Use of Child Safety Seats: Incentive and Education Programs

Summary Evidence Table

Study	Intervention Comparison Elements	Study Population	Outcome Measure	Reported Baseline	Reported Effect	Value used in summary ^a	Follow- Up Time
Author (Year): Foss, 1989	Reward: Monthly drawing for prizes \$50-200 value (entry to	Children and parents of	Observed use of child safety			Percentage point difference (pre vs.	7 weeks
Study Period: not reported Study Design: Time series	drawing by license plate number if seen with all child passengers correctly restrained)	children 0-12 years old	seats among children aged 0–5 years	26.8%	31.6%	post) +4.8%, [95%	
	,	Sample size:	o 3 years	20.0 70	31.070	Confidence	
Design Suitability: Moderate	Other program elements: Radio, newspaper, poster, flyers to	7,003 observed				Interval: 1.5% – 8.0%]	
Quality of Execution: Fair	promote program					(significance not reported)	
Evaluation Setting: Community-wide	Comparison: No program available in pre-intervention period						
Author (Year): Roberts et al. (1986)	Reward: Cars with children correctly restrained upon arrival at school were awarded tokens coded	Children and parents of children 6	Observed correct use of child			Percentage point difference (pre vs. post)	3 months
Study Period: not reported	to gift certificates	months-6 years old in	safety seats				
Study Design: Time series	Other program elements: Reminder items: flyers, brochures;	Tuscaloosa, Alabama	Center I	48%	60.0%	+12%	
Design Suitability: Moderate	feedback: winners names posted with prizes won	Sample size:	Center II	11.3%	18.8%	+7.5%	
Quality of Execution: Fair	Comparison: No program available	3,500 observed	Total	29.7%	39.5%	+9.8%	
Evaluation Setting: Child day care centers	in pre-intervention period					(significance not reported)	
Author (Year): Roberts et al. (1987)	Reward: Children received stickers when correctly restrained	Children and parents of children 6	Observed correct use of child			Percentage point difference (pre vs. post)	1 month
Study Period: not reported	Other program elements: Parents received flyers about child auto	months-6 years old in	safety seats			. ,	
Study Design: Time series	safety, study, reward and conditions; posters	Tuscaloosa, Alabama	Center I	22.7%	36.4%	+13.7	
Design Suitability: Moderate	Comparison: No program available		Center II	34.2%	42.0%	+7.8%	

Study	Intervention Comparison Elements	Study Population	Outcome Measure	Reported Baseline	Reported Effect	Value used in summary ^a	Follow- Up Time
Quality of Execution: Fair	in pre-intervention period	90 children	Total	28.5%	39.3%	+10.8%	
Evaluation Setting: Child day care centers						(significance not reported)	
Author (Year): Stuy et al. (1993)	Reward: Sticker rewards when children correctly restrained	Children <3 to >5 years, low SES,	Observed correct use of child			Percentage point difference (intervention	immediate
Study Period: 1990	Other program elements: 20- minute weekly presentation on	intervention group 47%	safety seats			vs. comparison group)	
Study Design: Randomized community trial	safety; reinforcement; car safety videotapes; photographs of properly restrained children; published	African- American	Intervention	29%	65%	+36%, p<0.05	
Design Suitability: Greatest	material to parents; signed policy statement about transportation of	Sample size: 233 children	Control	25%	25%		
Quality of Execution: Fair	children to center						
Evaluation Setting: Child day care centers; unspecified Midwestern U.S. city	Comparison: No No program available to control parents; may have been exposed to car safety videotapes available at the center.						

^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.