

Use of Child Safety Seats: Community-Wide Information and Enhanced Enforcement Campaigns

Summary Evidence Tables

Programs in Communities with Existing Child Safety Seat Laws that Used Enhanced Enforcement Campaigns

Study	Intervention and comparison elements	Study Population and Sample	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary ^a	Follow-up time
<p>Author (Year): Lane et al. 1984</p> <p>Study Period: 1981–1982</p> <p>Study Design: Time series</p> <p>Design Suitability: Moderate:</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair</p> <p>Evaluation Setting: Community-wide: Victoria, Australia</p>	<p>Intervention period: 10/81 to 2/82</p> <p>Media elements: TV, radio, and print media, press conference, shopping center displays, stickers in cabs</p> <p>Enforcement: Threat of enforcement; police distribution of warning leaflets or fines</p> <p>Comparison: Pre-program period</p>	<p>Study Population: Motor vehicle occupants aged 0–7 years at 4 survey sites</p> <p>Sample Size: 4920</p>	Observed child safety seat use in the vehicle's rear seat	65.2%	Pre/post difference: +20.8%, p<0.0001	+20.8%	1 month
<p>Author (Year): Decina et al. (1994)</p> <p>Study Period: 1990–1991</p> <p>Study Design: Non-randomized group trial</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair</p> <p>Evaluation Setting: Community-wide: Philadelphia, PA</p>	<p>Intervention period: 2/91 to 12/91</p> <p>Media elements: Police education activities (articles, visits to schools, lectures, exhibits, display booths), educational and promotional items, child safety seat clinic; displays</p> <p>Enforcement: Regular enforcement plus "blitz" campaigns (not described)</p> <p>Comparison: Comparison community in PA</p>	<p>Study Population: Motor vehicle occupants aged 1–5 years in two intervention communities and one comparison community</p> <p>Sample Size: 5859</p>	Observed correct use of child safety seats	Intervention: 62.3% Comparison: 63.4%	Pre/post difference: +8.75% -4.3% (significance not reported)	Before/after difference between intervention and comparison groups: +13.1%	1 month

Programs in Communities with Existing Child Safety Seat Laws but Without Enhanced Enforcement

Study	Intervention and comparison elements	Study Population and Sample	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary ^a	Follow-up time
<p>Author (Year): Heathington et al. (1982)</p> <p>Study Period: 1977–1978</p> <p>Study Design: Time series</p> <p>Design Suitability: Moderate</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair</p> <p>Evaluation Setting: Community-wide: TN</p>	<p>Intervention period: 10/77 to 7/80</p> <p>Basic Plan Distribution of brochures and posters in hospitals, clinics, other public sites</p> <p>Comprehensive: PSAs, news spots, TV and State Plan radio talk shows, newspaper articles and editorials, billboards</p> <p>Other: Loan programs for low income families (not evaluated)</p> <p>Comparison: Pre-program period</p>	<p>Study Population: Motor vehicle occupants aged 0–3 years throughout Tennessee</p> <p>Sample Size: 68,884</p>	<p>Observed use of child safety seats</p> <p>Basic Plan</p> <p>Comprehensive Plan</p>	<p>9.2%</p> <p>13.6%</p>	<p>Pre/post difference:</p> <p>+4.4%</p> <p>+3.8% (compared to Basic Plan) (significance not reported)</p>	<p>+4.4%</p> <p>+3.8%</p>	<p>Minimum 6 month follow-up</p>

Programs in Communities Without Existing Child Safety Seat Laws

Study	Intervention and comparison elements	Study Population and Sample	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary ^a	Follow-up time
<p>Author (Year): Pless et al. (1986)</p> <p>Study Period: 1981</p> <p>Study Design: Before-and-after</p> <p>Design Suitability: Least</p>	<p>Intervention period: 5/81 to 10/81</p> <p>Media elements: Targeted to French-speaking population: press conference, TV and radio PSAs (2/day-1/week), TV and radio programming, posters, pamphlets</p>	<p>Study Population: Motor vehicle occupants aged 0–4 and 5–11 years at 4 survey sites; 2 sites were in</p>	<p>Observed correct use of child safety seats</p> <p>0–4 years</p>	<p>20.4%</p>	<p>Pre/post difference:</p> <p>+13.7%, $\chi^2=39.3$,</p>	<p>Pre/post difference between age groups:</p> <p>+12.3%</p>	<p>1 month</p>

<p>Quality of Execution: Fair</p> <p>Evaluation Setting: Community-wide: Montreal, Canada</p>	<p>Other: Concurrent campaigns aimed at English-speaking audience in New York and Vermont (spillover likely)</p> <p>Comparison: Pre-program period and older children not covered by law</p>	<p>primarily French-speaking areas, 2 in primarily English-speaking areas</p> <p>Sample Size: 3959</p>	<p>5–11 years</p>	<p>7.2%</p>	<p>p<0.001</p> <p>+1.4 (not significant)</p> <p>Effect driven by sites with higher proportions of English-speaking mothers and higher SES</p>		
---	--	---	-------------------	-------------	--	--	--

^a This is the value we used to summarize the evidence and to develop the recommendation. In some cases, this column reflects values we calculated because the effects reported by the authors were not consistent with effect measures used in other studies.