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Abstract

Background: Previous work has demonstrated discrepancies between self-reported and observed smoke alarm functionality. This study aimed to improve self-report of smoke alarm status.

Methods: Participants were asked if they had: 1) any working smoke alarm; and 2) a working smoke alarm on every level of their home (Brief Form). Subsequently, parents answered an Extended Form prompting them to consider each level and how they knew the smoke alarms were functioning.

Results: 554 participants completed both forms. On the Brief Form, 96% of participants reported having any smoke alarm and 92% reported having a working alarm on every level. On the Extended Form, 85% of parents reported having any smoke alarm and 73% reported having a working alarm on every level.

Conclusion: Prompting residents to consider the presence and functionality of smoke alarms on each level of their home increased the opportunity to provided tailored communication to improve smoke alarm coverage.

Introduction:

In 2016, there were approximately 352,000 residential fires resulting in 2,950 civilian deaths and 12,775 civilian injuries (Haynes 2017). A working smoke alarm is known to reduce the risk of dying in a fire by 50% (Douglas et al. 1999). However, many homes lack the recommended number of smoke alarms (i.e., one on every level of the home) (Chen et al. 2003). Sixty percent of home fire deaths occur in homes with no smoke alarms or smoke alarm that do not work (Haynes 2017).

Previous work also demonstrated discrepancies between self-reported and observed smoke alarm functionality with positive predictive values ranging from 26–90% (Roberston et al. 2005). When answering commonly used questions to assess smoke alarm status. Over reporting may occur because respondents do not consider all levels of the home and because they may be unaware of indicators of alarm functionality (Hatfield et al. 2006).

While observed data may be the recognized gold standard, direct observations may not be feasible from a resource or time perspective. Self reported smoke alarm information is still useful (Stepnitz et al. 2012) but data quality could potentially be improved by asking questions in a manner which causes respondents to think more deliberately about their homes and actions (Chen et al. 2003; Watson et al. 2014) The goal of the research presented here is to compare two self-reported measurement options to determine how to enhance the accurate reporting of the presence and functionality of smoke alarms. As part of a larger study on child home safety, we compared a Brief Form and an Extended Form of questions about smoke alarm status.

Methods:
The methods for this study have been previously described (Ahrens 2011). Briefly, parents of children 4–7 years old were recruited during a visit to the Pediatric Emergency Department (PED) at the Johns Hopkins Hospital or the Arkansas Children's Hospital. Parents were randomized to receive a tailored educational intervention to improve either fire safety or child passenger safety behaviors. Tailored education was delivered via a smartphone app that was downloaded for free by study participants. Upon downloading the app, respondents completed a baseline assessment of their study group’s behavior and related beliefs. Based on their responses, a personalized feedback report with tailored education was immediately delivered in the app.

Data for this analysis come from the baseline assessment of the fire safety arm of the study. As part of the assessment, respondents were first asked if they had: 1) any working smoke alarms; and 2) a working smoke alarm on every level of their home. These two questions constitute the Brief Form. Later in the assessment, they answered an Extended Form, which asked them to identify the number of levels in their home (including the basement and attic), and then were prompted for each of those level to report whether a smoke alarm was present, if it was working, and how they knew it was working. (Fig. 1) Answers were summarized to create two variables comparable to the items assessed on the Brief Form: any working smoke alarm and a working smoke alarm on every level. Responses from the Brief and Extended Forms were compared using a Kuder-Richardson test, a measure of internal consistency for binomial data.

**Results:**

A total of 554 respondents completed both the Brief and Extended Forms. The mean age was 31 years old, 92% of respondents were female, 60% were African American, and 94% had completed high school or received a GED. Approximately one third (33%) were unemployed, 59% were receiving income assistance and 65% were renters. (Table 1)

Comparing responses to the two forms, more respondents reported any smoke alarms on the Brief Form (n = 531, 96%) compared to the Extended Form (n = 478, 85%). Table 2 compares the reports of working smoke alarms between the two forms. Again, more respondents reported more working smoke alarms on all levels on the Brief Form (n = 508, 92%) compared to the Extended Form (n = 411, 73%).

A total of 111 participants reported a working smoke alarm on every level on the Brief Form, but not on the Extended Form. When asked about the reason they did not have a working smoke alarm on every level, respondents most often cited that they thought they did have a working smoke alarm on every level (n = 37), nuisance alarms (i.e., the alarm went off when cooking or showering) (n = 23), or they didn't think they needed one on every level (n = 19). (Table 3) The Kuder-Richardson coefficient was 0.51.

**Discussion**
Our results show that question phrasing and quantity altered respondents’ report of presence and functionality of smoke alarm, presumably for more accurate reporting. Because there are times when self-reported information is the most feasible way to obtain information, researchers need to carefully consider question phrasing, question order, and other prompts to enhance respondents’ answers. By first assessing the number of levels in one’s home, we were able to alter respondents answers. And, by asking respondents to provide a basis for their report of a “working smoke alarm” we may have encouraged more accurate reporting.

Prompting residents with more detailed questions increased the opportunity for tailored feedback from our smart phone app. For research purposes, devoting more items to measuring a self-reported behavior of interest may increase validity. For educational purposes, tailored messages have been demonstrated to be more effective than generic messages in affecting change (Schmid et al. 2008; Kreuter et al. 2000; Omaki et al. 2017). However, messages that are tailored to a person’s reported behaviors are likely to have limited impact when over-reporting occurs. This study provides valuable insight into the effect of more directed survey items to increase accurate reporting.

The population of this study was drawn from a sample of majority renters from one urban setting. Replication of the study with a more diverse sample would improve generalizability. Future studies with observed smoke alarm status would allow for confirmation of our hypothesis that the accuracy of smoke alarm reporting was improved.

Accurate reporting of presence and functionality of smoke alarms is essential for several reasons. First, in the context of research on smoke alarms, which often relies on self-report), valid and reliable measures are needed for rigorous and reproducible studies. Second, interventions such as smoke alarm installation programs often rely on residents’ reports of not having working alarms as the indication that they need to enter the home. Third, educational programs need correct information on whether alarms are present and working to provide the correct educational messages. Finally, awareness of smoke alarm functionality is essential for residents to understand their level of protection in their homes.

**Declarations**

**Availability of data and materials**

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Consent for publication

This manuscript does not contain any individual person's data in any form (including individual details, images or videos).
Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the study participants for contribution of their time this

Funding

This work was supported by NIH Grant No. HD069221, “Evaluating a Web-based Child Passenger Safety Program: Safety in Seconds v2.0.” The research presented in this paper is that of the authors and does not reflect the official policy of the NIH. The Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health IRB approved this research, IRB No. 4536. This study is registered at ClinicalTrials.Gov (Clinical Trial Registration No. NCT02345941).

Author information

Affiliations

Johns Hopkins Center for Injury Research and Policy, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, 624 North Broadway Baltimore, MD, 21205, USA

Wendy Shields, Elise Omaki, Andrea Gielen, & Eileen McDonald

Johns Hopkins Department of Health Policy and Management, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, 624 North Broadway Baltimore, MD, 21205, USA

Wendy Shields & Elise Omaki

Johns Hopkins Department of Health, Behavior, and Society, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, 624 North Broadway Baltimore, MD, 21205, USA

Andrea Gielen, & Eileen McDonald

Contributions

WS also was the primary author for the writing in the manuscript. EO analyzed the data. All authors were involved in the creation and idea behind the manuscript, as well as some of the writing. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Corresponding author

Correspondence to Wendy Shields wshields@jhu.edu
Ethics declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study was approved by the Johns Hopkins Institutional Review Board. All participants consented to participate.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Haynes H. Fire loss in the United States During 2016, National Fire Protection Agency. Sept 2017.
2. Douglas MR, Mallonee S, Istre GR. Estimating the proportion of homes with functioning smoke alarms: a comparison of telephone survey and household survey results. Am J Public Health. 1999;89:1112–14.
3. Chen LH, Gielen AC, McDonald EM. Validity of self reported home safety practices. Inj Prev. 2003;9:73–5.
4. Robertson AS, Rivara FP, Ebel BE, et al. Validation of parent self reported home safety practices. Inj Prev. 2005;11:209–12.
5. Hatfield PM, Staresinic AG, Sorkness CA, et al. Validating self reported home safety practices in a culturally diverse non-inner city population. Inj Prev. 2006;12:52–7.
6. Stepnitz R, Shields W, McDonald E, et al. Validity of smoke alarm self-report measures and reasons for over-reporting. Inj Prev. 2012;18:298–302.
7. Watson M, Benford P, Coupland C, et al. Validation of a home safety questionnaire used in a series of case-control studies. Inj Prev. 2014;20:336–42.
8. Ahrens M. Smoke alarms in U S. Home Fires. Quincy, MASS: National Fire Protection agency. September 2011 Available at https://www.dli.mn.gov/CCLD/cld/PDF/1309_9.pdf.
9. Schmid KL, Rivers SE, Latimer AE, et al. Targeting or Tailoring? Maximizing Resources to Create Effective Health Communications. Mark Health Serv. 2008;28:32–7.
10. Krueter MW, Oswald DL, Bull CB, Clark EM. Are tailored health education materials always more effective than non-tailored materials? Health Educ Res. 2000;15:305–15.
11. Omaki E, Shields WC, McDonald E, Aitken ME, Bishai D, Case J, Gielen A. Evaluating a smartphone application to improve child passenger safety and fire safety knowledge and behaviour. Inj Prev. 2017 Feb;23(1):58. doi:10.1136/injuryprev-2016-042161.
|                         | N     | %     |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|
| **Participant Age**     |       |       |
| Mean (SD)               | 31.46 | (7.08)|
| **Participant Gender**  |       |       |
| Male                    | 43    | 8%    |
| Female                  | 5014  | 92%   |
| **Race**                |       |       |
| Black/African American  | 330   | 60%   |
| White/Caucasian         | 182   | 33%   |
| Other                   | 34    | 6%    |
| **Hispanic or Latino**  |       |       |
| Yes                     | 19    | 3%    |
| No                      | 529   | 97%   |
| **Education**           |       |       |
| Less than high school (HS) | 32   | 6%    |
| High school or GED      | 166   | 30%   |
| Greater than HS         | 196   | 36%   |
| Completed college or above | 152  | 28%   |
| **Per Capita Income**   |       |       |
| $5,000 or less          | 199   | 41%   |
| $5,001-$10,000          | 157   | 32%   |
| More than 10,000        | 130   | 27%   |
| **Parent Receives Aid** |       |       |
| Yes                     | 318   | 59%   |
| No                      | 224   | 41%   |
| **Employment**          |       |       |
| Yes, full time          | 289   | 53%   |
| Yes, part time          | 75    | 14%   |
| No                      | 178   | 33%   |
| **Homeowner Status**    |       |       |
| Own                     | 180   | 33%   |
| Rent                    | 353   | 65%   |
| I don’t know            | 9     | 2%    |
| **Child’s Age**         |       |       |
| Mean (SD)               | 5.30  | (1.16)|
| **Child’s Gender**      |       |       |
| Male                    | 304   | 55%   |
| Female                  | 250   | 45%   |
Table 2
Self-report of having a working smoke alarm on every level.

|                     | Yes | No  | Total |
|---------------------|-----|-----|-------|
| **Extended Form**   |     |     |       |
| Brief Form          |     |     |       |
| Yes                 | 397 | 111 | 508 (92%) |
| No/Don't know       | 8   | 38  | 46 (8%) |
| **Total**           | 405 (73%) | 149 | 554 (27%) |

Table 3
Reported Reasons for not having a working smoke alarm on every level among

| Reason                                           | N (%)  |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Thought they had a working SA on every level     | 37 (33%) |
| Smoke alarms go off while cooking or showering  | 23 (21%) |
| Didn’t think they needed a working SA on every level | 21 (19%) |
| Never thought or decided about having a SA on every level | 16 (14%) |
| Barriers to obtaining/installing smoke alarm (i.e. not enough time/money, don't know how to install, landlord won't allow) | 14 (13%) |
| **Total**                                        | 111    |

* results from n = 111 participants responding having a working smoke alarm on every level on the brief form, but not on the extended form

**Figures**
Extended Form Smoke Alarm Questions
1. Let’s think about the alarms in your home closely. Does your home have a basement?
2. Does your home have an attic that someone spends time in?
3. Other than the basement and the attic, how many other levels are in your home?
   *Repeated for each level of the home:*
4a. Thinking about the [basement/attic/Nth level], do you have a working smoke alarm on that floor?
4b. How do you know the smoke alarm on the [basement/attic/Nth level] is working?
   - The batteries were changed in the last 6 months.
   - The alarm was tested in the last 6 months.
   - The alarm is hardwired
   - The light is on.
   - The alarm beeps regularly.*
   - Actually, I’m not sure my smoke alarm is working.

**Figure 1**

Extended Form Smoke Alarm Questions