e - ISSN - 2349-0691



AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ADVANCES IN NURSING RESEARCH



Journal homepage: www.mcmed.us/journal/ajanr

EFFECTIVENESS OF VIDEOTAPED VIGNETTES ON CHILD SAFETY AT HOME AMONG MOTHERS OF TODDLERS

Selva Regi Ruben L*

Assistant Professor, College of Nursing Madurai Medical College, Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India.

Article Info

Received 24/01/2024 Revised 15/02/2024 Accepted 17/02/2024

Key word:

Child safety knowledge Mother's practices Videotaped vignettes Socio-demographic variables Quasi-experimental research

ABSTRACT

Objectives of the study: To assess the level knowledge of mothers regarding child safety at home. To assess the practice of mothers regarding child safety at home. To evaluate the effectiveness of videotaped vignettes among mothers on child safety at home. To associate the post test knowledge with selected socio demographic variables. Hypothesis: H1 There is statistically significant difference in knowledge and practice of mothers on child safety at home after videotaped vignettes. H2 There is statistically significant association between knowledge and practice of mothers on child safety at home with selected socio demographic variables. Research Design: The Research design for this study is Quasi experimental research design; one group pre test and post test design. Setting: This study was conducted in Paravai at Madurai. It is situated 10-15 kilometers away from college of nursing, Madurai medical college Madurai. Sample size: The sample size was 60. Sampling Technique: systematic random sampling method. Statistical analysis: Both descriptive and inferential statistical methods were used to analyse the collected data. Data analysis and interpretation: It shows the posttest values of Knowledge, and practice with selected variables are positively correlated with the knowledge scores in the primary prevention level, and practice aspect are statistically significant, moderate positively correlated. r = 0.51 (P=0.001) It means When knowledge increases their practice also increases moderately. Conclusion: Thus, in assessing home injury risk for toddlers, one must consider the risktaking tendencies of the individual child within the specific context of their parents' protectiveness beliefs and practice.

INTRODUCTION

The causes of child mortality have changed over the last few decades. While deaths due to common childhood diseases such as diarrhoea, pneumonia, vaccine-preventable diseases and infectious diseases continue to decline, injuries and non communicable diseases are emerging as the leading causes of childhood death.

However, injuries in children have been neglected for many years. In the India, trauma is the leading cause of death in children after the first year of

Corresponding Author Selva Regi Ruben L

life, accounting for 50% of mortality, with an injury occurring every 4 minutes and death every 6 minutes. Home accidents are among the most common adverse events in their lives. It is vital to focus on child injury prevention at all ages in order to prevent injury deaths in children who have been saved from other diseases earlier on in life. 'Child Protection' is about protecting children from or against any perceived or real danger/risk to their life. Child protection is integrally linked to every other right of the child. It is evident that injuries constitute a major proportion of childhood deaths and hospitalization in the Asia-Pacific Region. Since injury is the leading cause of childhood mortality it is evident that the Millennium Development Goals (Goal 4 – reduce under-



five mortality rate) cannot be met without addressing the issue of child injuries.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

As per NCRB report of 2006, there were 22,766 deaths (<5 years) due to injuries among children. However, a recent national review on burden of injuries in India revealed that, nearly 8.2% of deaths and 20-25% of hospitalizations occur among children, based on few hospital and population based studies. In the same year, there were deaths among 1,133 children in Tamilnadu. As child injuries are not examined separately in Tamilnadu, the problem is unclear. several types of injuries like road traffic injuries, falls, burns, drowning, poisoning, fall of objects, (burns ,17%, falls 13%, drowning and poisoning ,6% and 5%).

In contrast to other health risks, home accidents have during the last three centuries played a continuous and important role as a cause of child mortality (WHO, 2009; Mölsted et al, 1999 However, injuries are the main cause of child mortality in India among children between 1 and 3 years old (WHO, 2009).

Falls were the second leading cause for injury hospitalization among children, Burns were common 90% of the burn injuries occurred at home. Poison and animal bites are commonly occurring injuries. Most accidents to children between 0-3 years old occur in the home.

In a survey made in India, scalding was found to be the most common cause of accidents among young children (Freccero et al, 2000). In a descriptive study by Carlsson et al (2006a) it was shown that boys aged 1-2 years were those who most frequently suffered from burn and scald injuries. Recent research findings confirm that risk factors for injury to young children include not only child behavioral attributes but also caregiver supervisory patterns. Building on these findings, the aim of the present study was to explore the notion that injury risk arises from an interaction of child attributes and parent supervision.

Hypotheses

H1.There is significant difference in knowledge and practice of mothers on child safety at home after videotaped vignettes.

H2. There is significant association between knowledge and practice of mothers on child safety at home with selected socio demographic variables.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Setting of research

This study was conducted in selected streets in Paravai at Madurai. It is situated 10-15 kilometers away from college of nursing, Madurai medical college, Madurai.

Research Design

The Research design for this study was Quasi experimental - One group pre test and post test design.

Dependent Variable

Knowledge and Practice of child safety

Independent variable

Videotaped vignettes

Target Population

All mothers with the children in the age group of below five years Accessible

Population

The mothers of children those who in 1 - 3 years of age group residing at Paravai.

Sample size

The sample size was 60.

Sampling Technique

Systematic Random Sampling

K = N/n

Where N = population size

n = sample size

Criteria for sample selection Inclusion criteria

Mothers of children in the age group of 1-3 years.

Mothers of children who are resident of paravai.

Mothers of Children of both sexes

Mothers who are willing to participate in the study.

Mothers who understand and speak in Tamil

Exclusion Criteria

Mothers who are working in the day time

Mothers who have previous attended programmes on child safety

Data Collection procedure

Prior to the data collection the necessary permission was obtained from the Govt Rajaji hospital ethical committee, block medical officer of Paravai, samayanallur PHC, Madurai.

The data collection was done for four weeks from 01.09.2011 to 30.09.2011 in selected streets in Paravai village at Madurai. Before conducting the study, written consent was obtained from the subject after self introduction and explanation regarding the nature of the procedure. Semi structured questionnaire and modified parental supervision attribute profile questionnaire was used to assess the knowledge and practice among mothers of toddlers. First week pre test was conducted to assess



the level of child safety knowledge and practices at home. Every day 5-7 subjects were assessed with Semi structured questionnaire and modified parental supervision attribute profile questionnaire and selected 5-7 mothers with toddlers. Study subject were divided into group-I, group-II, group-III, group-IV respectively. Video vignette was provided to the group morning and evening for 20 minutes. Each group was receiving the intervention alternative days. Fourth week, Post test was conducted by using the Semi structured questionnaire and modified parental supervision attribute profile questionnaire used to

reassess the knowledge and practice individually. Each day seven to eight subjects were reassessed.

Protection of human subjects

The investigator obtained approval from the dissertation committee, the Govt. Rajaji hospital ethical committee, and from the block medical officer,PHC, Samayanallur. Both verbal and written consent was obtained from all the study samples and the data collected was kept confidential. Anonymity was maintained throughout the study.

Section A Distribution of mothers of paravai, Madurai with their selected demographic variables

Table 1: Frequency and percentage of demographic variables of mothers N = 60.

| | Demographic variables | No. of mothers | % |
|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------|
| Age | 31 -40 yrs | 11 | 18.3% |
| | 21 -30 yrs | 44 | 73.3% |
| | < 20 yrs | 5 | 8.3% |
| Literacy status | Primary education | 12 | 20.0% |
| · | High school | 14 | 23.3% |
| | HSc | 22 | 36.7% |
| | Collegiate education | 8 | 13.3% |
| | No formal education | 4 | 6.7% |
| Occupation | Cooly | 19 | 31.7% |
| _ | Business | 4 | 6.7% |
| | Private employee | 17 | 28.3% |
| | House wife | 20 | 33.3% |
| Type of family | Nuclear family | 28 | 46.7% |
| | Joint family | 32 | 53.3% |
| Religion | Hindu | 40 | 66.7% |
| - | Muslim | 20 | 33.3% |
| Family income | > Rs.5000 | 52 | 86.7% |
| • | Rs.4001 -5000 | 8 | 13.3% |
| No. of Children | One | 52 | 86.7% |
| | Two | 8 | 13.3% |

Table 2: comparison of pretest and post test on level of knowledge of mothers

| 14510 21 00 | Level of knowledge | Primary | mowieage | Secondary | | Overall | |
|-------------|--------------------|---------|----------|-----------|--------|---------|-------|
| | | n | % | N | % | n | % |
| Pretest | Poor knowledge | 32 | 53.3% | 10 | 16.70% | 18 | 30.0% |
| | Moderate knowledge | 28 | 46.7% | 50 | 83.3% | 42 | 70.0% |
| | Good knowledge | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| | Total | 60 | 100% | 60 | 100% | 60 | 100% |
| posttest | Poor knowledge | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| | Moderate knowledge | 12 | 20.0% | 11 | 18.3% | 11 | 18.3% |
| | Good knowledge | 48 | 80.0% | 49 | 81.7% | 49 | 81.7% |
| | Total | 60 | 100% | 60 | 100% | 60 | 100% |

Table 3: comparison of pretest and post test mean and standard deviation on practice of mothers

| Practice | No. of questions | Min –Max score | Pretest | | Posttest | |
|---------------|------------------|----------------|------------|-------|------------|-------|
| | | | Mean±SD | % | Mean±SD | % |
| Overall score | 20 | 0 -40 | 17.53±0.51 | 43.8% | 32.63±1.29 | 81.6% |



Table 4: Comparison of pretest and post test level of practice of mothers

| Level of practice | | Pretest | Posttest | | | |
|-------------------|----|---------|----------|-------|--|--|
| | n | % | n | % | | |
| Poor practice | 27 | 45.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Moderate practice | 33 | 55.0% | 10 | 16.7% | | |
| Good practice | 0 | 0.0% | 50 | 83.3% | | |
| Total | 60 | 100% | 60 | 100% | | |

Table 5: Correlation between pretest knowledge and practice with post test knowledge and practice

| | Correlation between | mean score Mean±SD | Karl Pearson correlation coefficient | Interpretation |
|----------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| | Knowledge | 46.57 ± | | Not significant, poor, positive |
| Drotost | score | 4.82 | r = 0.15 | Correlation |
| Pretest | Pretest Practice score | 17.53 ± | P=0.22 | It means When knowledge increases their practice |
| | Fractice score | 0.50 | | also increases poorly |
| | Knowledge | 96.67± | | Significant, moderate, positive Correlation. |
| Docttoot | score | 3.21 | r = 0.51 | It means When knowledge increases their practice |
| Posttest | Practice score | 32.63 ± | P=0.001*** | also increases moderately |
| | riactice score | 1.29 | | |

Table 6: Association between post test level of knowledge with their demographic variables.

| • | | Mo | derate | | Good | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----|--------|----|--------|-------|---|
| Demographic variables | | n | % | n | % | Total | Chi square test |
| Age | <20 yrs | 3 | 60.0% | 2 | 40.0% | 5 | χ2=6.59 P=0.03* DF= 2 significant |
| | 21 -30 yrs | 7 | 15.9% | 37 | 84.1% | 44 | |
| | 31 -40 yrs | 1 | 9.1% | 10 | 90.9% | 11 | |
| Literacy status | No formal education | 3 | 25.0% | 1 | 75.0% | 4 | χ2=15.06P=0.01** DF= 4 significant |
| | Primary education | 4 | 33.3% | 8 | 66.7% | 12 | ~ |
| | High school | 3 | 21.4% | 11 | 78.6% | 14 | |
| | HSc | 1 | 4.5% | 21 | 95.5% | 22 | |
| | Collegiate education | 0 | 0.0% | 8 | 100.0% | 8 | |
| Occupation | Cooly | 2 | 10.5% | 17 | 89.5% | 19 | χ2=2.43P=0.49 |
| | Business | 1 | 25.0% | 3 | 75.0% | 4 | DF= 3 not significant |
| | Private employee | 5 | 29.4% | 12 | 70.6% | 17 | |
| | House wife | 3 | 15.0% | 17 | 85.0% | 20 | |
| Type of family | Nuclear family | 2 | 7.1% | 26 | 92.9% | 28 | χ2=4.39 P=0.04* DF= 1 significant |
| | Joint family | 9 | 28.1% | 23 | 71.9% | 32 | ~ |
| Religion | Hindu | 10 | 25.0% | 30 | 75.0% | 40 | χ 2=3.56P=0.06 DF= 1 not significant |
| | Muslim | 1 | 5.0% | 19 | 95.0% | 20 | ~ |
| Family income | > Rs.5000 | 10 | 19.2% | 42 | 80.8% | 52 | χ2=0.21P=0.64 DF= 1 not significant |
| - | Rs.4001 -5000 | 1 | 12.5% | 7 | 87.5% | 8 | |
| No.of Children | One | 10 | 19.2% | 42 | 80.8% | 52 | χ2=0.21P=0.64 |
| | Two | 1 | 12.5% | 7 | 87.5% | 8 | DF=1 not significant |

Table 7: Association between post test level of practice with their demographic variables.

| Demographic variables | | M | oderate | | Good | Total | Chi square test |
|-----------------------|------------|---|---------|----|--------|-------|------------------------------------|
| | | n | % | n | % | | |
| Age | <20 yrs | 4 | 80.0% | 1 | 20.0% | 5 | χ2=16.93 P=0.01* DF= 2 significant |
| | 21 -30 yrs | 6 | 13.6% | 38 | 86.4% | 44 | |
| | 31 -40 yrs | 0 | 0.0% | 11 | 100.0% | 11 | |

N

Research Article

| Literacy status | No formal education | 3 | 75.0% | 1 | 25.0% | 4 | χ2=18.42P=0.01** DF= 4 significant |
|-----------------|----------------------|---|-------|----|--------|----|---|
| | Primary education | 4 | 33.3% | 8 | 66.7% | 12 | " |
| | High school | 3 | 21.4% | 11 | 78.6% | 14 | |
| | HSc | 0 | 0.0% | 22 | 100.0% | 22 | |
| | Collegiate education | 0 | 0.0% | 8 | 100.0% | 8 | |
| Occupation | Cooly | 1 | 5.3% | 18 | 94.7% | 19 | χ2=2.43P=0.49 |
| | Business | | | 4 | 100.0% | 4 | DF= 3 not significant |
| | Private employee | 7 | 41.2% | 10 | 58.8% | 17 | |
| | House wife | 2 | 10.0% | 18 | 90.0% | 20 | |
| Type of family | Nuclear family | 1 | 3.6% | 27 | 96.4% | 28 | χ2=6.48 P=0.01* DF= 1 significant |
| | Joint family | 9 | 28.1% | 23 | 71.9% | 32 | " |
| Religion | Hindu | 8 | 20.0% | 32 | 80.0% | 40 | $\chi 2=3.56P=0.06$ DF= 1 not |
| | | 2 | 10.0% | 18 | 90.0% | 20 | significant |
| | Muslim | | | | | | |
| Family income | > Rs.5000 | 9 | 17.3% | 43 | 82.7% | 52 | χ 2=0.21P=0.64 DF= 1 not significant |
| | Rs.4001 -5000 | 1 | 12.5% | 7 | 87.5% | 8 | _ |
| No.of Children | One | 8 | 15.4% | 44 | 84.6% | 52 | χ2=0.21P=0.64 |
| | Two | 2 | 25.0% | 6 | 75.0% | 8 | DF=1 not significant |

DISCUSSION

Sharma et al (2007) performed a study of 'At Risk' toddlers in rural area (Pachhad block of District Sirmour, H.P.) found that majority of 'at risk' children were found in the age group of 25-36 months. Higher prevalence of 'at risk' children in this age group may be due to the fact that in India, pregnancies occur too close and by the time, the child is 2 year old, mother has another sibling in her lap. So the elder sibling is neglected and left in the care of some substitute. The illiterate mothers did not take precaution from household chemicals in rural slum because two third toddlers (64.5%) were within its reach. It was also observed that the toddlers whose mothers were either illiterate or educate up to primary standard were more at risk of different type of home accidents as compare to educated mother in rural slum. This supports the present study.

The discussion of this present study focused on the shifts that would be needed in future in order to save the life of children. One major comment made by the researcher was that in future the domestic accident problem should be investigated more from the hazard side and less from the health side. Information about the various types of injuries and the outcomes are available, while the exact information on the causes of the domestic accidents, When the location of the accident is registered very often information is given about the room where the accident occurred, but not what element in the room caused the accident.

CONCLUSION

The present study used multi-method strategies to study in-home injuries experienced by toddlers over a 3-month period. The findings provide numerous insights into toddlers' in-home injuries and reveal a number of factors that relate to such injuries. Parental factors relevant to child injury included parents' beliefs about control over their child's health, protectiveness, and beliefs about child supervision. The significant finding of the study proclaims that video taped vignettes were effective and extremely safe home environment, Indian scenario has to be modified. It is the responsibility of the Nurse to inculcate the essential knowledge to the mothers of toddler.

REFERENCES

- 1. Brown K. J, Roberts M. C, Mayes S & Boles R. E. (2005). Effects of parental viewing of children's risk behavior on home safety practices. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 30, 571-580.
- 2. Colver A, Hutchinson P & Judson E. (1982). Promotion of children's home safety. *British Medical Journal*, 385, 1177-1180
- 3. Davé S, Nazareth I., Senior R & Sherr L. (in press). A comparison of father and mother report of child behaviour on the Strengths and Difficulties Quesionnaire. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*.
- 4. Davis, R. (1999). Web-based administration of a personalit questionnaire: Comparison with traditional methods. *Behaviour Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 31, 572-577.
- 5. Dershewitz, R. A. (1977). Prevention of childhood household injuries: A controlled clinical trial. American Journal



- of Public Health, 67, 1148.
- 6. Efron, B. (1987). Better bootstrap confidence intervals. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 82, 171-185.
- 7. Erdfelder, E., Faul, F., & Buchner, A. (1996). GPOWER: A general power analysis program. Behavior Research Methods, *Instruments*, & *Computers*, 28, 1-11.
- 8. Fagot, B. I., Kronsberg, S., & MacGregor, D. (1985). Adult responses to young children in risky situations. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 31, 385-395.
- 9. Gallagher, S., Hunter, P., & Guyer, B. (1985). A home injury prevention program for children. *Pediatric Clinics of North America*, 1, 95-112.
- 10. Garbarino, J. (1988). Preventing childhood injury: Developmental and mental health issues. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 58, 25-45.
- 11. Gielen, A.C., & Sleet, D.A. (2003). Application of behavior-change theories and methods to injury prevention. *Epidemiological Reviews*, 25, 65-76.
- 12. Goodman R (1997) The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A research note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 38, 581-586.
- 13. Goodman R, Scott S (1999) Comparing the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire and the Child Behavior Checklist: Is small beautiful? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 27, 17-24
- 14. Glik, D. C., Kronenfeld, J., & Jackson, K. (1991). Predictors of risk perceptions of childhood injury among parents of preschoolers. *Health Education Quarterly*, 18, 285-301.

