were relatively rare among female participants and the number was too small to support investigating this interaction in the regression models.

Conclusions

Despite the limitations of our study, our findings are an important and timely contribution to the literature on older adolescents driving after drug use. This work supplements our knowledge that marijuana use increases crash risk by providing an estimate for how common it is for underage students to have taken this risk in the past 28 days.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by grant R01DA031580-03 from the National Institutes of Health Common Fund, managed by the OD/Office of Strategic Coordination (OSC), and by grant T32HD057822 from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

The authors would like to thank Mara Stewart, BSN, Lauren Kacvinsky, BS, and the Social Media and Adolescent Health Research Team for assistance with data collection and management. We thank Janessa Graves, PhD, MPH, Alex Quistberg, PhD, MPH, and Jin Wang, PhD for their suggestions about data analysis.

REFERENCES

1. Li M-C, Brady JE, DiMaggio CJ, Lusardi AR, Tzong KY, Li G. Marijuana Use and Motor Vehicle Crashes. *Epidemiol. Rev.* Jan 1; 2012 34(1):65–72. [PubMed: 21976636]
2. Asbridge M, Hayden JA, Cartwright JL. Acute cannabis consumption and motor vehicle collision risk: systematic review of observational studies and meta-analysis. *BMJ.* Feb 09.2012 23(33):57, 344.
3. Johnson MB, Kelley-Baker T, Voas RB, Lacey JH. The prevalence of cannabis-involved driving in California. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence.* 2012; 123(1–3):105–109. [PubMed: 22101027]
4. Dennis B, Farnam TW. Too high to drive? Marijuana-friendly Colorado debates blood-level limits. *The Washington Post.* Mar 1.2013
5. Pickett W, Davison C, Torunian M, McFaul S, Walsh P, Thompson W. Drinking, Substance Use and the Operation of Motor Vehicles by Young Adolescents in Canada. *PLoS ONE.* 2012; 7(8):e42807. [PubMed: 22936992]
6. Shope JT, Bingham CR. Teen Driving: Motor-Vehicle Crashes and Factors That Contribute. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2008; 35(3, Supplement):S261–S271. [PubMed: 18702980]
7. Mann RE, Stoduto G, Butters J, et al. Age group differences in collision risk. *Journal of Safety Research.* 2010; 41(5):445–449. [PubMed: 21059462]
8. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. *Fatality Facts: Teenagers.* 2011.
9. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality. Results from the 2011 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Summary of National Findings. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration; Rockville, MD: 2012.
10. Romano E, Pollini RA. Patterns of drug use in fatal crashes. *Addiction.* 2013 n/a-n/a.
11. Carter A, Brandon KO, Goldman MS. The college and noncollege experience: A review of the factors that influence drinking behavior in young adulthood. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs.* 2010; 71(5):742–750. [PubMed: 20731981]

12. Bureau of Labor Statistics. College Enrollment and Work Activity of 2012 High School Graduates. U.S. Department of Labor; Apr 17. 2013 13
13. Pinchevsky GM, Arria AM, Caldeira KM, Garnier-Dykstra LM, Vincent KB, O'Grady KE. Marijuana exposure opportunity and initiation during college: parent and peer influences. *Prev Sci*. Feb; 2012 13(1):43–54. [PubMed: 21870157]
14. Fromme K, Corbin WR, Kruse MI. Behavioral risks during the transition from high school to college. *Dev Psychol*. Sep; 2008 44(5):1497–1504. [PubMed: 18793080]
15. Fleming CB, White HR, Haggerty KP, Abbott RD, Catalano RF. Educational Paths and Substance Use From Adolescence Into Early Adulthood. *Journal of Drug Issues*. 2012; 42(2):104–126.
16. Primack BA, Kim KH, Shensa A, Sidani JE, Barnett TE, Switzer GE. Tobacco, marijuana, and alcohol use in university students: a cluster analysis. *J Am Coll Health*. Jul; 2012 60(5):374–386. [PubMed: 22686360]
17. O'Malley PM, Johnston LD. Epidemiology of alcohol and other drug use among american college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 2002; S14:23–39.
18. Garnier-Dykstra LM, Caldeira KM, Vincent KB, O'Grady KE, Arria AM. Nonmedical Use of Prescription Stimulants During College: Four-Year Trends in Exposure Opportunity, Use, Motives, and Sources. *Journal of American College Health*. Jan 04; 2012 60(3):226–234. [PubMed: 22420700]
19. American College Health Association. National College Health Assessment II: Reference Group Executive Summary Fall 2012. American College Health Association; Hanover, MD: 2013.
20. Bergen G, Shults RA, Beck LF, Qayad M. Self-Reported Alcohol-Impaired Driving in the U.S., 2006 and 2008. *Am. J. Prev. Med*. 2012; 42(2):142–149. [PubMed: 22261210]
21. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Vital Signs: Alcohol-Impaired Driving Among Adults --United States, 2010. *MMWR Morbid Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2011; 60(39):1351–1356.
22. Arria AM, Caldeira KM, Vincent KB, Garnier-Dykstra LM, O'Grady KE. Substance-related traffic-risk behaviors among college students. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2011; 118(2–3): 306–312. [PubMed: 21601379]
23. Arterberry BJ, Treloar HR, Smith AE, Martens MP, Pedersen SL, McCarthy DM. Marijuana Use, Driving, and Related Cognitions. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2012
24. Hingson RA, Zha W, Weitzman ER. Magnitude of and trends in alcohol-related mortality and morbidity among U.S. college students ages 18–24, 1998–2005. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 2009; (Supplement No. 16):12–20. [PubMed: 19538908]
25. Barrett SP, Darredeau C, Pihl RO. Patterns of simultaneous polysubstance use in drug using university students. *Human Psychopharmacology: Clinical and Experimental*. 2006; 21(4):255–263. [PubMed: 16783813]
26. Grossbard JR, Mastroleo NR, Kilmer JR, et al. Substance use patterns among first-year college students: Secondary effects of a combined alcohol intervention. *J. Subst. Abuse Treat*. 2010; 39(4):384–390. [PubMed: 20817383]
27. Sobell LC, Sobell MB, Leo GI, Cancilla A. Reliability of a Timeline Method: assessing normal drinkers' reports of recent drinking and a comparative evaluation across several populations. *British Journal of Addiction*. 1988; 83(4):393–402. [PubMed: 3395719]
28. Saunders JB, Aasland OG, Babor TF, De La Fuente JR, Grant M. Development of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO Collaborative Project on Early Detection of Persons with Harmful Alcohol Consumption-II. *Addiction*. 1993; 88(6):791–804. [PubMed: 8329970]
29. Allen JP, Litten RZ, Fertig JB, Babor T. A Review of Research on the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT). *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*. 1997; 21(4):613–619.
30. Goudie, RJBMS.; De Neve, J-E.; Oswald, AJ.; Wu, S. Happiness as a driver of risk-avoiding behavior: A conceptual framework with an application to seatbelt wearing and automobile accidents. Centre for Economic Performance (CEP): London School of Economics; 2012.
31. Zou G. A modified Poisson regression approach to prospective studies with binary data. *Am. J. Epidemiol*. 2004; 159(7):702–706. [PubMed: 15033648]

32. LaBrie JW, Kenney SR, Mirza T, Lac A. Identifying factors that increase the likelihood of driving after drinking among college students. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*. 2011; 43(4):1371–1377. [PubMed: 21545868]
33. Lacey, JH.; Kelley-Baker, T.; Furr-Holden, D., et al. 2007 National Roadside Survey of Alcohol and Drug Use by Drivers: Alcohol Results. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; Washington, DC: 2009.
34. Lacey, JH.; Kelley-Baker, T.; Furr-Holden, D., et al. 2007 National Roadside Survey of alcohol and Drug Use by Drivers: Drug Results. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; Washington, DC: 2009.
35. Knight JR, Shrier LA, Bravender TD, Farrell M, Vander Bilt J, Shaffer HJ. A new brief screen for adolescent substance abuse. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. Jun; 1999 153(6):591–596. [PubMed: 10357299]
36. Norberg MM, Mackenzie J, Copeland J. Quantifying cannabis use with the Timeline Followback approach: A psychometric evaluation. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2012; 121(3):247–252. [PubMed: 21955364]
37. Pedersen ER, Grow J, Duncan S, Neighbors C, Larimer ME. Concurrent validity of an online version of the Timeline Followback assessment. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2012; 26(3): 672–677. [PubMed: 22486334]
38. Vakili S, Sobell LC, Sobell MB, Simco ER, Agrawal S. Using the Timeline Followback to determine time windows representative of annual alcohol consumption with problem drinkers. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2008; 33(9):1123–1130. [PubMed: 18562125]
39. Turner J, Keller A, Bauerle J. The Longitudinal Pattern of Alcohol-Related Injury in a College Population: Emergency Department Data Compared to Self-Reported Data. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*. 2010; 36(4):194–198. [PubMed: 20560838]

Table 1

Demographic and substance use characteristics of underage college students, age 18-20 years

	Males N=138	Females N=177	Total N=315	P value
Demographics				
Race/Ethnicity, No. (%)				0.98
White	106 (76.8)	132 (74.6)	238 (75.6)	
Black	2 (1.4)	3 (1.7)	5 (1.6)	
Hispanic	5 (3.6)	5 (2.8)	10 (3.2)	
Asian	13 (9.4)	22 (12.4)	35 (11.1)	
Other	12 (8.7)	15 (8.5)	27 (8.6)	
University, No. (%)				0.63
Washington	54 (39.1)	74 (41.8)	128 (40.6)	
Wisconsin	84 (60.9)	103 (58.2)	187 (59.4)	
Driving Characteristics, No. (%)				
Have driver license	130 (94.2)	164 (92.7)	294 (93.3)	0.59
Reported always wearing seatbelt	110 (79.7)	158 (89.3)	268 (85.1)	0.02
Have car at school	14 (10.1)	18 (10.2)	32 (10.2)	0.53
Substance Use				
Use of alcohol or marijuana in past 28 days, No. (%)	96 (69.6)	114 (64.4)	210 (66.7)	0.34
<i>Marijuana</i>				
Age at first marijuana use [*] , mean (SD)	17 (1.4)	17 (1.3)	17 (1.3)	0.99
Past 28-day marijuana use				0.00
0 days	97 (70.3)	154 (87.0)	251 (79.7)	
1 - 4 days	16 (11.6)	19 (10.7)	35 (11.1)	
5 or more days	25 (18.1)	4 (2.3)	29 (9.2)	
No. of days using marijuana [*] , mean (SD)	10.5 (9.8)	3 (3.4)	7.8 (8.8)	0.00
% friends using marijuana, mean (SD)	33.2 (24.8)	30 (23.4)	31.4 (24.0)	0.25
<i>Alcohol</i>				
Age at first alcohol use [*] , mean (SD)	16.1 (1.7)	16.5 (1.5)	16.3 (1.6)	0.06
Past 28-day alcohol use				0.10
0 days	46 (33.3)	64 (36.2)	110 (34.9)	
1 - 4 days	47 (34.1)	74 (41.8)	121 (38.4)	
5 or more days	45 (32.6)	39 (22.0)	84 (26.7)	
No. of days using alcohol [*] , mean (SD)	5.3 (4.2)	4.2 (3.8)	4.7 (3.8)	0.02
No. of days binge drinking [*] , mean (SD)	3.3 (3.5)	2.3 (3.3)	2.8 (3.4)	0.02
AUDIT score				0.01
<8	75 (54.3)	118 (66.7)	193 (61.3)	
8-14 (hazardous)	52 (37.7)	38 (21.5)	90 (28.6)	
>15 (dependence)	9 (6.5)	14 (7.9)	23 (7.3)	
% friends using alcohol, mean (SD)	70.6 (23.6)	71.7 (24.8)	71 (24.2)	0.66
Alcohol and marijuana use on the same day ^{**}	32 (23.2)	15 (8.5)	47 (14.9)	0.00

Note. AUDIT=Alcohol use disorders identification test;

P-value from chi-square test (differences in proportions) or t tests (differences in means)

* Among those who used the substance in the past 28 days.

** Alcohol and marijuana may not have been used at the same time

Table 2

Past 28-day prevalence of driving or riding after marijuana or alcohol use among underage college students

Driving or Riding Behavior	Males	Females	Total	P value
All students	138	177	315	
Drove after marijuana use, n (%)	18 (13.0)	2 (1.1)	20 (6.3)	<0.001
Rode with marijuana-using driver, n (%)	29 (21.0)	12 (6.8)	41 (13.0)	<0.001
Drove after drinking alcohol, n (%)	11 (8.0)	3 (1.7)	14 (4.4)	0.01
Rode with drinking driver, n (%)	21 (15.2)	16 (9.0)	37 (11.7)	0.09
Students who used marijuana in past 28 days	41	23	64	0.01
Drove after marijuana use, n (%)	18 (43.9)	2 (8.7)	20 (31.3)	<0.001
Rode with marijuana-using driver, n (%)	21 (51.2)	8 (34.8)	29 (45.3)	0.21
Students who used alcohol in past 28 days	92	113	205	
Drove after drinking alcohol, n (%)	11 (12.0)	3 (2.7)	14 (6.8)	0.01
Rode with drinking driver, n (%)	19 (20.7)	13 (11.5)	32 (15.6)	0.07
Students who used either substance in past 28 days	96	114	210	
Drove after substance use, n (%)	24 (25.0)	5 (4.4)	29 (13.8)	0.00
Rode with substance-using driver, n (%)	40 (42.0)	22 (19.3)	62 (29.5)	0.00
Students who used no substances in past 28 days	42	63	105	
Rode with substance-using driver, n(%)	3 (7.1)	4 (6.4)	7 (6.7)	0.83

Note. P-values obtained from chi-squared tests

Table 3

Adjusted relative risk of driving or riding after marijuana use among underage college students

	<u>Drove after marijuana use</u>			<u>Rode with a marijuana-using driver</u>		
	Current users only (N=64)			All students (N=315)		
	RR	95% CI		RR	95% CI	
Rode with MJ using driver	5.72	1.84	17.80			
Drove after MJ use				4.42	2.40	8.14
Drove after drinking	2.45	1.39	4.31			
Reported always wearing seatbelt				0.55	0.33	0.91
Age at first marijuana use	0.78	0.63	0.97			
% of friends using marijuana				1.02	1.01	1.03

Note. RR=Relative risk. Initial multivariate models also adjusted for sex, university, riding with a drinking driver, and the number of days of marijuana use in the past 28 days. These covariates were non-significant and were excluded from the final models.

Table 4

Adjusted relative risk of driving or riding after drinking alcohol among underage college students

	<u>Drove after drinking</u>			<u>Rode with drinking driver</u>		
	Current drinkers only (N=205)			All students (N=315)		
	RR	95% CI		RR	95% CI	
Rode with drinking driver	7.24	2.45	21.35			
Drove after drinking				4.73	2.54	8.08
Reported always wearing seatbelt	0.20	0.09	0.48			
# days binge drinking in past 28 days				1.12	1.08	1.17
# days non-binge drinking in past 28 days	1.15	1.09	1.22	1.07	1.01	1.13

Note. RR = Relative risk. Initial multivariate model also included sex, university, rode with marijuana-using driver, drove after marijuana use, age at first alcohol use, positive AUDIT score, and % of friends who drink alcohol. These covariates were non-significant and were excluded from the final models.

Table 5

Relative risk of driving after use of any substance among underage college students with any past 28-day use of marijuana or alcohol (N=210)

	IRR	95% CI	
Substance used in past 28 days			
Alcohol only	(ref)		
Marijuana only	6.24	1.89	21.17
Alcohol and marijuana	2.46	0.94	6.46
Male	2.46	0.97	6.28
Number of days in past 28 using either marijuana or alcohol	1.06	1.03	1.09
Reported always wearing seatbelt	0.34	0.18	0.64
AUDIT positive	2.86	1.07	7.65

AUDIT= Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test. Positive score was defined as >8 indicating hazardous or dependent drinking.