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Abstract


Methods—As part of a 1994 national telephone survey of 5238 randomly dialed households, adult respondents reported data on bicycle helmet ownership and helmet use among 1645 child bicyclists. Data were weighted to provide national estimates.

Results—It is estimated that 72.7% of children 5–14 year olds ride bicycles, that is, 27.7 million child bicyclists. Of the bicyclists, 50.2% have a helmet and 25.0% reportedly always wore their helmet when cycling. Reported helmet ownership and use increased with income and educational level and decreased with age. Among regions of the US, those with the highest proportion of states with helmet use laws in 1994 also had the highest proportion of helmet use among children. Among child bicyclists who had been seen by a health care provider in the preceding 12 months, 43.9% of those counseled to wear a bicycle helmet were reported to comply compared with 19.1% of those seen by a provider but not so counseled (p < 0.001).

Conclusions—To meet the year 2000 objective of 50% of bicyclists wearing helmets, use among American children will have to double. Concerted and increased efforts to promote the wearing of bicycle helmets are necessary.
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Bicycle riding, a common activity of American children, causes substantial morbidity and mortality. In particular, head injury is the most common cause of death and serious disability from bicycle related accidents.1 Bicycle crashes cause an average of 247 traumatic brain injury deaths and 140,000 head injuries each year in the US among persons younger than 20 years.4 Indeed, bicycle related head injuries are a problem in many parts of the world.5-7

Because bicycle safety helmets substantially reduce the risk of head injury,8-11 a year 2000 goal for the US is for 50% of bicyclists to wear helmets.12 The most recent national survey for helmet usage, performed in 1991, estimated that only 11.7% of American children under 15 years wore helmets 'always' or 'almost always' when riding a bicycle.13 A 1993 survey targeting ninth through 12th graders found that helmet usage rates were much lower among adolescents; although 75% of these students had ridden a bicycle within the year, 93% reported rarely or never wearing a helmet.14 It is estimated that as many as 184 deaths and 116,000 head injuries might be prevented annually if all child and adolescent bicyclists wore helmets.

In 1994, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention conducted the Injury Control and Risk Survey (ICARIS), a national survey designed to assess a wide variety of injury risk factors. This report summarizes data from that survey about bicycle helmet ownership and use among American children in 1994.

Methods

We conducted a random digit dial telephone survey from 28 April through 18 September 1994. From a listing of all exchanges in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, we stratified telephone exchanges by whether they had >= 10% of households occupied by minorities. Such exchanges were sampled at a higher rate than the others. At least six attempts were made to contact each number.

To ensure equal numbers of male and female respondents, once a household was reached, we determined the number of adult (aged 18 years and older) men and women residing there. Using a random procedure, we then selected one gender category from those applicable to the household; if more than one eligible individual was in the gender category, we asked for the individual with the most recent birthday. If a household member agreed to participate, an English or Spanish speaking adult respondent reported on household and individual factors, such as total pretax household income and highest educational level. After enumeration of the age and sex of children under the age of 15 years, respondents were asked, for each child between age 5 and 14, if the child had ridden a bicycle in the preceding 30 days. For each child who had ridden, the respondent was asked if the child had a bicycle helmet, and if yes, how often the child wore a helmet while riding during the preceding 30 days (always, more than half the time, half the time, less than half the time, never). For answers of 'no' to helmet ownership, respondents were asked why the child didn’t own a helmet. For answers of usage...
half the time or less, respondents were asked why the child didn’t wear a helmet more often. In tallying responses about bicycle riding, helmet ownership, and helmet use, ‘don’t know’ and ‘refusal’ responses were classified as

no’ (‘don’t know’ = three children to riding, three to helmet owning, and 16 to helmet wearing; refusals = one, zero, and zero children, respectively). Only reported ‘always use’ of a helmet was counted as ‘use’ for the purposes of analysis.

For one randomly selected child, the respondent was asked if the child had seen or visited a physician or nurse during the preceding 12 months. If yes, respondents were asked if, during these visits, anyone gave the child or family member any written information or spoke to them about bicycle safety helmets. Responses of ‘don’t know’ were considered as ‘no’.

Data were weighted to provide national estimates and percentages. Household weights combine a sampling weight (the inverse of the probability of selection of the study unit) and a ratio adjustment (the ratio of the March 1994 Current Population Survey (CPS) number of households to the study estimates by census region and location in a metropolitan statistical area). Data on each child in the household was further weighted to reflect the March 1994 CPS estimates for the relevant age-sex-race group. In effect, the ratio adjustment procedure combines the weights of children in a particular age-sex-race group in an area of the country to fully represent all such similar children in that area.

To account for the complex survey design, we used SUDAAN® software for the statistical analysis of correlated data. This software package allowed us to obtain estimates using the proper design parameters and compute appropriate standard errors of these estimates. Failure to account for the complex survey design may result in an underestimate of the variance and a subsequent overestimate of the significance. Using SUDAAN, we generated weighted estimates and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the American population. The log-likelihood χ² test in SUDAAN assessed independence between our outcomes (helmet ownership and use) and selected demographic characteristics of our study population. To provide adjusted estimates of univariate predictors, we used logistic regression in SUDAAN. Because income had so many missing values, and because income and educational level often are related, we used highest educational level in the household in our modeling procedures. We used the adjusted Wald-F test to assess statistical significance of variables in our model.

### Results

Interviews were completed for 5238 households (response rate = 5238 completed interviews/[5238 completed interviews + 3630 refusals + 474 incomplete interviews] = 56.1%). Of these 5328 households, 1490 contained one or more children aged 5–14 years, for a total of 2343 children in this age group. Of these 2343 children, 1645 (weighted 72.7%) were reported to have ridden a bicycle in the preceding month, that is, an estimated
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Table 3  Top four adult reported reasons for American child bicyclists aged 5–14 years not owning or wearing a helmet, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Unweighted No of riders (n = 1645)</th>
<th>Weighted % of riders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't own helmet</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>49-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low risk*</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>14-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never considered</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>11-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Won't wear</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmet owners</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>50-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always and &gt;50%, users</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>32-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;50%, of time users</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>17-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low risk*</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child won't wear</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical issues;</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer concerns</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses = helmet not necessary, child is infrequent rider, or child only rides in safe areas.
†Reasons were only asked for bicyclists reported to use helmets half the time or less.
‡Responses = uncomfortable, fit problem, helmet damaged or lost, interferes with riding.

Discussion

Despite a variety of community efforts to increase the use of bicycle helmets among children, helmet wearing is still not typical behavior among child bicyclists in the US, especially older children. There is no single reason why helmet ownership and use is not more popular; however, 'low perceived risk' and 'never considering the issue' were the most frequently offered reasons for non-use in this and in some other surveys.13 While direct interviewing of children may reveal somewhat different reasons for non-use (for example peer pressure, unattractiveness of helmets),12 our results suggest that educational efforts targeted at parents and health care providers may provide some additional impetus for behavior change, especially for younger children who are typically under more 'parental control' than older children.

Clearly, helmet ownership is a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for helmet use. Our finding that helmet ownership and use is associated with household income and age of the child, confirms the findings of other telephone surveys.13 While discount or rebate programs for helmets have been suggested as a means to increase use among low income child-

27-7 million child bicyclists. Characteristics associated with bicycle riding were age and sex of child, household income, and census region (table 1). Helmets were reported owned by 817 (weighted 50-2%) riders (table 2). Characteristics associated with ownership were age and sex of child, household income, highest educational level in the household, and census region (table 2, figure). Among all riders, reported helmet 'always' use was 25-0% (table 2). Rider characteristics associated with 'always' use were lower age of child, higher household income, higher educational level, and census region (table 2, figure). The most frequently offered reason for not owning, or wearing a helmet more often, was low perceived risk (table 3).

Multivariable modeling suggested that the strongest predictors of both helmet ownership and helmet wearing were location in the Northeast or West, aged 5–9 years old, and higher educational achievement within the household (table 4).

Among 706 child bicyclists who had been seen by a health care provider in the preceding 12 months, 138 had been counseled to wear a bicycle helmet and 66 (weighted 43-9%) were reported to comply. By contrast, among 568 seen by a provider but not counseled to wear a helmet, 109 (weighted 19-1%) were reported always wearing a helmet (p < 0-001).

Another perspective comes from data on seat belt use and bicycle helmet wearing. Among 1610 child bicyclists with data on seat belt use and bicycle helmet wearing, the weighted 'always' helmet use rate was 31-4% among 1212 children always using a seat belt compared with 7-1%, helmet use among 398 children not always wearing a seat belt (p < 0-001).

Table 4  Relationship between selected characteristics and the likelihood of bicycle helmet ownership and use, US 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic*</th>
<th>For helmet owning†</th>
<th>For helmet wearing‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>2-02 (1-58 to 2-57)</td>
<td>2-31 (1-73 to 3-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–14</td>
<td>1-00 (referent)</td>
<td>1-00 (referent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>1-22 (0-96 to 1-97)</td>
<td>1-00 (0-75 to 1-33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>1-00 (referent)</td>
<td>1-00 (referent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; PG</td>
<td>3-94 (2-47 to 5-31)</td>
<td>2-40 (1-48 to 3-89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; CG</td>
<td>2-86 (1-79 to 4-05)</td>
<td>1-90 (1-17 to 3-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; HS and &lt; CG</td>
<td>1-51 (1-04 to 2-18)</td>
<td>0-69 (0-45 to 1-06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-00 (referent)</td>
<td>1-00 (referent)</td>
<td>1-00 (referent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>4-18 (2-80 to 5-72)</td>
<td>4-43 (2-80 to 7-00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>3-76 (2-90 to 5-07)</td>
<td>3-56 (2-32 to 5-52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>0-84 (0-56 to 1-24)</td>
<td>0-70 (0-40 to 1-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1-00 (referent)</td>
<td>1-00 (referent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Odds ratios are relative to the referent group after adjusting for all other factors in the model.
†Referent groups chosen on the basis of lowest percent of bicyclists.
‡All variables significant at p = 0-001 except for sex of child (p = 0-107).
§Helmet wearing = 'always' use. All variables significant at p < 0-001 except for sex of child (p = 0-992).
¶Highest educational level achieved in the household (HS = high school, CG = college graduate, PG = postgraduate).
ren, it is not clear that this approach is consistently effective.20,21

From our data, it appeared that about half of helmet owners always use them and this proportion was similar across income groups (table 2). This estimated ‘always use’ proportion among owners is lower than one study estimated (83%),20 but roughly the same as in two other studies.12,22 An accurate estimate of the ratio of use to ownership might provide direction in developing new approaches to evaluating community bicycle helmet promotion programs.

The strong association between prior counseling by a health care provider and the likelihood of helmet use was intriguing. Studies have suggested that counseling in such settings may influence behavior23 and helmet use.24 Interestingly, although boys appear at higher risk of bicycle related head injury than girls,4 within this age group 25% of the cases (Circumstances and severity of bicycle injuries: a report to the Snell Memorial Foundation. DC Thompson, FP Rivara, RS Thompson, unpublished manuscript). Recent studies also suggest that adults may over-report childhood helmet use relative to what is observed in the community or at schools.25 If that is the case here, then helmet use is even lower than the 25% we have estimated.

Conversely, because we defined use as ‘always’ use, we may have underestimated use. Some of those classified as non-users may wear helmets some of the time. However, studies of self reported seat belt use and observed behavior,26 and studies comparing aggregated parental reports on bicycle helmet use to observations of children,27 suggest that only classifying ‘always’ users as users may better emulate what is observed.

Implications for prevention

Medical care for bicycle related injuries in the US costs an estimated $8 billion dollars per year.28 Raising childhood helmet usage could prevent many deaths and injuries and result in substantial cost savings.24 Bicycle helmet use laws appear effective in increasing helmet use among children.16,17 It is of interest, therefore, that among census regions of the US, those with the highest proportion of states with statewide helmet use laws in 1994 also had the highest proportion of helmet use among children (figure). In the Northeast, for example, four of nine states has such laws in 1994 and 71-4% and 44.7% of child bicyclists owned and used bicycles, respectively. In the Midwest, only two states had such laws, and helmet ownership and use were the lowest at 33.9% and 11.2%, respectively. To meet the Healthy People 2000 objective of 50% of bicyclists wearing helmets,29 use among children will have to double. While there appears to have been a doubling in use from 1991,30 concerted and increased efforts to promote the wearing of bicycle helmets by children appear necessary. In the health care setting, counseling children and parents of bicycle riding children29 may be a useful adjunct to other efforts.
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