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## Chapter 1

## INTRODUCTION

In December, 1984, The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute conducted a direct-observation survey of 17,568 motor vehicle occupants throughout the State of Michigan. The December survey found $19.5 \%$ of drivers and $17.6 \%$ of front seat passengers were restrained. Restraint use among all drivers and passengers averaged 19.8\%. Of the 538 children under four observed, $60.8 \%$ were restrained, as required by the Michigan Child Restraint law. Differential restraint use was examined by age, sex, seating position, time of day, day of week, type of roadway, weather conditions, vehicle type and size, and region of state. The reader is referred to the earlier report for complete results of the December, 1984 survey (Wagenaar and Wiviott, 1985).

On March 8, 1985, Public Act No. 1 of 1985 was signed into law, requiring front-seat occupants of motor vehicles traveling in Michigan to use seat belts beginning July 1, 1985. This report presents results from a direct observational survey conducted in April, 1985, the second of two pre-belt-law surveys. These results, combined with the data collected in December, 1984, will function as a baseline from which the effects of the law will be measured. In addition, the current survey will provide information on the effect of publicity surrounding passage of the mandatory use law on restraint use, independent of its implementation, since the second survey was conducted after the law was passed by the legislature and signed by the governor, but before it took effect.

## Chapter 2

## METHODS

To ensure comparability across survey waves, the same methods were used in the December, 1984 and April, 1985 survey waves, except for a few minor differences. The sample design, data collection methods, and analytic procedures are discussed in detail in the earlier report (Wagenaar and Wiviott, 1985). In both waves, trained observers observed motor vehicles at a carefully selected probability sample of 240 intersections throughout the state. Observers recorded restraint use, seat position, estimated age, and sex for all occupants in each observed vehicle. In addition, the size and type of the vehicle was recorded in the December, 1984, wave. In April, 1985 , the license plate number was recorded instead of the vehicle size and type. Accurate recording of license plate numbers by the observers was generally not a problem. However, for other reasons, collection of license plate numbers proved to be somewhat more difficult than originally anticipated. Despite attempts to record the plate numbers discreetly, observers on several occasions were personally threatened by belligerent drivers who did not wish to have their plate numbers recorded. On rare occasions bellicose drivers exited their vehicles and demanded that the record of their plate number be destroyed. Occasionally drivers would drive around the block and pass the observer a second time. These intimidating actions made the tasks of the observers more difficult. Because lack of seat belt use will be a violation of law beginning July 1 , drivers may become increasingly suspicious of observers who record their vehicle license plate numbers.

In the current survey wave, recorded license plate numbers were matched with information obtained from vehicle registration data recorded by the Michigan Department of State. Of the total of 12,345 vehicles observed, license plate numbers were not recorded by observers for only $262(2.1 \%)$. An additional 406 vehicles ( $3.3 \%$ ) had out-of-state license plates. Finally, no matching registration information was found for 144 (1.2\%) vehicles. Lack of matching registration information may be a result of observer recording errors or unregistered vehicles. In total, 812 of 12,345 vehicles ( $6.6 \%$ ) could not be matched with registration information. For the vehicles that were matched, the vehicle make/model information provided by the vehicle registration records was of limited use. The make/model information recorded was frequently not specific enough for accurate coding into the vehicle size/type variable used in this series of seat
belt surveys. ${ }^{1}$ More accurate information was available in the form of vehicle identification numbers. However, considerable effort is required to code vehicle size and type from these numbers. Because of limited utility of the vehicle registration data, and because observed motorists are increasingly annoyed at having their license plate numbers recorded, in future survey waves we will return to having observers directly code vehicle size and type, as in the December, 1984, survey.

Detailed information on the seating positions of all occupants, including nonstandard seating positions, was recorded. Specifically, observers noted whether passengers were sitting, standing, kneeling, or lying on the seat, floor, or cargo area of the vehicle. Passengers riding on the lap of another occupant were recorded. The objective was to collect a complete complement of restraint use and related information on all occupants of the vehicles included in the sample.

The December, 1984, and April, 1985 waves included the same sample of 240 sites. In both survey waves, every site selected into the probability sample was observed. One full-time observer visited 120 sites, the second full-time observer visited 92 sites; 28 sites were visited by the field supervisor. A fourth observer worked with one of the full-time observers at central city sites where two-person observation teams were required. At these sites the two observers collected data at the same intersection but from different paths of traffic. Each observer typically recorded 27 vehicles at each site, providing a total of 54 vehicles for each of the 27 Detroit sites. Using two-person teams for central city sites allowed for efficient and rapid collection of data while providing security for the observers. Descriptive statistics for the 240 observation sites are shown in Table 2.1.

Actual number of cases observed across categories of the major variables are shown in Table 2.2. Restraint use estimates based on a small number of cases, such as those for occupants in extra seats, cargo areas, or in laps, need to be interpreted with care.

In addition to showing the actual number of cases by subcategory, Table 2.2 indicates the extent of missing data for each variable. The key restraint item was missing for only $2.9 \%$ of all occupants observed. These are cases in which the observer could not accurately identify whether the occupant was restrained. Belt use was not recorded for only $0.6 \%$ of the 12,345 drivers observed, and $2.4 \%$ of the 4,158 right front occupants observed. Restraint use could not be determined for 14 of 31 occupants of third and fourth seats of station wagons or vans. Front center and rear seat occupants had moderate levels of missing data on restraint use (12 to $25 \%$ ). Missing data for all other variables was less than $1 \%$.

[^0]TABLE 2.1
Descriptive Statistics for the 240 Observation Sites

| Day of Week |  | Start Time |  | Site Choice |  | Weather |  | Observer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monday | 13.3\% | 7-10 AM | 19.1\% | Primary | 98.3\% | Sunny | 76.2\% | (A) | 50.0\% |
| Tuesday | 14.6\% | 10-12 AM | 24.2\% | Alternate | 1.7\% | Cloudy | 20.4\% | (B) | 38.3\% |
| Wednesday | 15.8\% | 12-2 PM | 22.5\% |  |  | Rain | 2.9\% |  | 11.7\% |
| Thursday | 15.0\% | 2-4 PM | 22.9\% |  |  | Snow | 0.4\% |  |  |
| Friday | 15.0\% | 4-7 PM | 11.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Saturday | 13.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sunday | 12.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTALS | 100\% |  | 100\% |  | 100\% |  | 100\% |  | 100\% |

TABLE 2.2
Sample Distributions for Major Variables by Seating Position, Unweighted Ns and Percent Missing Data

|  | Seating Position |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Driver | Front Center | Front <br> Right | Rear <br> Left | Rear Center | Rear <br> Right | Extra Seats | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cargo } \\ & \text { Area } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Held } \\ & \text { in Lap } \end{aligned}$ | All |
| Restraint Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 9,164 | 183 | 3,118 | 288 | 236 | 354 | 12 | 48 | 76 | 13,498 |
| Belted | 3,112 | 23 | 888 | 107 | 50 | 132 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4,316 |
| CRD Correct | - | 15 | 45 | 47 | 35 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 193 |
| CRD Wrong | - | 5 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Missing | 69 | 55 | 99 | 80 | 43 | 178 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 538 |
| \% Missing | 0.6 | 19.6 | 2.4 | 15.1 | 11.6 | 24.6 | 45.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 7,659 | 98 | 1,419 | 254 | 179 | 312 | 12 | 29 | 30 | 10,001 |
| Female | 4,675 | 158 | 2,717 | 258 | 175 | 394 | 3 | 17 | 28 | 8,430 |
| Missing | 11 | 25 | 22 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 2 | 18 | 150 |
| \% Missing | 0.1 | 8.9 | 0.5 | 3.2 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 51.6 | 4.2 | 23.7 | 0.8 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0-3 | - | 59 | 98 | 87 | 82 | 89 | 2 | 6 | 54 | 481 |
| 4-15 | 3 | 101 | 506 | 260 | 230 | 326 | 12 | 33 | 20 | 1,506 |
| 16-29 | 4,356 | 72 | 1,300 | 79 | 31 | 126 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5,971 |
| 30-59 | 6,620 | 33 | 1,605 | 68 | 15 | 115 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8,457 |
| 60+ | 1,319 | 9 | 615 | 29 | 7 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,041 |
| Missing | 47 | 7 | 34 | 6 |  | 5 | 12 | 7 | 1 | 125 |
| \% Missing | 0.4 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 38.7 | 14.6 | 1.3 | 0.7 |
| Site Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 10,001 | 249 | 3,489 | 446 | 316 | 596 | 16 | 42 | 67 | 15,238 |
| Freeway Exit | 2,344 | 32 | 669 | 83 | 55 | 127 | 15 | 6 | 9 | 3,343 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Day of Week |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monday | 1,617 | 24 | 457 | 43 | 27 | 58 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 2,241 |
| Tuesday | 1,908 | 29 | 517 | 55 | 56 | 96 | 10 | 11 | 8 | 2,690 |
| Wednesday | 1,988 | 32 | 524 | 62 | 28 | 89 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 2,749 |
| Thursday | 1,897 | 42 | 542 | 46 | 47 | 72 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 2,663 |
| Friday | 1,833 | 23 | 521 | 62 | 35 | 82 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 2,573 |
| Saturday | 1,607 | 61 | 748 | 112 | 73 | 139 | 8 | 11 | 14 | 2,775 |
| Sunday | 1,495 | 70 | 849 | 149 | 105 | 187 | 7 | 11 | 13 | 2,890 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE 2.2 Continued

|  | Seating Position |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Driver | Front Center | Front Right | Rear <br> Left | Rear <br> Center | Rear <br> Right | Extra Seats | Cargo Area | Held <br> in Lap | All |
| Time of Day |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7-9 AM | 862 | 9 | 186 | 27 | 16 | 40 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1,144 |
| 9-10 AM | 1,279 | 24 | 346 | 39 | 29 | 57 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 1,791 |
| 10-11 AM | 1,437 | 28 | 423 | 53 | 33 | 60 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 2,055 |
| 11-12 AM | 1,543 | 44 | 534 | 67 | 52 | 91 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 2,353 |
| 12-1 PM | 1,370 | 27 | 496 | 63 | 39 | 73 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2,082 |
| 1-2 PM | 1,166 | 17 | 444 | 50 | 32 | 73 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 1,798 |
| 2-3 PM | 1,376 | 31 | 505 | 59 | 41 | 80 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 2,109 |
| 3-4 PM | 1,439 | 34 | 522 | 69 | 44 | 100 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 2,231 |
| 4-5 PM | 1,107 | 33 | 388 | 52 | 45 | 80 | , | 12 | 6 | 1,731 |
| 5-7 PM | 766 | 34 | 314 | 50 | 40 | 69 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 1,287 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Weather |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sunny | 9,362 | 221 | 3,175 | 397 | 267 | 562 | 18 | 47 | 53 | 14,119 |
| Cloudy | 2,575 | 58 | 877 | 118 | 100 | 145 | 11 | 1 | 23 | 3,909 |
| Rain | 357 | 2 | 89 | 13 | 3 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 481 |
| Snow | 51 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MDOT Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Western U.P. | 581 | 20 | 246 | 38 | 20 | 53 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 967 |
| Eastern U.P. | 408 | 12 | 156 | 13 | 13 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 628 |
| Northwest | 611 | 14 | 186 | 21 | 12 | 32 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 884 |
| Northeast | 408 | 6 | 150 | 9 | 6 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 598 |
| West Central | 1,402 | 39 | 510 | 83 | 61 | 92 | 18 | 5 | 10 | 2,221 |
| East Central | 1,413 | 22 | 459 | 52 | 45 | 74 | 0 |  | 10 | 2,080 |
| Southwest | 1,378 | 48 | 562 | 78 | 46 | 106 | 10 | 18 | 5 | 2,259 |
| Southeast | 1,221 | 33 | 369 | 54 | 35 | 68 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1,788 |
| Metro Detroit | 4,923 | 87 | 1,520 | 181 | 133 | 262 | 2 | 12 | 34 | 7,156 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL N | 12,345 | 281 | 4,158 | 529 | 371 | 723 | 31 | 48 | 76 | 18,581 |

## Chapter 3

## RESULTS

Restraint use among drivers and passengers in Michigan during April, 1985 averaged 25.8\%, a clear increase from the $19.8 \%$ restrained in December, 1984, and the $12.9 \%$ restrained in August, 1983 (Figure 3.1). For drivers alone, $26.0 \%$ were restrained in April, 1985, compared to $19.5 \%$ in December, 1984, and $13.6 \%$ in August, 1983 (Figure 3.2). It appears that publicity surrounding passage of Michigan's mandatory seat belt use law has resulted in an increase in use of seat belts by motorists, even before the law takes effect.

Use of seat belts increased between December, 1984 and April, 1985 for all age groups except children under four, whose use remained at $60 \%$ (Table 3.1). ${ }^{2}$ Occupants age $4-15$ increased from $23.9 \%$ in December to $31.4 \%$ in April. Occupants age $16-29$ increased from $18.5 \%$ to $23.0 \%$. Similar figures for motorists age $30-59$ are from $18.4 \%$ to $25.9 \%$, and for those age 60 and over, from $14.6 \%$ to $21.8 \%$.

The largest increase in restraint use from December, 1984 to April, 1985 occurred among drivers, $19.5 \%$ to $26.0 \%$, and right front passengers, $17.4 \%$ to $23.9 \%$ (Figure 3.3). This pattern may be because the seat belt law to take effect July 1 applies only to front seat occupants.

Female motor vehicle occupants increased their seat belt use from December to April slightly more than males (Table 3.2). Males increased from $17.5 \%$ to $23.4 \%$, and females from $21.9 \%$ to $28.5 \%$. As a result, the sex differential in use noted in the earlier report remains, with males less likely to use belts than females.

The increased use of seat belts between December and April was particularly pronounced for freeway travel. Observed restraint use at freeway exits increased 9.1 percentage points, from $23.3 \%$ to $32.4 \%$ (Table 3.2). The increase at regular intersections was 5.5 percentage points. This change accentuated the belt use difference between motorists at freeway and regular intersections, with freeway exits having substantially higher rates of restraint use.

The use of seat belts increased at all times of the day, except the period from 5 to 7 p.m. Restraint use among motorists traveling in the early evening decreased from $27.8 \%$ in December to $24.2 \%$ in April (Table 3.3 and Figure 3.4). The largest increase in restraint use, from $19.7 \%$ to $32.9 \%$, occurred from 7 to 9 a.m. These differences may be partly a result of differences in the

[^1]FIGURE 3.1
Restraint Use by Age


FIGURE 3.2
Driver Restraint Use by Age


TABLE 3.1
Restraint Use by Age and Seating Position ${ }^{1}$

| Age Group | Seating Position |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Driver | Front Center | Front Right | Rear Left | Rear Center | Rear Right | Extra Seats | Cargo Area | Held in Lap | $\mathrm{All}^{2}$ |
| Age 0-3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Belted | - | 14.5 | 18.5 | 17.3 | 8.3 | 18.7 | 44.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.7 |
| \% Correct CRD | - | 26.2 | 45.5 | 53.5 | 42.0 | 55.7 | 55.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 39.8 |
| \% Incorrect CRD | - | 10.4 | 5.1 | 8.2 | 8.5 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 |
| \% Restrained ${ }^{3}$ | - | 51.1 | 69.1 | 79.0 | 58.8 | 82.6 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 60.2 |
| Unweighted N | - | 59 | 98 | 87 | 82 | 89 | 2 | 6 | 54 | 481 |
| Age 4-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 42.2 | 18.0 | 36.2 | 35.2 | 23.0 | 37.6 | 25.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 31.4 |
| Unweighted N | 3 | 101 | 506 | 260 | 230 | 326 | 12 | 33 | 20 | 1,506 |
| Age 16-29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 26.0 | 0.0 | 16.2 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 23.0 |
| Unweighted N | 4,356 | 72 | 1,300 | 79 | 31 | 126 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5,971 |
| Age 30-59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 26.9 | 0.0 | 23.6 | 16.8 | 0.0 | 13.1 | - | 0.0 | - | 25.9 |
| Unweighted N | 6,620 | 33 | 1,605 | 68 | 15 | 115 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8,457 |
| Age 60+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 22.1 | 0.0 | 22.8 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | - | - | - | 21.8 |
| Unweighted N | 1,319 | 9 | 615 | 29 | 7 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,041 |
| All Ages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 26.0 | 19.0 | 23.9 | 35.9 | 28.4 | 34.6 | 30.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.8 |
| Unweighted N | 12,345 | 281 | 4,158 | 529 | 371 | 723 | 31 | 48 | 76 | 18,581 |

[^2]FIGURE 3.3
Restraint Use by Seat Position

$\square \backslash$ December, 1984
April, 1985

TABLE 3.2
Percent Restraint Use by Sex, Observation Site, and Weather Conditions ${ }^{1}$

|  | Seating Position |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Driver | Front Center | Front Right | Rear Left | Rear Center | Rear Right | Extra Seats ${ }^{2}$ | $\mathrm{All}^{3}$ |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 23.4 | 17.7 | 20.1 | 34.2 | 31.2 | 35.6 | 34.1 | 23.4 |
| Female | 30.3 | 18.2 | 25.6 | 34.9 | 23.8 | 32.5 | 39.3 | 28.5 |
| Observation Site |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 24.1 | 18.2 | 22.9 | 34.6 | 27.2 | 35.0 | 31.8 | 24.3 |
| Freeway Exit | 33.6 | 26.4 | 28.1 | 42.2 | 35.1 | 32.7 | 0.0 | 32.4 |
| Weather Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mostly Sunny | 25.1 | 19.8 | 24.1 | 36.6 | 30.0 | 37.5 | 35.9 | 25.4 |
| Mostly Cloudy | 25.9 | 16.7 | 19.6 | 34.3 | 22.0 | 26.2 | 0.0 | 24.4 |
| Raining | 42.3 | 0.0 | 43.8 | 30.8 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 41.7 |
| Snowing | 62.7 | - | 58.8 | - | - | 50.0 | - | $59.7{ }^{4}$ |
| TOTAL | 26.0 | 19.0 | 23.9 | 35.9 | 28.4 | 34.6 | 30.2 | 25.8 |

${ }^{1}$ All percents are based on analyses weighted according to the sample design to accurately represent the entire state. Restraint use includes correct and incorrect use of child restraint devices.
${ }^{2}$ Based on only 31 observed occupants.
${ }^{3}$ Restraint use for all positions includes passengers traveling in cargo areas, passengers held in laps, and passengers standing.
${ }^{4}$ Only 51 vehicles were observed while it was snowing.

TABLE 3.3
Percent Restraint Use by Time of Day and Day of Week ${ }^{1}$

|  | Seating Position |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Driver | Front <br> Center | Front <br> Right | Rear <br> Left | Rear Center | Rear <br> Right | Extra Seats ${ }^{2}$ | All $^{3}$ |
| Time of Day |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7-9 AM | 33.0 | 22.7 | 30.4 | 34.8 | 34.5 | 42.6 | 66.7 | 32.9 |
| 9-10 AM | 23.8 | 10.2 | 22.3 | 60.0 | 52.1 | 47.7 | 100.0 | 24.9 |
| 10-11 AM | 24.6 | 27.8 | 22.0 | 50.6 | 41.7 | 55.5 | 0.0 | 25.4 |
| 11-12 AM | 24.4 | 31.7 | 25.0 | 37.1 | 37.2 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 25.4 |
| 12-1 PM | 26.2 | 21.9 | 28.1 | 34.2 | 16.0 | 35.2 | 0.0 | 26.7 |
| 1-2 PM | 25.3 | 15.4 | 21.1 | 34.8 | 7.5 | 31.0 | 0.0 | 24.1 |
| 2-3 PM | 24.8 | 26.1 | 23.1 | 30.0 | 16.7 | 22.1 | 0.0 | 24.1 |
| $3-4$ PM | 27.4 | 9.4 | 22.6 | 32.6 | 26.1 | 31.4 | 0.0 | 26.2 |
| 4-5 PM | 27.3 | 10.1 | 25.4 | 29.9 | 34.9 | 30.8 | 0.0 | 26.6 |
| 5-7 PM | 26.0 | 7.3 | 20.4 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 29.3 | 0.0 | 24.2 |
| Day of Week |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monday | 22.2 | 25.5 | 18.1 | 43.0 | 34.8 | 39.2 | 0.0 | 22.1 |
| Tuesday | 26.5 | 12.2 | 19.2 | 26.3 | 23.9 | 31.9 | 100.0 | 25.0 |
| Wednesday | 29.9 | 7.0 | 25.0 | 35.0 | 30.5 | 24.4 | 0.0 | 28.4 |
| Thursday | 23.8 | 25.3 | 19.9 | 44.0 | 33.5 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 23.7 |
| Friday | 29.9 | 35.8 | 26.3 | 47.3 | 33.7 | 42.2 | 0.0 | 29.8 |
| Saturday | 21.1 | 8.7 | 22.8 | 25.6 | 21.7 | 32.0 | 41.8 | 21.8 |
| Sunday | 27.4 | 25.7 | 30.7 | 38.4 | 28.5 | 37.7 | 0.0 | 29.0 |
| TOTAL | 26.0 | 19.0 | 23.9 | 35.9 | 28.4 | 34.6 | 30.2 | 25.8 |

[^3]FIGURE 3.4
Restraint Use by Time of Day
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age or sex of motorists at various times of the day and changes in driving patterns between December and April. Additional multivariate analyses of these relationships are planned after additional survey waves are completed.

There were no consistent patterns in changes in restraint use by day of week (Table 3.3 and Figure 3.5). Although belt use increased the most on Sundays (from $18.0 \%$ to $29.0 \%$ ), use also increased substantially on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Fridays.

The size of increases in seat belt use from December to April varied by region of the state (Table 3.4 and Figure 3.6). ${ }^{3}$ Belt use was up 8 percentage points in the southwestern and southeastern regions, and was up $7 \%$ in the Detroit metropolitan area. In contrast, virtually no change in restraint use was seen in the northwestern, northeastern, and east central regions.

As found in the December, 1984 survey, restraint use in April, 1985 varied substantially by sampling area (Table 3.5). In addition, the change in belt use from December to April varied across sampling areas. Belt use in five sampling areas increased by over 13 percentage points (Wayne County, City of Livonia, up 20 percentage points; Washtenaw County, City of Ann Arbor, up 18.4 percentage points; Kent County, City of Wyoming, up 15.5 percentage points; Mecosta and Newaygo counties, up 14.1 percentage points; and Kalamazoo County, up 13.8 percentage points). In contrast, observed restraint use declined slightly in five sampling areas (Grand Traverse County, down 7.8 percentage points; Crawford and Roscommon counties, down 4.8 percentage points; Saginaw County, down 1.4 percentage points; Dickinson County, down 0.9 percentage points; and Ingham County, down 0.5 percentage points). Because only 200 to 300 occupants are observed in most sampling areas, however, these differences are of minor significance.

As found in the previous survey wave, passenger restraint use is closely correlated with belt use of the driver (Table 3.6). Of passengers traveling with a belted driver, $74.8 \%$ were restrained. In contrast, only $10.8 \%$ of passengers traveling with an unbelted driver were restrained.

Finally, occupants in nonstandard seating positions, such as lying on a seat or in cargo area, standing on seat, floor, or cargo area, kneeling on a seat, or sitting on lap of another passenger, were tallied separately (Table 3.7). Of the nonstandard positions, children riding on the lap of another passenger was the most common.

In summary, the use of seat belts increased from December, 1984 to April, 1985, a time of extensive publicity surrounding passage and signing of Michigan's mandatory seat belt law. Use increased for all age groups except children under 4, who have been subject to mandatory restraint use since April, 1982. The data reported here will be used as a baseline, along with the December, 1984 wave, from which to assess the effects of Michigan's mandatory seat belt law. Further survey waves are planned for July and December of 1985, and April, July, and December of 1986.
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TABLE 3.4
Percent Restraint Use by Michigan Department of Transportation Regions ${ }^{1}$

| MDOT Region | Seating Position |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Driver | Front Center | Front Right | Rear <br> Left | Rear Center | Rear <br> Right | Extra <br> Seats ${ }^{2}$ | $\mathrm{All}^{3}$ |
| 1. Western U.P. | 18.2 | 15.0 | 22.9 | 39.0 | 16.9 | 53.3 | - | 20.3 |
| 2. Eastern U.P. | 16.6 | 25.0 | 13.6 | 14.3 | 30.0 | 33.3 | - | 16.3 |
| 3. Northwest | 23.6 | 12.5 | 20.5 | 37.7 | 30.1 | 57.2 | - | 23.5 |
| 4. Northeast | 23.1 | 60.0 | 15.4 | 50.0 | 33.3 | 44.4 | - | 22.1 |
| 5. West Central | 25.4 | 20.1 | 23.9 | 37.9 | 24.3 | 46.2 | 21.8 | 25.5 |
| 6. East Central | 26.4 | 12.8 | 20.9 | 29.9 | 16.0 | 31.5 | - | 24.9 |
| 7. Southwest | 27.5 | 8.9 | 27.6 | 42.3 | 44.3 | 50.5 | 42.8 | 28.3 |
| 8. Southeast | 32.3 | 23.2 | 31.5 | 45.3 | 41.3 | 35.0 | 0.0 | 32.5 |
| Metro Detroit | 25.0 | 21.5 | 22.6 | 31.3 | 26.4 | 28.0 | 0.0 | 24.6 |
| TOTAL | 26.0 | 19.0 | 23.9 | 35.9 | 28.4 | 34.6 | 30.2 | 25.8 |

[^5]FIGURE 3.6
Restraint Use by Region


Restraint Use, Number of Vehicles Observed, and Number of Occupants Observed for Each Sampling Area ${ }^{1}$

| Sampling Area | Number of Vehicles Observed | Number of Occupants Observed | Percent <br> Drivers Restrained | Percent <br> Front Seat <br> Passengers <br> Restrained ${ }^{2}$ | Percent <br> All Occupants Restrained ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barry ${ }^{3}$ | 203 | 275 | 27.5 | 22.0 | 26.4 |
| Bay | 191 | 347 | 27.1 | 25.9 | 26.4 |
| Berrien County | 197 | 407 | 22.9 | 22.0 | 25.1 |
| Berrien, Niles | 196 | 356 | 21.2 | 19.9 | 21.6 |
| Charlevoix | 204 | 285 | 20.3 | 17.0 | 19.8 |
| Chippewa | 204 | 283 | 20.3 | 22.0 | 21.5 |
| Crawford-Roscommon | 204 | 307 | 19.2 | 18.2 | 19.9 |
| Delta | 204 | 345 | 12.9 | 9.0 | 11.9 |
| Dickinson | 181 | 344 | 7.8 | 18.4 | 12.8 |
| Eaton | 204 | 354 | 31.4 | 31.6 | 32.2 |
| Genesee | 611 | 862 | 27.5 | 21.8 | 26.1 |
| Grand Traverse | 203 | 282 | 31.1 | 22.7 | 30.9 |
| Ingham County | 203 | 350 | 27.6 | 30.8 | 30.7 |
| Ingham, East Lansing | 204 | 314 | 36.8 | 34.8 | 36.4 |
| Iosco-Alcona | 204 | 291 | 27.0 | 15.5 | 24.4 |
| Jackson | 202 | 274 | 25.7 | 32.7 | 27.4 |
| Kalamazoo County | 194 | 269 | 32.6 | 37.8 | 35.3 |
| Kalamazoo City | 203 | 263 | 32.0 | 24.6 | 31.3 |
| Kent County | 201 | 277 | 35.7 | 26.2 | 34.1 |
| Kent, Grand Rapids | 198 | 292 | 23.1 | 17.7 | 21.3 |
| Kent, Wyoming | 204 | 284 | 28.6 | 40.4 | 33.1 |
| Lapeer | 203 | 293 | 27.1 | 20.0 | 25.7 |
| Lenawee ${ }^{3}$ | 204 | 310 | 24.0 | 14.7 | 21.6 |
| Macomb | 612 | 817 | 28.1 | 25.0 | 28.9 |
| Marquette | 400 | 623 | 23.2 | 25.0 | 24.6 |
| Mason | 204 | 317 | 19.4 | 20.3 | 20.1 |
| Mecosta-Newaygo | 204 | 392 | 26.7 | 28.1 | 26.6 |
| Monroe ${ }^{3}$ | 204 | 275 | 27.1 | 25.5 | 27.2 |
| Montcalm ${ }^{3}$ | 187 | 393 | 22.0 | 25.1 | 23.4 |
| Muskegon | 204 | 301 | 19.3 | 10.3 | 18.7 |
| Oakland County | 1012 | 1,484 | 36.6 | 35.4 | 36.4 |
| Oakland, Royal Oak | 204 | 302 | 28.4 | 31.8 | 30.1 |
| Ottawa | 204 | 282 | 22.1 | 13.2 | 21.9 |
| Saginaw | 408 | 578 | 23.9 | 14.2 | 21.4 |
| St. Clair | 197 | 320 | 19.4 | 20.7 | 20.3 |
| VanBuren | 181 | 335 | 24.6 | 30.6 | 28.6 |
| Washtenaw, Ann Arbor | 204 | 265 | 52.0 | 57.8 | 53.2 |
| Wayne, Detroit | 1,677 | 2,362 | 15.1 | 9.1 | 13.3 |
| Wayne, Canton | 201 | 400 | 27.9 | 27.9 | 27.2 |
| Wayne, Garden City | 204 | 275 | 24.5 | 24.6 | 26.3 |
| Wayne, Livonia | 204 | 264 | 37.9 | 45.5 | 40.9 |
| Wayne, Melvindale etc. | 204 | 316 | 19.6 | 21.5 | 19.7 |
| Wayne, Trenton etc. | 204 | 294 | 24.0 | 15.9 | 21.4 |
| Wayne, Wyandotte | 204 | 322 | 20.2 | 17.4 | 18.7 |
| TOTAL | 12,345 | 18,581 | 26.0 | 23.6 | 25.8 |

${ }^{1}$ All percentages are based on weighted analyses.
${ }^{2}$ Includes correct and incorrect use of child restraint devices.
${ }^{3}$ For these sampling areas no signalized freeway exits existed. Therefore, freeway exits required by the sample design were selected from an adjacent county.

TABLE 3.6
Passenger Restraint Use by Driver Restraint Use by Age ${ }^{1}$

|  | Passenger Seating Position |  | Total Passengers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Front Seats | Rear Seats |  |
| Driver Restrained |  |  |  |
| Passengers 0-3 |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 97.2 | 97.6 | 97.5 |
| Unweighted N | 38 | 86 | 124 |
| Passengers 4-15 |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 90.5 | 76.5 | 82.4 |
| Unweighted N | 140 | 219 | 359 |
| Passengers 16-29 |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 67.8 | 37.0 | 63.9 |
| Unweighted N | 239 | 50 | 289 |
| Passengers 30-59 |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 76.1 | 32.1 | 71.8 |
| Unweighted N | 382 | 57 | 439 |
| Passengers 60+ |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 66.6 | 23.2 | 62.7 |
| Unweighted N | 152 | 22 | 174 |
| Total Passengers |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 76.0 | 71.8 | 74.8 |
| Unweighted N | 959 | 442 | 1,401 |
| Driver Not Restrained |  |  |  |
| Passengers 0-3 |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 49.8 | 61.4 | 56.6 |
| Unweighted N | 113 | 163 | 276 |
| Passengers 4-15 |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 15.2 | 15.6 | 15.4 |
| Unweighted N | 463 | 589 | 1,052 |
| Passengers 16-29 |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 3.9 | 1.4 | 3.6 |
| Unweighted N | 1,116 | 184 | 1,300 |
| Passengers 30-59 |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 6.0 | 5.5 | 6.0 |
| Unweighted N | 1,243 | 140 | 1,383 |
| Passengers 60+ |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 7.7 | 1.8 | 7.1 |
| Unweighted N | 467 | 75 | 542 |
| Total Passengers |  |  |  |
| \% Restrained | 8.4 | 18.9 | 10.8 |
| Unweighted N | 3,435 | 1,158 | 4,593 |

[^6]TABLE 3.7
Number of Occupants in Nonstandard Seating Positions by Age ${ }^{1}$

|  | Age of Occupant |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Position | $0-3$ | $4-15$ | $16+$ |
| Lying |  |  |  |
| Front seat | 1 | 1 |  |
| Rear seat | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Cargo area |  |  | 3 |
| Standing | 8 | 1 |  |
| Front seat | 8 | 1 |  |
| Front floor | 8 | 9 |  |
| Rear seat | 1 | 1 |  |
| Rear floor |  |  |  |
| Cargo area | 1 | 2 |  |
| Between bucket seats | 1 | 2 |  |
| Kneeling |  |  |  |
| Front seat |  | 5 |  |
| Rear seat | 1 | 3 |  |
| Sitting | 54 | 20 | 1 |
| On edge of rear seat |  | 2 |  |
| Between bucket seats |  |  |  |
| On lap |  |  |  |
| Shared seat belt | 481 | 1,506 | 16,469 |
| Total occupants in nonstandard positions | 86 | 59 | 9 |
| Total occupants in all positions |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Data are not weighted.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ For example, "Ford Wagon" does not provide any information on vehicle size.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Compare Table 3.1 here with Table 3.1 in Wagenaar and Wiviott, 1985.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ All percents are based on analyses weighted according to the sample design to accurately represent the entire state. Unweighted Ns indicate the actual number of occupants observed in a given group.
    ${ }^{2}$ Restraint use for all positions includes cargo areas, passengers held in laps, and passengers standing.
    ${ }^{3}$ Percent restrained includes correct and incorrect CRD use.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ All percents are based on analyses weighted according to the sample design to accurately represent the entire state. Restraint use includes correct and incorrect use of child restraint devices.
    ${ }^{2}$ Based on only 48 observed occupants.
    ${ }^{3}$ Restraint use for all positions includes cargo areas and passengers held in laps.

[^4]:    ${ }^{3}$ See Appendix A for a map delineating region boundaries.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ All percents are based on analyses weighted according to the sample design to accurately represent the entire state. Restraint use includes correct and incorrect use of child restraint devices.
    ${ }^{2}$ Based on only 31 observed occupants.
    ${ }^{3}$ Restraint use for all positions includes cargo areas and passengers held in laps and standing.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ All percents are based on analyses weighted according to the sample design to accurately represent the entire state. Restraint use includes correct and incorrect use of child restraint devices. Unweighted Ns indicate the actual number of occupants observed in each group. This table excludes 155 occupants in nonstandard seats (third or fourth seats, cargo areas, riding on the lap of another passenger, or doubled in one seat position).

