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Abstract

Objective—To determine the household prevalence of firearms in Pennsylvania, and describe the storage practices for these weapons.


Main outcome measures—Firearm ownership and storage practices were computed by household characteristics using logistic regression.

Results—The prevalence of firearm ownership was 37% (95% confidence interval = 35.4 to 38.6). Ownership of firearms was significantly higher for white residents, households with annual income of $20,000 or more, those in rural counties, and those with children and adolescents. Of the households with firearms, 23% contained a single firearm, the majority of which were handguns (40%) or rifles (40%); 76% had two or more firearms, with 57% reporting one handgun or more and 83% reporting one rifle or more. Storage of firearms in 72% of households involved two or more of these barriers: (1) taken apart; (2) trigger lock applied; (3) kept in a locked place; (4) unloaded; (5) no other ammunition; (6) locked ammunition; 6% stored at least one of their firearms with none of these barriers. The strongest predictor of storing a firearm with fewer than two protective barriers was households with no children or adolescents.

Conclusions—Firearms are present in a large number of Pennsylvania homes. Many of these homes also contain children. To reduce the potential risks of firearms, optimal methods of storage of firearms in the home need to be determined.
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Methods

The BRFSS is a health survey conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to collect population-based data on key behavioral health risks that contribute to the leading causes of death. The Pennsylvania Department of Health began participating in the BRFSS in 1989, and by 1994, all 50 states and the District of Columbia were included. All of the states use the standardized CDC generated core questionnaire, along with supplemental questions they add. The state added
questions for Pennsylvania in 1994 included several on behavioral risks for firearms, obtained from the National Center for Health Statistics. Adequate reliability has been shown in the measurement of health risk behaviors generally, and in the validity of self-reports of firearm ownership among registered gun owners.

The BRFSS is ongoing, consisting of monthly telephone interviews. Randomly generated telephone numbers were used to select households for the survey. Interviews were conducted in the evenings and on weekends in order to reach people when they were more likely to be at home, as well as during the day. A total of 10,041 telephone numbers were called in the first stage of sampling to identify residential telephone numbers. Non-working telephone numbers (25.1%) and business telephone numbers (16.2%) were discarded. In the second stage, drop-outs included refusals (14.6%), 'no answer' (4%), no eligible respondent or unavailability of respondent (2%), and all others (17%). At least six calls were placed at different times of the day and night and different days of the week before any sample number was classified as a 'no answer'. Within each contacted household, one respondent was selected randomly from all persons 18 years or older who reside in the household. A 10% probability sample of all completed interviews were verified by contacting the respondent. According to the 1990 census of the population and housing, only 2.6% of occupied housing units in Pennsylvania do not have telephones.

Questions relating to firearm ownership, storage practices, and household characteristics were analyzed using households as the unit of analysis. Using SAS on a main frame computer, prevalence rates and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were calculated by several household characteristics. We also analyzed the type of firearm owned by the household characteristics for those with single and multiple firearms.

Several questions were asked on the BRFSS that address six different barriers towards firearm usage. These were: (1) whether the firearm was kept in a locked place; (2) whether it was taken apart; and if not, (3) whether a trigger lock was applied to it; (4) whether it was unloaded; and if unloaded, (5) whether any ammunition was available, and if available, (6) whether the ammunition was kept in a locked place. To determine storage practices, we developed a hierarchy of practices based on the absolute number of barriers asked about. Twenty two different storage practices of varying risk were identified from combinations of the six barriers, for example, firearm(s): taken apart + locked place + no ammunition (three barriers; n = 10); taken apart + unlocked place + locked ammunition (two barriers; n = 30); not taken apart + no trigger lock + loaded + locked place (one barrier; n = 17). In cases of multiple firearms, the questions pertained to all or to the least secure of respondent's firearms. Therefore, a barrier was checked if all firearms were restricted by it (except for 'taken apart' which did not necessarily apply to all) and not checked if at least one firearm was not restricted by it.

The 22 methods of storage were regrouped into five categories according to the number of barriers imposed. Although some of the barriers may appear to provide greater protection than others, our analyses were restricted to the absolute number of barriers and avoided the subjectivity of weighting some as more protective than others. In addition, we were not aware of any injury risk data associated with specific methods of storage. Finally, storage practice methods were dichotomized according to the total number of barriers present. Households using two or more barriers to every firearm were compared with those where at least one firearm was stored with fewer than two barriers. Adjusted odds ratios of ownership prevalence and firearm storage using fewer than two barriers in the home were computed through logistic regression modeling with statistical significance set at \( \alpha = 0.05 \).

### Results

#### Prevalence of Firearm Ownership

Respondents from 37% (95% CI = 35.4 to 38.6) of households in Pennsylvania reported keeping one or more firearms in or around their homes. Ownership rates varied significantly by race, annual household income, presence of children and adolescents in the home, and residence. White, non-Hispanic households were three times more likely to contain firearms than black, non-Hispanic households. There was a significantly higher prevalence of firearms in households with increasing annual income above $20,000. Households with children and adolescents were more likely to contain firearms than those with no children and adolescents, and those in rural counties were twice as likely to have firearms than those in urban counties. Victimization of a household member from interpersonal violence within 12 months before the survey was not related to firearm ownership (table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household characteristic</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Prevalence 95% CI (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>3620</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3160</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual household income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$20,000</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000+</td>
<td>2215</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of children &lt;18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2273</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimized for IPV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3419</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/rural residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2809</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cells may not add to total number because of missing data.

IPV = Intepersonal violence defined as having been hit, slapped, kicked by another person or hit them with an object or weapon.

** Significant differences between two groups at 0.05.
TYPE OF FIREARMS OWNED

Nineteen per cent of households with firearms had at least one handgun, 22%, had at least one shotgun, and 26%, had at least one rifle. The type of firearms owned was significantly related to race and residence (table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household characteristics</th>
<th>No with firearms*</th>
<th>% with &gt;1 handguns</th>
<th>% with &gt;1 shotguns</th>
<th>% with &gt;1 rifles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All households</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>19:2</td>
<td>21:6</td>
<td>26:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>20:0</td>
<td>23:8</td>
<td>29:2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11:6</td>
<td>2:8</td>
<td>2:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual household income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$20 000</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>12:0</td>
<td>14:5</td>
<td>18:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 000+</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>23:6</td>
<td>25:9</td>
<td>31:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of children &lt;18 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>22:1</td>
<td>25:2</td>
<td>31:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>17:4</td>
<td>19:4</td>
<td>23:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimized for IPV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21:4</td>
<td>20:4</td>
<td>26:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>19:0</td>
<td>21:6</td>
<td>24:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/rural residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>16:5</td>
<td>16:3</td>
<td>20:3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>28:6</td>
<td>39:7</td>
<td>47:7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cells may not add to total number because of missing data.
**Significant differences between two groups at 0.05.

STORAGE OF FIREARMS IN THE HOUSEHOLD

Storage practices based on the number of barriers are shown in table 3. Three hundred and three (23%) households with one or more firearms could not be categorized as to storage practices because respondents refused to answer some questions, did not know, or were uncertain how to respond.

More than 70% with one or more firearms had two or more barriers towards usage, 22% had only one barrier, and 6% had no barrier.

Storage practices were significantly related to race and the presence of children and adolescents (table 3). Thirty five per cent of handguns in households with one or more firearms were stored with one barrier or none compared with 28% of shotguns and 27% of rifles (data not shown).

ADJUSTED ODDS RATIOS FOR FIREARM OWNERSHIP AND STORAGE USING <2 BARRIERS

After adjusting for all other factors, owning a firearm was found to be significantly related to race, annual household income, presence of children and adolescents in the home, and rural residence. White, non-Hispanic homes were nearly three times as likely to contain firearms than black, non-Hispanic homes, whereas those with annual income of less than $20 000 were less likely to own a firearm than those whose annual income was $20 000 or more (odds ratio = 0:40; 95% CI = 0:34 to 0:48). In contrast, homes with children and adolescents were more likely to store firearms using two or more barriers (table 4).

Discussion

It has been estimated that half of all homes in the US own at least one firearm, but our investigation estimated a household firearm prevalence of 37% in Pennsylvania. This rate of ownership is, however, similar to that recently reported for two other US states by other investigators but much higher than many other countries. In Australia, 20% of households own firearms, while in Finland firearm ownership is 23%. Only 10% of the total population of New Zealand are reported to possess firearms, while lower ownership rates are reported for households in the Netherlands (2%) and Scotland (5%).

Previous studies of predictors of firearm ownership showed higher rates in rural residents, those in single family dwellings, in families with one adult male, fewer preschool children, females with 12 years of education,
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with stolen firearms. This may perhaps because some or as with any other predictor of firearm ownership was found to be only 6%.32

In addition to a household firearm prevalence of 37%, we found that 76% of these homes contained more than one firearm, and that at least one firearm was stored loaded and unlocked in 6% of homes surveyed. Another 22% of homes stored at least one firearm with only one barrier towards usage. Most prior studies have limited the definition of unsafe storage practices of firearms only to cases where they are stored loaded and kept in unlocked places,18 23 34 without consideration of other storage methods, such as the presence of ammunition in unlocked places. Senturia et al reported that 13% of handguns and 1% of rifles kept in the homes of families attending pediatric practices in Chicago, New Jersey, Houston, Utah, Georgia, Iowa, and South Carolina were stored loaded and in unlocked places.34 In Oregon, 10% of adults were reported to live in households with firearms always or sometimes stored loaded and unlocked. Another 30% of homes were reported to store their firearms in ‘some other way’.18 A national random telephone survey found 21% of gun owners keeping their firearms loaded and unlocked.35

Ownership of a handgun, having received training, and owning a gun for protection were predictors of firearms stored loaded and unlocked in a national random telephone survey.34 We found that homes without children were more likely to store firearms using fewer than two barriers. We also found handguns, the most prevalent type of firearm kept in Pennsylvania homes, to be more commonly stored using fewer than two barriers. This is a concern as a recent study found that handguns were used in 80% of firearm suicides, 71% of firearm suicides, and all unintentional and undetermined firearm deaths between 1990 and 1994 in Milwaukee.35

A significant proportion of households with firearms also have children. Even though these households stored their firearms using more barriers, the mere combination of firearms and children is alarming. The availability of guns in the home has been identified as a contributory factor in adolescent suicide.19 29 37 An accessible firearm with accessible ammunition may be all that is needed for a depressed adolescent to succeed in a suicide attempt.

There are several limitations with this study, as with any based on self reports. Self report of behaviors rather than direct observations means some information is under-reported perhaps because of social desirability, illegal behavior, or personal sensitivities. However, these inaccuracies may apply only to persons with stolen firearms who may not admit to ownership. Several prior studies attest to the validity of self reported surveys of registered gun owners.23 24

The problem of recall bias may also affect our estimates, particularly if it has been a long while since the respondents used their firearm. There is also a possibility of selection bias toward persons from homes with telephones, those of high socioeconomic status, and English speaking homes. According to the 1990 census, however, only 2-6% of occupied housing units in Pennsylvania do not have telephones. Although this is a small proportion, non-coverage of these homes, as well as of non-English speaking homes, could lead to biased estimates.

Our analysis is also limited by the fact that the effectiveness of specific firearm storage methods is unknown. We avoided the subjective process of classifying one storage practice as more effective than another. Instead, we focused on the absolute number of barriers used. While the imposition of no barrier is clearly the highest risk, the small sample size (6%) prevented this subgroup from being analyzed separately. Therefore, we collapsed the imposition of a single barrier with no barrier. It is conceivable that some homes with a single barrier (for example a trigger lock) may be safer than others with two or more barriers (for example locked ammunition and a trigger lock but gun loaded). Conversely, it could be argued that homes that have taken the steps to apply two or more barriers are more conscious of the risk for injury that a firearm imposes. Additionally, some of our estimates are based on small denominators and may, therefore, be unstable and unreliable.

This study raises a number of important questions and implications for prevention. It is clear from this study and others16 29 30 34 that a large number of homes in the US contain firearms. As with any other potentially lethal household product, prevention dictates that the product be stored in a manner that promotes safe and responsible usage. Yet the optimal method of firearm storage remain undefined. It is unclear, for example, whether the use of a trigger lock is a more effective method of storage than use of a gun safe or case. Further research is needed to determine what methods of storage and what combinations of protective barriers are most effective in reducing the risk of firearm injuries and deaths.

In addition, once optimal methods of firearm storage are determined, there will still remain the challenge of implementing safe and effective storage in the estimated 200 million US homes that contain firearms. The study by Hemenway et al revealed that firearm training alone, as currently provided, may not be enough to ensure appropriate storage.33 Other strategies need to be considered and researched. In the interim, we believe that all health care providers and particularly pediatricians, family physicians, and emergency physicians should have open and frank discussions with their patients regarding firearm ownership and storage. Health care providers should become familiar with various storage methods and
safety options. The use of at least one or preferably two or more protective barriers should be advocated, particularly in homes with children.

This project was funded, in part, under a contract administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Health. The department specifically disclaims responsibility for any analyses, interpretations, or conclusions.


—Gun dangers, Australian style—
Police arrested a blind man walking in Melbourne with a semiautomatic gun who was threatening people. Amazingly, perhaps, he was licensed to own this weapon.

—-Safety symbols—
The Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) in the UK has commissioned a long overdue study of safety related symbols or pictograms to answer the simple question, do they work? The study is to include a literature review, a survey of symbols in use, and a limited user trial (Child Safety News, Summer 1996).

—Firearm deaths: international comparisons—
These annual death rates by firearms per million population speak for themselves: Japan 0-3, UK 2-3, Canada 5-9, Switzerland 13-8, US 62-5. (Toronto Star, 28 July 1996). Commenting on the Japanese figures, Yamanaka writes: '...about firearm statistics...I have never thought about [this]. In Japan, firearms are strictly controlled, I believe...I am 48 years old but have never touched a gun...I only see firearms on the waist of a policeman.'