

Community Tobacco Survey of Adult Residents of Broome County (New York)

Opinions, Behaviors, and Perceptions Related
to Exposure to Secondhand Smoke, Tobacco
Marketing, Tobacco Sales, Tobacco Use, and
Tobacco Cessation

December 2013

Conducted for the
Tobacco Free Broome
Binghamton, New York

Prepared by
Joel LaLone Consulting
Watertown, New York

Table of Contents

Section 1 – Introduction and Description of the Study.....	4
1.1 – Purpose and Goals for this Study.....	5
1.2 – Methodology – How This Data Was Collected.....	7
Table 1 – Response Rates for the December 2013 Broome County Community Tobacco Survey.....	8
1.3 – Demographics of the Sample – Who was Interviewed?.....	9
Table 2 – Demographics of the Sample Compared to U.S. Census Estimates for Broome County.....	9
1.4 – Technical Comments to Assist Interpretation of the Data.....	12
Margin of Error – More Detail for Those Interested in Maximizing Precision and Accuracy of Estimates.....	12
Table 3 – Margins of Error for Varying Sample Sizes and Varying Sample Proportions.....	14
Significance Testing – Testing for Statistically Significant Differences, Trends, and Relationships.....	15
Table 4 – Sample Sizes and Approximate Margins of Error within Demographic Subgroups.....	18
Section 2 – Detailed Statistical Results	21
“Framing” a Statistic – Providing Perspective to Better Understand, Interpret, and Use this Survey Data.....	22
2.1 – Spreading the Message about the Dangers of Tobacco Findings.....	24
Summary of Findings – Spreading the Message about the Dangers of Tobacco.....	24
Table 5 – Have you ever heard of the New York State Smokers’ Quitline?.....	35
2.2 – Tobacco Marketing – <i>Displays in Stores</i> – Findings.....	26
Summary of Findings – Tobacco Marketing – <i>Displays in Stores</i>.....	26
Table 6 – Displaying tobacco products in stores in very visible locations – make teens more likely to smoke?.....	27
Table 7 – Opinion about a policy that would ban the display of tobacco products in stores.....	28
Table 8 – Support tobacco retailers required to keep tobacco products out of view from customers in stores?.....	29
2.3 – Tobacco Marketing – <i>Advertisements</i> – Findings.....	30
Summary of Findings – Tobacco Marketing – <i>Advertisements</i>.....	30
Table 9 – Displaying tobacco advertisements in stores make teens more likely to smoke?.....	31
Table 10 – Think advertising of tobacco products in convenience stores and gas stations should be allowed?.....	32
2.4 – Tobacco Marketing – <i>To Youths in the Media</i> – Findings.....	33
Summary of Findings – Tobacco Marketing – <i>To Youths in the Media</i>.....	33
Table 11 – “Internet sites, youth-rated movies, and TV shows that youth use and watch should not include tobacco use or images.”.....	34
Table 12 – Support a policy that restricts showing the use of tobacco in media rated for youth viewership?.....	35
2.5 – Tobacco Point of Sale Findings.....	36
Summary of Findings – Tobacco Point of Sale.....	36
Table 13 – Pharmacies should or should not be allowed to sell tobacco products?.....	37
Table 14 – Opinion about a policy that would restrict the sale of tobacco products in stores located near schools?... ..	38
Table 15 – Support a policy limiting the maximum number of tobacco retailers allowed in a neighborhood or area?... ..	39
2.6 – Outdoor Tobacco Policies Findings.....	40
Summary of Findings – Outdoor Tobacco Policies.....	40
Table 16 – SUMMARY – Attitudes About Restricting or Eliminating Smoking at Public Outdoor Locations – <i>Among All Participants</i>	40
Table 17 – SUMMARY – Attitudes About Restricting or Eliminating Smoking at Public Outdoor Locations – <i>Among Current Smokers</i>	40
Table 18 – Support for a Smoke-free Policy at a Public Building Entryways	42
Table 19 – Support for a Smoke-free Policy at a Public Park or Outdoor Recreational Area.....	43
Table 20 – Support for a Smoke-free Policy at a Public Beach or Municipal Pool.....	44
Table 21 – Law prohibiting smoking inside cars when persons under the age of 18 present - Agree or Disagree.....	45

2.7 – Smoke Free Housing Findings..... 46
Summary of Findings – Smoke Free Housing..... 46
 Table 22 – Rules about smoking inside residential units in your building?..... 47
 Table 23 – Opinions About a Smoke-free Policy in MUDs..... 48

2.8 – Tobacco Use Findings..... 49
Summary of Findings – Tobacco Use..... 49
 Table 24 – Smoked at Least 100 Cigarettes in Entire Life?..... 51
 Table 25 – Some Every Day, Some Days, or Not at All..... 52
 Table 26 – Cigarette Use Status – Current, Former, Never Smokers?..... 53
 Table 27 – Non-cigarette Tobacco Use – Use at least one non-cigarette type of product..... 54
 Table 28 – Overall Tobacco Use..... 55
 Table 29 – E-cigarette Use..... 56
 Table 30 – Reasons why you choose to use e-cigarettes..... 57

2.9 – Further Tobacco Purchase, Use, and Cessation Issues –
Current Smokers Findings..... 58
Summary of Findings – Further Tobacco Purchase, Use, and Cessation Issues – *Current Smokers*..... 58
 Table 31 – Stopped smoking for one day or longer in past year because you were trying to quit smoking?..... 59
 Table 32 – Purchase cigarettes over the Internet or from a website in past 12 months?..... 60
 Table 33 – Do you want to quit smoking now?..... 61

Section 3 – Concluding Comments 62

Appendix – The Survey Instrument..... 63

Contact Information

Tobacco Free Broome

Sharon Fischer, Public Health Educator
 Coordinator, Tobacco Control Program
 Broome County Health Department
 225 Front Street
 Binghamton, New York 13905
 Phone: 607-778-3068
 Fax: 607-778-3998
 SFischer@co.broome.ny.us
 www.tobaccofreebt.org

Joel LaLone Consulting

Mr. Joel LaLone, Owner
 428 Flower Avenue West
 Watertown, New York 13601
 (315)-408-9214
 joel@joellaloneconsulting.com
 www.joellaloneconsulting.com

Section 1

Introduction and Description of the Study

1.1 PURPOSE AND GOALS FOR THIS STUDY

Tobacco Free Broome is a community partnership located in Binghamton, New York that is affiliated with the New York Tobacco Control Program, a program of the New York State Department of Health. Tobacco Free Broome is sponsored by the Broome County Health Department. The goals of Tobacco Free Broome include advocating, initiating, funding, and supporting activities that promote the prevention and cessation of tobacco use among residents of Broome County (New York). Ultimately, the purpose of this tobacco prevention community partnership, and its programs and services, is to better educate residents regarding the risks of tobacco use and to reduce the rates of tobacco use and tobacco-related death and disease in the county.

The New York State Department of Health Tobacco Control Program (NYTCP) implements evidence-based and promising strategies to prevent and reduce tobacco use. The NYTCP envisions a tobacco-free society for all New Yorkers. The program began in January 2000, and is built on a foundation of community partners using evidence-based strategies from the Guide to Community Preventive Services to decrease tobacco use. Over time, the program has effectively implemented a strong clean indoor air law, maintained support for high tobacco taxes to keep the price of tobacco high, and worked to increase access to effective cessation services and motivate smokers to try to quit. As a result of programmatic efforts, youth and adult smoking rates in the state are at their lowest levels on record.

The current *vision*, *mission*, and *goal* for the New York Tobacco Control Program are:

- Vision:** All New Yorkers living in a tobacco-free society.
- Mission:** To reduce morbidity and mortality and alleviate the social and economic burden caused by tobacco use in New York State.
- Goal:** To reduce the prevalence of adult cigarette use to 12% and adolescent cigarette use to 10%.

To satisfy this vision and mission, and to attain this goal, the New York Tobacco Control Program and its community partnerships have identified the following **priority issues**: (1) eliminating exposure to secondhand smoke; (2) changing the community's attitudes and policies regarding tobacco use, thereby decreasing the social acceptability of tobacco; (3) promoting cessation of tobacco use; (4) preventing the initiation of tobacco use among youths and adults; (5) building and maintaining effective tobacco control infrastructure; and (6) contributing to the science of tobacco control.

The **role** of tobacco community partnerships includes working to change the community environment to support the tobacco-free norm. Partnerships are continuously working to engage local stakeholders; educate community leaders and the public; and mobilize the community to strengthen tobacco-related policies to restrict the use and availability of tobacco products, restrict tobacco product promotion, and limit opportunities for exposure to secondhand smoke. (Source for description of vision, mission, goal, priority issues, and role: www.health.ny.gov/prevention/tobacco_control)

Specific **current priorities** that have been identified for the tobacco community partnerships include, but are not limited to: Spreading the Message about the Dangers of Tobacco; Tobacco Marketing; Tobacco Point of Sale; Outdoor Tobacco Policies; Smoke Free Workplace; and Smoke Free Housing. (Source: www.tobaccofreeenys.org)

To accomplish, address, and/or attain the vision, mission, goal, priority issues, role, and current priorities in Broome County, Tobacco Free Broome has a need for current and accurate information regarding tobacco-related behaviors and attitudes among Broome County residents. To measure the necessary attitudes and behaviors regarding tobacco issues in the county, Tobacco Free Broome contracted with *Joel LaLone Consulting*, Watertown, New York, to complete a community study. The study involved completion of a random telephone survey of a sample of approximately 400 adult residents of Broome County.

This study was designed with the following two primary goals:

Study Goal #1

Planning – There is a goal to collect current tobacco-related attitude and behavior information via surveying local adult residents to provide data that will be useful to Broome County health professionals to best make data-driven decisions about future health-related goals, objectives,

programs, services, initiatives, interventions, promotions, and/or potential policies in the county. In summary, the collected data will provide current measurements of public opinion and behavior to help support and plan future activities for Tobacco Free Broome.

Study Goal #2

Evaluation – The second goal involves using the adult survey data to allow for evaluation of the impact of past initiatives and activities provided by Tobacco Free Broome. Previous similar tobacco-related surveys have been completed in 2006, 2009, and 2011 in Broome County. Comparison of the current (2013) survey results to these earlier survey results with identification of any statistically significant trends is useful to Broome County health professionals to attempt to identify which initiatives have been most effective, most successful. Essentially this goal is to answer the questions: “Has Tobacco Free Broome met its goals as outlined in its workplan?” and “Has there been any impact among the local population?”

The variables recorded in this study (survey questions) were developed with a focus of accomplishing these two study goals. The survey instrument included approximately 25 survey questions relating to the following nine primary sections of questions/information regarding attitudes and behaviors related to tobacco. The specific tobacco-related topics that are studied and reported in the remainder of this document are:

1. **Spreading the Message about the Dangers of Tobacco**
2. **Tobacco Marketing – *Displays in Stores***
3. **Tobacco Marketing – *Advertising***
4. **Tobacco Marketing – *To Youths in the Media***
5. **Tobacco Point of Sale**
6. **Outdoor Tobacco Policies**
7. **Smoke Free Housing**
8. **Tobacco Use**
9. **Tobacco Purchase, Use, and Cessation Issues – *Among Current Smokers***

This report is a summary and explanation of the findings of the Broome County community tobacco study completed for Tobacco Free Broome in December 2013. When possible, comparisons of the current results are made to the results of previous community tobacco surveys completed in Broome County in 2006, 2009, and 2011. Additionally, the current Broome County results are compared to current regional average results. The current regional average results are derived using the findings from twenty-one separate Central, Northern, and Western New York county-wide tobacco-related studies that were completed by tobacco community partnerships during the interval of December 2012 – December 2013 (including Broome County). Each of these twenty-one studies is similar to the current Tobacco Free Broome study in methodology, sample size, goals, and scope. Finally, the current Broome County results are cross-tabulated by the possible explanatory factors of Gender, Age, Education Level, Household Income Level, and Current Cigarette Smoking Status. It is standard methodology with professional surveys to provide this more detailed information to the reader – information that may assist in explaining the overall findings – by reporting the results for all subgroups within these key demographic variables. The results provide important current information about contemporary thinking and behaviors of citizens; and, over time, will continue to provide important baseline and comparative information as well for healthcare leadership.

1.2

METHODOLOGY – HOW THIS DATA WAS COLLECTED

The survey instrument used in this study was developed through the collective efforts of the evaluation specialists at the New York State Department of Health Tobacco Control Program, together with the local tobacco coalition coordinator at Tobacco Free Broome. The instrument, the introductory script used by interviewers on the telephone, and the required methodology to collect the data (complete interviews) were each approved by the Institutional Review Board of the New York State Department of Health in November of 2013. The survey included approximately twenty-five items (questions) regarding the nine sets of tobacco issues outlined in the preceding introductory section of this report. Copies of the script and survey instrument are attached as an appendix.

The study included completing interviews of 400 adult residents of Broome County. All interviews were completed via telephone. The goal before commencing the data collection was to complete at least 20% of the interviews on the cellular phones of the participants, with the remaining 80% of the interviews (at most) on the landlines of participants, with a total goal of approximately 400 completed interviews. To be eligible to complete the survey, the resident was required to be at least 18 years of age. To complete the landline portion of the sampling, personal residence telephone numbers were randomly selected from the population of approximately 70,000 household landline telephone numbers in service in Broome County. These landline telephone numbers were obtained from *Accudata America*, a subsidiary of Primis, Inc. *Accudata America* is a firm that specializes in providing contact information for residents of the United States. The telephone numbers were obtained from an unscrubbed list, ensuring that individuals whose households are included in the “telemarketing do-not-call list” would be represented in this study. After receiving the randomly selected landline telephone numbers, the list was randomly sorted a second time and a group of residential landline numbers was attempted for interviews in the county. To complete the cell phone portion of the sampling, a random-digit generation process with manual dialing was utilized where common area codes and three-digit prefixes for cellular phones in use in the Broome County region were identified, and random sets of four-digit telephone number endings after these common prefixes were generated to be attempted. Before a survey was completed with a participant who was speaking on their cellular phone it was queried and established that the participant was not driving a motor vehicle at that time, and that he or she was in a safe and private location at that time. Interviews were completed on the cellular phone of the participants for 112 of the 400 completed interviews (28% of all completed interviews), and interviews were completed on the landline telephone of the participants for 288 of the 400 completed interviews (72% of all completed interviews).

All telephone calls were made between 3:30 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. from a call center in Watertown, New York, on evenings between December 16th, 2013 and January 14th, 2014. The staff of *Joel LaLone Consulting*, who completed the interviews, has extensive experience and training in human subject research methodology and effective interviewing techniques. It was necessary to attempt to contact 3,005 households before completing the contracted 400 interviews (cellular phones and landline telephone results combined). When each of the 3,005 telephone numbers was attempted, one of four results occurred: Completion of an interview; a Decline to be interviewed; No Answer/Busy; or an Invalid Number (includes those cellular phone numbers contacted for which the persons lived outside of Broome County). As required within the research protocol provided by the New York State Department of Health, voluntary informed consent was obtained from each resident before the interview was completed. This protocol included informing each resident that it was his or her right to decline to answer any and all individual questions within the interview. To be categorized as a completed interview, at least one-half (50%) of the questions in the survey were required to be completed. The resident's refusal to answer more than one-half of the questions was considered a decline to be interviewed. The typical length of a completed survey was approximately ten minutes. Declines to be interviewed (refusals) were not called back with an attempt to convince the resident to reconsider the interview. If no contact was made at a telephone number (No Answer/Busy), callbacks were made to the phone number. Telephone numbers that were not successfully contacted and, as a result, were ultimately categorized as No Answer/Busy, were attempted a minimum of four times (three callbacks).

When no person answered the telephone no messages were left by interviewers, neither on answering machines at homes nor as voicemail to cellular phones. No rewards or gifts were offered to contacted adults to encourage their participation. The response rate results for the study are summarized below.

Table 1 Response Rates for the December 2013 Broome County Community Tobacco Survey

Response rates for LANDLINES & CELL PHONES COMBINED attempted in this study: (≈28% of interviews were completed on cell phones, with 20% of participants indicating "cell-only" phone ownership)	Complete Interview	Decline to be Interviewed	Not Valid Telephone Number	No Answer/ Busy	TOTALS
Frequency	400	586	314	1,705	3,005
% of Numbers Attempted	13%	20%	10%	57%	100%
% of Valid Numbers	15%	22%		63%	100%
% of Contacted Residents	41%	59%			100%

Within the fields of social science and community-based research, when using a hybrid sampling design including both landline telephone interview and cellular phone interview methodology, a response rate of over 40% of all successful contacts where a potential participant is actually talking on the phone is considered very successful.

1.3 DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE SAMPLE – WHO WAS INTERVIEWED?

This section of the final report of study findings includes a description of the results for the demographic variables included in the survey sample. The demographic characteristics of the sampled adult residents can be used to attain the following three separate objectives. Initially, this information adds to the knowledge and awareness about the true characteristics of the population of adult residents in the sampled county (i.e. What is the current typical household size, educational profile, and/or annual household income level in Broome County?). Secondly, this demographic information facilitates the ability for the data to be sorted or partitioned to investigate for significant relationships – relationships between demographic characteristics of people and their attitudes and behaviors regarding tobacco. Identification of significant relationships allows tobacco community partnerships to use the data more effectively to identify specific subgroups of the county population for programming and interventions, and ultimately, measure impact and change within these subgroups. Finally, the demographic information also serves an important purpose when compared to established facts regarding the population demographics among adults in Broome County – to analyze the representativeness of the sample that was randomly selected in this study. The results for the demographic questions in the survey are summarized in the following table. The estimated demographic characteristics of the entire adult population residing in Broome County that were reported by the U.S. Census Bureau in 2012 are also summarized for each demographic variable and provided for comparison.

Table 2 Demographics of the Sample Compared to U.S. Census Estimates for Broome County (sample results weighted for Gender, Age, Education Level, Residence Type, Phone Ownership)

Demographic Characteristics:	Broome County (December 2013 Sample)	Broome County (U.S. Census Estimates)
Gender (US Census %'s are among those age 18 or older)		
Male	49%	49%
Female	51%	51%
Age Group (US Census %'s are among those age 18 or older)		
18-24	15%	15%
25-34	14%	14%
35-44	15%	15%
45-54	19%	19%
55-64	16%	16%
65+	21%	21%
Education Level (US Census reports for those over age of 25)		
HS Graduate or less	44%	44%
Some College	30%	30%
College Graduate (4+years)	26%	26%
Annual Household Income		
Less than \$25,000	25%	28%
\$25,000-\$50,000	42%	26%
\$50,000-\$75,000	17%	19%
More than \$75,000	16%	28%
Type of Residence		
Multi-unit Dwelling or Apartment	30%	31% "housing units in multi-unit structures"
Single-family home	69%	
Don't know/Not sure	1%	

Table 2 Demographics of the Sample Compared to U.S. Census Estimates for Broome County (cont.) (sample results weighted for Gender, Age, Education Level, Residence Type, Phone Ownership)

Demographic Characteristics:	Broome County (December 2013 Sample)	Broome County (U.S. Census Estimates)
Race/Ethnicity		
White	89%	89%
Black or African American	7%	5%
Hispanic or Latino	2%	3%
Asian	1%	4%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0%	0%
American Indian, Alaska Native	1%	1%
Employment Status (US Census reports for those over age of 15)		
Employed for wages	54%	55% employed 5% unemployed 40% "not in labor force"
Self-employed	3%	
Out of work more than 1 year	2%	
Out of work less than 1 year	4%	
Homemaker	3%	
Student	6%	
Retired	26%	
Unable to work	2%	
Not sure	1%	
Children in the Household		
No persons under age 18 in home.	64%	25% "1+ children in household"
1 person under age 18 in home.	20%	
2 persons under age 18 in home.	8%	
3 persons under age 18 in home.	4%	
4+ persons under age 18 in home.	4%	

In general, Table 2 demonstrates that after weighting the data collected in this study for Gender, Age, Education, Residence Type, and Phone Ownership, the responses to the demographic questions for the Broome County residents who are included in the survey (those who actually answered the telephone and completed the survey) appear to closely parallel that which is true for the entire adult population of the county. The postal zip code for each participant was recorded, and the geographic distribution of this sample represents Broome County accurately, as well. The targets for demographic characteristics were drawn from the most recent U.S. Census updates for Broome County (<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/36000.html>).

The primary exceptions when comparing the raw (unweighted) demographics of this Broome County sample to U.S. Census estimates for the entire county adult population are that women are overrepresented in the unweighted sample (women are more likely than men to answer the telephone and/or agree to a survey, whereas the distribution of men and women in the Broome County adult population is essentially equal), older residents are also overrepresented in the unweighted sample (again, older residents are more likely than younger adult residents to participate in a telephone survey), those adult residents with lower formal education levels are underrepresented in the unweighted sample (less likely to participate in a survey than those with higher formal education levels), adult residents of multiple-unit dwellings are underrepresented in the unweighted sample (due to less likelihood that renters purchase a landline in their unit), and residents who are only accessible via cell phone (they have no landline in their home) are slightly underrepresented in the unweighted sample. These types of sampling error are inherent in telephone methodology: females, older persons, those with higher formal education levels, those who live in single-family homes, and those who are not "cell-phone only" are typically overrepresented – regardless of the subject of the survey, not just in the instance when the survey relates to tobacco issues. To compensate for this overrepresentation in the unweighted sample of females, older residents, the highly-educated, homeowners, and those who have no cell phone, post-stratification weightings by gender, age, education level, residence type, and telephone ownership have been applied in any further analysis of the tobacco issues included in this report. All subsequent statistics that will be reported in this document are weighted by gender, age, education level, residence type, and telephone ownership. Again, the gender, age, education level, and residence type targets that are used for these weighting algorithms are derived from the 2012 U.S. Census updates for the Broome County adult population, and the telephone ownership population estimates are derived from a combination of participant phone ownership responses along with recent estimates for U.S. households published by the Center for Disease Control (www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr039.pdf).

Given the emphasis placed on scientific sampling design and protocol utilized in this study, and the high response rates; after application of post-stratification weightings by gender, age, education level, residence type, and phone ownership, it is felt that this weighted sample of Broome County adults does accurately represent the population of all

Broome County adults. Therefore, the findings of this study may be generalized to the population of all adults of at least 18 years of age living in Broome County.

In survey research, the exact margin of error when estimating for an entire population is question-specific, with the margin of error for each survey question depending upon the sample size for each question and sample statistics that result for each question. Sample sizes tend to vary for each question on the survey, since some questions are only appropriate for certain subgroups (i.e. only *current cigarette smokers* might then be further asked if they would like to quit smoking now) and/or as a result of persons refusing to answer survey questions (which is their right to do so, of course, according to human subject research law). In general, the results of this survey for any questions that were answered by the entire sample of 400 interviewed Broome County adults may be generalized to the population of all adults at least 18 years of age residing in the county with a 95% confidence level to within a **margin of error of approximately ± 4 percentage points** (there is an *average* margin of error of $\pm 3.9\%$ with a sample size of $n=400$). For results that are investigated for certain specific subgroups in Broome County, such as results specifically for current cigarette smokers, the resulting smaller sample sizes allow generalization to the specific subpopulation of all adults at least 18 years of age residing in Broome County (i.e. generalization of some specific characteristics of *sampled smokers* in Broome County to *all cigarette smokers in Broome County*) with a 95% confidence level to within a margin of error that will be larger than ± 4 percentage points.

A bit more of an explanation regarding the meaning of a margin of error may be helpful at this point. The utility of a margin of error is: one can be 95% confident that any sample statistic presented in the remainder of this report for the entire sample of $n=400$ adults from the county would/could only deviate from the true value that would be found if all 160,000 adults in the county were in fact interviewed, by at most 4 percentage points. Note that the preceding statement regarding 95% confidence that the statistics in this study are at the most only 4 percentage points away from the true population values if all 160,000 adults in the counties were interviewed is based upon the fundamental proven mathematical, probability, and sampling theory facts and theorems that are proven in any first-semester college statistics course. Often-times to the non-statistician these statements could appear counter-intuitive, and one might assume that the accuracy of a survey would somehow be related to the small portion of the entire population that is actually sampled ... in other words, those who have not studied statistics coursework and/or theory at times pose some question such as “why would I ever believe the results from only surveying 400 adults from Broome County, when that means that approximately 159,600 of the approximately 160,000 Broome County adult residents have not been interviewed?” While this observation of such a small proportional sample size is absolutely true (400 out of 160,000 is only 0.0025, or 0.25%, which is approximately one out of every 400 adult residents) the suggestion that it is too small, or that the 159,600 not sampled is even relevant, is incorrect, no less incorrect than it would be to state that $2+2=5$.

In summary, the size of the margin of error when sampling (surveying) is independent of the size of the population from which one is sampling. The size of the margin of error is directly a function of sample size (the 400 in Broome County) not population size (the 160,000 in Broome County). These same folks who question whether $n=400$ in Broome County is “large enough” might question why the sample size in Broome County is $n=400$, while in a much larger county in New York State which might have an adult population size of over 1,000,000, the same sample size of $n=400$ would be appropriate to use. Again, the reader is reminded that the size of the sampled population rarely, if ever, is related to the size of the sample selected from that population. If *Joel LaLone Consulting* were to survey the adult residents of Broome County ($N \approx 160,000$ in the population) a sample size of $n=400$ would be recommended/implemented. Likewise, if *Joel LaLone Consulting* were to survey the adult residents of the entirety of New York State ($N \approx 15,000,000$ in the population) a sample size of $n=400$ would also be recommended/implemented. And, these two studies, one of smaller Broome County and one of larger New York State, using the same sample sizes of $n=400$, would have the same resulting margins of error of approximately ± 4 percentage points.

Enough with all of that statistical theory – now an example illustrating the appropriate use of the margin of error for this study will be shown. If one has a goal to use this survey data to estimate the percentage of the entire adult population of Broome County who feels that “pharmacies *should not* be allowed to sell tobacco”, then reference to Table 13 later in this report shows that 59.6% of the sampled adults respond with *should not*. Using a margin of error of *approximately ± 4 percentage points*, the result is that we are 95% confident that if all 160,000 adults in the county were interviewed and asked their preference regarding tobacco sales allowed at pharmacies, the resulting percentage who would respond with *should not* will be contained in the interval $59.6\% \pm 4\%$, somewhere between 55.6% and 63.6%. This resulting interval is called a **confidence interval** (much more explanation of confidence intervals is provided in Section 1.4 of this report for interested readers).

Throughout this report the key participant demographic characteristics of Gender, Age, Education Level, Household Income Level, and Cigarette Smoking Status are investigated as potential explanatory variables that may be correlated with tobacco-related attitudes and behaviors for the county. It is standard methodology with professional surveys to provide this further rich information to the reader – information that may assist in explaining the overall findings – by reporting the cross-tabulated results for all subgroups within key demographic variables. For more specific detail regarding the margin of error for this survey and the elements of statistical tests of significance, please continue to Section 1.4 – Technical Comments and/or contact the professional staff at *Joel LaLone Consulting*. All data compilation and statistical analyses within this study have been completed using *SPSS, Release 22*.

1.4

TECHNICAL COMMENTS TO ASSIST INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

The results of this study will be disseminated to, and utilized in decision-making by, a very wide array of readers – who, no doubt, have a very wide array of statistical backgrounds. The following comments are provided to give guidance for interpretation of the presented findings so that readers with less-than-current statistical training might maximize the use of the information contained in this community tobacco assessment survey.

Margin of Error – More Detail for Those Interested in Maximizing Precision and Accuracy of Estimates

When data is collected, of course, it is only possible for the researcher to analyze the results of the *sample* data, the data from the group of individuals actually sampled, or in this case, actually interviewed. However, it is typically the goal of the researcher to use this *sample* data to draw a conclusion, or estimate, which they are confident is true for the entire *population* from which the sample was selected. To complete this estimation the standard statistical technique is to construct a **confidence interval** – an interval of values between which one can be 95% certain, or confident, that the true population value will fall. For example, if a researcher interviews $n=500$ randomly selected participants from some population (i.e. a county) of total size $N=100,000$ individuals, and the researcher finds that $x=200$ of the 500 sampled participants indicate that they “agree” with some posed statement (200 out of 500 would be 40%), then the researcher can never be 100% certain that if all 100,000 population members were, in fact, interviewed that the result for this entire population investigation would be that exactly 40% (that would be exactly 40,000 out of the 100,000 in the population) would “agree.” In general, one can never guarantee with 100% certainty that a statistic for some random sample will perfectly, exactly, result the same as the population value that describes the entire population (this value is called a “parameter”). Fortunately, considering the types of variables and resulting data that typically are generated in survey research, use of the statistical tools of probability distributions and sampling distributions allows the determination of a very important distance – the distance within which one would expect 95% of the samples of size n to fall either above or below the true population value. This distance is commonly referred to as the **margin of error**. Once this distance (margin of error) is measured, there is a 95% probability that the sample result (the result of the $n=500$ sampled participants in the illustration above) will fall within that distance of the true population value. Therefore, to construct the very useful and easily-interpreted statistical estimation tool known as a **confidence interval**, all one must do is calculate the margin of error and add-and-subtract it to-and-from the sample result (statistic) and the outcome is that there is a 95% chance that the resulting interval does, in fact, include the true population value within the interval.

To illustrate the above-described concepts of margin of error and confidence intervals, recall that the margin of error for this survey has been earlier stated in the Demographics section in this report as *approximately* ± 4 percentage points. Therefore, when a percentage is observed in one of the following Broome County “2013 Results” tables (recall, $n=400$ participants), the appropriate interpretation is that we are 95% confident that if *all* adult residents of Broome County were surveyed (rather than just the 400 that were actually surveyed), the percentage that would result for all residents would be within ± 4 percentage points of the *sample* percentage that has been calculated and reported in this study. Again, as an example, since 59.6% of the sample of Broome County adults in December 2013 reported that they believe that *tobacco products should not be sold in pharmacies* (please refer to Table 13 later in this report to verify this statistic), with this sample result, one can infer with 95% confidence (only a 5% chance that it will not be true) that if *all* Broome County adults were asked, somewhere between 55.6% and 63.6% of the population of approximately 160,000 adults over the age of 18 in Broome County would indicate that they believe that *tobacco products should not be sold in pharmacies* (using a margin of error of $\pm 4\%$). This resulting interval (55.6%-63.6%) is known as a 95% Confidence Interval.

The preceding introductory example used a margin of error of $\pm 4\%$, as a result of an illustration that used all 400 participants in this study. However, the margin of error when using the sample results in this study to construct a confidence interval to estimate a population percentage will not always be $\pm 4\%$. There is not one universal value of a

margin of error that can be precisely calculated and used for the results for every question included in this survey, or for that matter, any multiple-question survey. Calculation methods used in this study for generating the margin of error depend upon the following three factors, which include two factors in addition to the sample-size factor that has been mentioned earlier in Section 1.3.

1. The **sample size** is the number of adults who validly answered the survey question. The sample size will not always be $n=400$ since individuals have a right to omit any question. Additionally, some survey questions were only posed after screening questions. In general, the smaller the sample size then the larger the margin of error, and conversely, the larger the sample size then the smaller the margin of error.
2. The **sample proportion or percentage** is the calculated percentage of the sample who responded with the answer or category of interest (i.e. responded "Agree"). This percentage can vary from 0%-100%, and, of course, will change from question to question throughout the survey. In general, the further that a sample percentage varies from 50%, in either direction (approaching either 0% or 100%), the smaller the margin of error, and conversely, the closer that the actual sample percentage is to 50% then the larger the resulting margin of error. As an example, if 160 out of 400 sampled residents "Agree" with some posed statement, then the sample proportion would be $(160 \div 400 = 0.40 = 40\%)$
3. The **confidence level** is used in generalizing the results of the sample to the population that the sample represented. In this study, the standard confidence level used in survey research, 95% confidence level, will be used for all survey questions.

In mathematical notation, the margin of error for each sample result for this study would be represented as:

$$ME = 1.96 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{p(100-p)}{n}}$$

Where n = sample size = # valid responses to the survey question

p = sample percentage for the survey question (between 0%-100%)

1.96 = the standard normal score associated with the 95% confidence level

Since the sample size varies (in fact, is conceivably different for each question on the survey) and the sample percentage varies (also, conceivably different for each question on the survey) the following table (Table 3) has been provided for the reader to determine the correct margin of error to use whenever constructing a confidence interval using the sample data presented in this study. This table was generated using the ME formula shown above. Likewise, for any sample size that is not included in Table 3, and any sample proportion that is not included in Table 3 (2% increments were used), the reader could use the ME formula shown above to directly calculate a most-precise margin of error.

Table 3

Margins of Error for Varying Sample Sizes and Varying Sample Proportions

Varying Sample %'s:	Varying Sample Sizes (n=...):															
	30	50	75	100	125	150	175	200	225	250	275	300	325	350	375	400
2%	5.0%	3.9%	3.2%	2.7%	2.5%	2.2%	2.1%	1.9%	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%	1.6%	1.5%	1.5%	1.4%	1.4%
4%	7.0%	5.4%	4.4%	3.8%	3.4%	3.1%	2.9%	2.7%	2.6%	2.4%	2.3%	2.2%	2.1%	2.1%	2.0%	1.9%
6%	8.5%	6.6%	5.4%	4.7%	4.2%	3.8%	3.5%	3.3%	3.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.7%	2.6%	2.5%	2.4%	2.3%
8%	9.7%	7.5%	6.1%	5.3%	4.8%	4.3%	4.0%	3.8%	3.5%	3.4%	3.2%	3.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.7%	2.7%
10%	10.7%	8.3%	6.8%	5.9%	5.3%	4.8%	4.4%	4.2%	3.9%	3.7%	3.5%	3.4%	3.3%	3.1%	3.0%	2.9%
12%	11.6%	9.0%	7.4%	6.4%	5.7%	5.2%	4.8%	4.5%	4.2%	4.0%	3.8%	3.7%	3.5%	3.4%	3.3%	3.2%
14%	12.4%	9.6%	7.9%	6.8%	6.1%	5.6%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%	4.3%	4.1%	3.9%	3.8%	3.6%	3.5%	3.4%
16%	13.1%	10.2%	8.3%	7.2%	6.4%	5.9%	5.4%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%	4.3%	4.1%	4.0%	3.8%	3.7%	3.6%
18%	13.7%	10.6%	8.7%	7.5%	6.7%	6.1%	5.7%	5.3%	5.0%	4.8%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	4.0%	3.9%	3.8%
20%	14.3%	11.1%	9.1%	7.8%	7.0%	6.4%	5.9%	5.5%	5.2%	5.0%	4.7%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	4.0%	3.9%
22%	14.8%	11.5%	9.4%	8.1%	7.3%	6.6%	6.1%	5.7%	5.4%	5.1%	4.9%	4.7%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	4.1%
24%	15.3%	11.8%	9.7%	8.4%	7.5%	6.8%	6.3%	5.9%	5.6%	5.3%	5.0%	4.8%	4.6%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%
26%	15.7%	12.2%	9.9%	8.6%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	6.1%	5.7%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.8%	4.6%	4.4%	4.3%
28%	16.1%	12.4%	10.2%	8.8%	7.9%	7.2%	6.7%	6.2%	5.9%	5.6%	5.3%	5.1%	4.9%	4.7%	4.5%	4.4%
30%	16.4%	12.7%	10.4%	9.0%	8.0%	7.3%	6.8%	6.4%	6.0%	5.7%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.8%	4.6%	4.5%
32%	16.7%	12.9%	10.6%	9.1%	8.2%	7.5%	6.9%	6.5%	6.1%	5.8%	5.5%	5.3%	5.1%	4.9%	4.7%	4.6%
34%	17.0%	13.1%	10.7%	9.3%	8.3%	7.6%	7.0%	6.6%	6.2%	5.9%	5.6%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.8%	4.6%
36%	17.2%	13.3%	10.9%	9.4%	8.4%	7.7%	7.1%	6.7%	6.3%	6.0%	5.7%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.9%	4.7%
38%	17.4%	13.5%	11.0%	9.5%	8.5%	7.8%	7.2%	6.7%	6.3%	6.0%	5.7%	5.5%	5.3%	5.1%	4.9%	4.8%
40%	17.5%	13.6%	11.1%	9.6%	8.6%	7.8%	7.3%	6.8%	6.4%	6.1%	5.8%	5.5%	5.3%	5.1%	5.0%	4.8%
42%	17.7%	13.7%	11.2%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.3%	6.8%	6.4%	6.1%	5.8%	5.6%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.8%
44%	17.8%	13.8%	11.2%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.4%	6.9%	6.5%	6.2%	5.9%	5.6%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.9%
46%	17.8%	13.8%	11.3%	9.8%	8.7%	8.0%	7.4%	6.9%	6.5%	6.2%	5.9%	5.6%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.9%
48%	17.9%	13.8%	11.3%	9.8%	8.8%	8.0%	7.4%	6.9%	6.5%	6.2%	5.9%	5.7%	5.4%	5.2%	5.1%	4.9%
50%	17.9%	13.9%	11.3%	9.8%	8.8%	8.0%	7.4%	6.9%	6.5%	6.2%	5.9%	5.7%	5.4%	5.2%	5.1%	4.9%
52%	17.9%	13.8%	11.3%	9.8%	8.8%	8.0%	7.4%	6.9%	6.5%	6.2%	5.9%	5.7%	5.4%	5.2%	5.1%	4.9%
54%	17.8%	13.8%	11.3%	9.8%	8.7%	8.0%	7.4%	6.9%	6.5%	6.2%	5.9%	5.6%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.9%
56%	17.8%	13.8%	11.2%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.4%	6.9%	6.5%	6.2%	5.9%	5.6%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.9%
58%	17.7%	13.7%	11.2%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.3%	6.8%	6.4%	6.1%	5.8%	5.6%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.8%
60%	17.5%	13.6%	11.1%	9.6%	8.6%	7.8%	7.3%	6.8%	6.4%	6.1%	5.8%	5.5%	5.3%	5.1%	5.0%	4.8%
62%	17.4%	13.5%	11.0%	9.5%	8.5%	7.8%	7.2%	6.7%	6.3%	6.0%	5.7%	5.5%	5.3%	5.1%	4.9%	4.8%
64%	17.2%	13.3%	10.9%	9.4%	8.4%	7.7%	7.1%	6.7%	6.3%	6.0%	5.7%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.9%	4.7%
66%	17.0%	13.1%	10.7%	9.3%	8.3%	7.6%	7.0%	6.6%	6.2%	5.9%	5.6%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.8%	4.6%
68%	16.7%	12.9%	10.6%	9.1%	8.2%	7.5%	6.9%	6.5%	6.1%	5.8%	5.5%	5.3%	5.1%	4.9%	4.7%	4.6%
70%	16.4%	12.7%	10.4%	9.0%	8.0%	7.3%	6.8%	6.4%	6.0%	5.7%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.8%	4.6%	4.5%
72%	16.1%	12.4%	10.2%	8.8%	7.9%	7.2%	6.7%	6.2%	5.9%	5.6%	5.3%	5.1%	4.9%	4.7%	4.5%	4.4%
74%	15.7%	12.2%	9.9%	8.6%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	6.1%	5.7%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	4.8%	4.6%	4.4%	4.3%
76%	15.3%	11.8%	9.7%	8.4%	7.5%	6.8%	6.3%	5.9%	5.6%	5.3%	5.0%	4.8%	4.6%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%
78%	14.8%	11.5%	9.4%	8.1%	7.3%	6.6%	6.1%	5.7%	5.4%	5.1%	4.9%	4.7%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	4.1%
80%	14.3%	11.1%	9.1%	7.8%	7.0%	6.4%	5.9%	5.5%	5.2%	5.0%	4.7%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	4.0%	3.9%
82%	13.7%	10.6%	8.7%	7.5%	6.7%	6.1%	5.7%	5.3%	5.0%	4.8%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	4.0%	3.9%	3.8%
84%	13.1%	10.2%	8.3%	7.2%	6.4%	5.9%	5.4%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%	4.3%	4.1%	4.0%	3.8%	3.7%	3.6%
86%	12.4%	9.6%	7.9%	6.8%	6.1%	5.6%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%	4.3%	4.1%	3.9%	3.8%	3.6%	3.5%	3.4%
88%	11.6%	9.0%	7.4%	6.4%	5.7%	5.2%	4.8%	4.5%	4.2%	4.0%	3.8%	3.7%	3.5%	3.4%	3.3%	3.2%
90%	10.7%	8.3%	6.8%	5.9%	5.3%	4.8%	4.4%	4.2%	3.9%	3.7%	3.5%	3.4%	3.3%	3.1%	3.0%	2.9%
92%	9.7%	7.5%	6.1%	5.3%	4.8%	4.3%	4.0%	3.8%	3.5%	3.4%	3.2%	3.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.7%	2.7%
94%	8.5%	6.6%	5.4%	4.7%	4.2%	3.8%	3.5%	3.3%	3.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.7%	2.6%	2.5%	2.4%	2.3%
96%	7.0%	5.4%	4.4%	3.8%	3.4%	3.1%	2.9%	2.7%	2.6%	2.4%	2.3%	2.2%	2.1%	2.1%	2.0%	1.9%
98%	5.0%	3.9%	3.2%	2.7%	2.5%	2.2%	2.1%	1.9%	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%	1.6%	1.5%	1.5%	1.4%	1.4%
Average	14.3%	11.1%	9.0%	7.8%	7.0%	6.4%	5.9%	5.5%	5.2%	5.0%	4.7%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	4.0%	3.9%

Illustration of how to use Table 3: To estimate the percentage in the entire population of Broome County adults who would respond to “Would you support a local or state policy limiting the maximum number of tobacco retailers allowed in a neighborhood or area?” with “Yes”, one must simply refer to Table 15 to determine the sample size and percentage of this sample of Broome County adults who respond with “Yes”. From Table 15 it is found that 43.4% of the sampled Broome County adults indicate that they would support this type of policy, and the sample size is $n=400$. Reference to Table 3 on the preceding page indicates that the appropriate margin of error would be $\pm 4.9\%$ (used $n=400$, and used $p=44\%$, the closest entry to $p=43.4\%$ in the table). Therefore, we can be 95% confident that if all Broome County adults were asked, the resulting percentage who would indicate that they support a local or state policy limiting the maximum number of tobacco retailers allowed in a neighborhood or area among this population of adults would be within $\pm 4.9\%$ of the 43.4% found in our sample. The interpretation of this would be that we are 95% confident that among all Broome County adults the percentage who support a local or state policy limiting the maximum number of tobacco retailers allowed in a neighborhood or area would be somewhere between 38.5% and 48.3%. Note that this margin of error of 4.9 percentage points is larger than the earlier-cited study margin of error of 4 percentage points as a result of the sample proportion (43.4%) being so close to 50%.

As a second example of using Table 3, consider if $n=60$ persons *who are age 18-24* in Broome County validly answered a survey question (a question such as “Do you think that *pharmacies* should or should not be allowed to sell tobacco products?”, later described in detail in Table 13), and $p=84.6\%$ of these younger adults responded with *should not*, then the interpretation would be that the margin of error for estimating that which would be expected to be true for the entire Broome County *18-24 years of age* adult population would be $\pm 10.2\%$ (used the margin of error from Table 3 for the sample proportion included in the table that was closest to our actual sample proportion – 84% in the table, and sample size closest to our actual sample size – $n=50$ in the table). Finally, one could then state with 95% confidence that among *all Broome County adults age 18-24*, somewhere in the interval $84.6\% \pm 10.2\%$, or in other words, between 74.4% and 94.8%, think that pharmacies *should not* be allowed to sell tobacco products. Note that this margin of error of $\pm 10.2\%$ is larger than the earlier-cited margin of error of approximately $\pm 4\%$, predominately a result of having a sample of only 60 adults age 18-24 included in the sample. Again, this resulting interval (74.4%-94.8%) is known as a **95% Confidence Interval**.

It should be noted that the margin of error is a measurement of random error, error due to simply the random chance of sampling. For example, if one were to flip a fair coin $n=400$ times, the population percentage for the percentage of the time that the coin would result with a head is, of course, 50%. Use of Table 3 indicates that with a margin of error of $\pm 4.9\%$, one would determine that there is a 95% chance that a sample of $n=400$ flips would fall with $\pm 4.9\%$ of this real population value of 50%. In other words, there is a 95% chance that the sample result will be between $50\% \pm 4.9\%$, between 45.1% and 54.9%. Only 5% of the time would a sample of $n=400$ flips result with either less than 45.1% heads, or greater than 54.9% heads.

However, in survey research, it is not coins that are being flipped; it is humans who are being interviewed. When surveying humans there are other potential sources of error, sources of error in addition to random error (which is the only error encompassed by the margin of error). Response error, nonresponse error, process error, bias in sample selection, bias in question-phrasing, lack of clarity in question-phrasing, and undercoverage are common sources of other-than-random error. Methods that should be, and have been in this Broome County study, employed to minimize these other sources of error are: maximum effort to select the sample randomly, piloting and testing of utilized survey questions, extensive training of all data collectors (interviewers), and application of post-stratification algorithms. Hence, when using this study data to make estimates to the entire Broome County adult population, as is the case in standard survey research practices, the margin of error will be the only error measurement cited and interpreted.

Significance Testing – Testing for Statistically Significant Differences, Trends, and Relationships

The technical discussion of statistical techniques above has focused on the statistical inference referred to as *estimation* – construction of confidence intervals using the margins of error described in Table 3. To take full advantage of the data collected in this study, other statistical techniques are of value. Tests for significant trends over time, tests to compare to regional averages, and tests for significantly correlated factors with measured variables, are all presented as well.

A comment or two regarding “statistical significance” could help readers of varying quantitative backgrounds most appropriately interpret the results of what has been statistically analyzed. Again, because the data for the Broome County tobacco survey is based on a *sample* of 400 adult residents, as opposed to obtaining information from every single adult resident in Broome County, there must be a method of determining whether an observed relationship or difference in the *sample* survey data is likely to continue to hold true if *every* adult resident of the county were, in fact, interviewed. To make this determination, **tests of statistical significance** are standard practice in evaluating sample survey data.

For example, if the *sample* data shows that Broome County residents appear to think that pharmacies *should not* be allowed to sell tobacco products more commonly than those residents in neighboring counties (59.6% of Broome County adults think pharmacies *should not*, while the regional average rate is 54.7%, please refer to Table 13), the researcher would want to know if this higher proportion would still be present if they interviewed *every* Broome County

adult rather than just the sample of 400 adults who were actually interviewed. To answer this question, the researcher uses a test of statistical significance. The outcome of a **test of statistical significance** will be that the result is either “not statistically significant” or the result is “statistically significant.”

In this illustration, the meaning of “not statistically significant” is that if the sample were repeated many more times (in this case, that would mean many more different groups of $n=400$ randomly selected adults from the approximately 160,000 adults in Broome County), then the results of these samples would *not* consistently show that the Broome County adults believe that pharmacies should not be allowed to sell tobacco products more commonly than those residents in neighboring counties; some Broome County samples of 400 adults might be higher and some lower than the neighboring county average rate of 54.7%. In this case, the researcher could **not** report *with high levels of confidence* that the Broome County rate is statistically significantly different from the regional average. Rather, the difference found between the one actually-selected sample of size $n=400$ Broome County residents and the aggregate results of the neighboring counties would be interpreted as small enough that it could be due simply to the random chance of sampling when interviewing only 400 residents – *not statistically significant*.

Conversely, the meaning of “statistically significant” in this example is that if the sample were repeated many more times, then the results of these samples would consistently show that Broome County adults are more likely to believe that pharmacies *should not* be allowed to sell tobacco products than those adults in neighboring counties. Furthermore, if *every* adult in Broome County were interviewed, we are confident that this population opposed-to-tobacco-sales-at-pharmacies rate in the county would be higher than the average rate in neighboring counties. One can never be 100% certain (or confident) that the result of a sample will indicate appropriately whether the population value (in this illustration that would be: the results for *all* Broome County residents) is, in fact, different from some hypothesized value (in this illustration that would be: the regional average rate) or not. However, using the standard confidence level of 95%, an interpretation of “not statistically significant” means that the size of the observed sample difference would naturally be expected to be found in 95 out of 100 random samples of similar size n . The interpretation of a “statistically significant” difference is that the sample difference is so large that there is a probability of less than 5% that this difference occurred simply due to the random chance of sampling; instead, it is considered a “real” difference. In this study, when completing significance tests, the 95% confidence level will be used. In statistical vocabulary and notation, this would be represented as a p -value of less than 5% ($p<0.05$).

Note, this “belief that pharmacies *should not* be allowed to sell tobacco products” survey question is described in detail in Table 13, and the 2013 Broome County rate of 59.6% believing that pharmacies should not be allowed to sell tobacco products is significantly higher than the current regional average rate of 54.7%, this is a large enough difference to be considered statistically significant, which is what is indicated by the (“Should not” in Broome is significantly higher than the current regional average) comment that is directly above the Regional Comparison table for Broome County’s Table 13. In other words, 59.6% as a sample result, from a sample of $n=397$ random adults, is extremely unlikely to occur when selected from a larger population for which the overall population rate is 54.7%.

Correlated Explanatory Variables – How does one decide if there is a “statistically significant” correlation?

Throughout this report, comparisons for “relationships between collected variables” have been completed. The theory when completing these comparisons is similar to that which was described in the illustration above – the comparison of the Broome County “believe that pharmacies *should not* be allowed to sell tobacco products” rate to the current regional average. However, with investigations for *relationships between variables*, the focus becomes the identification of correlations *between* variables – is the result for some survey question different when looking at various subgroups (or, levels) of some other variable? Again, referring to the “pharmacies *should not* be allowed to sell tobacco products” scenario, one could observe in Table 13 that the rate *among males is 50.8% believe that pharmacies should not be allowed to sell tobacco*, and compare this to the rate *among females (which is 68.0%)*. A very small difference between these within-subgroup rates (or, proportions) could be small enough to quite likely occur simply due to the random chance of sampling when the real population values for all males and all females in the county are equal – found to be not a statistically significant difference ($p>0.05$). Conversely, a very large difference between these within-subgroup proportions could be large enough to be quite *unlikely* to occur simply due to the random chance of sampling when the real population values for all males and all females in the county are equal – found to be a statistically significant difference ($p<0.05$).

How does one determine if the observed difference in rates (or, percentages) when comparing subgroups is large enough to be statistically significant, or so small that it is not statistically significant? Commonly a traditional Chi Square Test is used to answer the question posed above (the question: “Is belief that pharmacies should not be allowed to sell tobacco products significantly related to gender in Broome County ... i.e. males and females differ significantly in their attitudes toward this tobacco sales issue), however, an alternative and more user-friendly and versatile statistical approach will be used throughout this study, rather than using Chi Square Tests.

The following few paragraphs will explain to the reader of this report in clear terminology, and with clear instructions, the “why?” and “how?” regarding the determination of which observed differences in rates (or, percentages) when comparing subgroups are large enough to be statistically significant.

Each correlational investigation in this report is presented in its own cross-tabulation table (i.e. an investigation for a relationship between “Age” and “How do you feel about tobacco products being sold in stores that are located near schools?” would be presented in its own table). As a result of approximately 20-25 outcome tobacco-related variables in this study, each cross-tabulated by all five of the potential explanatory variables of Gender, Age, Smoking Status, Education, and Household Income, there are approximately 100-150 cross-tabulation correlational investigation tables included in the following Detailed Statistical Results section of this report. This large number of cross-tabulation tables, combined with the variety of ways that the response distribution to many survey questions could be collapsed (very important limiting factor), suggests that an alternative, more versatile, approach to testing for significance in the cross-tabulation tables be utilized in place of the standard Chi Square Test. Therefore, rather than calculating and reporting the results for each of the \approx 100-150 cross-tabulation tables included in this report, the following method is recommended.

When the reader wishes to determine whether or not an observed difference in a cross-tabulation table is statistically significant or not (i.e. “Does the 50.8% of the 193 sampled *males* in Broome County believing that pharmacies *should not* be allowed to sell tobacco products differ significantly from the 68.0% of the 204 sampled *females* in the county who expressed this belief?”), the method that has been recommended by the New York State Department of Health in its presentation of the 2009 Expanded Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) results is also recommended for this 2013 Broome County study. The NYSDOH 2009 Expanded BRFSS (on page 12 of 151 in that report) cites the following:

“When the confidence intervals of two estimates of the same indicator from different areas (or, subgroups) do not overlap, they may be said to be statistically significantly different, i.e., these differences are unlikely related to chance and are considered true differences. If there is any value that is included in both intervals, the two estimates are not statistically significantly different.”

In other words, first the reader must identify the specific response choice of interest ... is one interested in only investigating “Do Not Allow At All”, or more interested in collapsing the two possible response choices “Do Not Allow At All” and “Restrict to Certain Areas” together ... or, does one want to only investigate “Strongly Favor”, or does one want to collapse “Strongly Favor” and “Somewhat Favor” together? Then, after observing the sample sizes at the bottom of the cross-tabulation tables, one may again refer to Table 3 in this study to identify the correct margins of error if estimating proportions (or, “percentages” or “rates”) for subgroups. With these margins of error, two separate confidence intervals may be constructed, one for each subgroup, and the overlap-vs.-non-overlap rule recommended above by the NYSDOH may be applied to determine whether or not the observed sample difference between demographic subgroups should be considered statistically significant.

Correlated Explanatory Variables – An example of determining if there is a “statistically significant” correlation?

To illustrate this BRFSS-recommended decision process with the potential relationship between the “gender” and “attitude about pharmacies *not* selling tobacco” variables that has been described earlier:

For Males: $n=193$, $p=50.8\%$, therefore from Table 3 the approximate margin of error is $\pm 6.9\%$
The resulting confidence interval is: $50.8\% \pm 6.9\%$, or **(43.9%, 57.7%)**.

For Females: $n=204$, $p=68.0\%$, therefore from Table 3 the approximate margin of error is $\pm 6.5\%$
The resulting confidence interval is: $68.0\% \pm 6.5\%$, or **(61.5%, 74.5%)**.

Since these two confidence intervals do not overlap, the difference between males and females is considered statistically significant. In other words, based upon the sample data collected in this survey, attitude about whether pharmacies *should not* be allowed to sell tobacco products is significantly related to gender in Broome County – males and females do differ significantly in their level of opposition to the sale of tobacco in pharmacies. The 50.8% among males is far enough away from (below) the 68.0% among females to be statistically significant.

It should be noted that the method of determining statistical significance in this study (the NYSDOH/BRFSS-recommended method) is less powerful than other mathematical hypothesis testing methods available. In other words, the overlapping-confidence-intervals method is more susceptible to erring with a “false-negative”, rather than a “false-positive” ... a real difference that exists in the populations being compared (i.e. males vs. females) is more likely to not be detected when using the overlapping-confidence-intervals method than is the case when using the alternative mathematical hypothesis testing methods available. However, the overlapping-confidence-intervals method is very, very unlikely to generate a “false-positive” ... in other words; a difference that does not actually exist in the entire populations is very, very unlikely to be identified as a statistically significant difference when the overlapping-confidence-intervals method is utilized. Any questions about statistical tests of significance, power of tests, margins of error, and any other analyses should be directed to the professional staff at *Joel LaLone Consulting*.

The above-described process is the appropriate process to use whenever comparing subgroups within the data set that has been collected and analyzed within this study. The level of precision that is provided in the margins of error

that are presented in Table 3 is the level of precision that is necessary to validly test for a statistically significant difference between subgroups (or, alternatively described – “test for a statistically significant relationship with some potential explanatory variable”). However, at times the results in this report will (and should be) presented to an audience that has less technical/statistical background than the typical members of a tobacco control community partnership. In this instance, it could be beneficial to explain the margins of error that are appropriate to use for smaller subgroups of the entire sample that has been collected in more general (or, *approximate*) terms. Therefore, the following Table 4 is provided with sample sizes and resulting *approximate* margins of error for the common demographic subgroups that will be compared throughout the remainder of this report. Again, caution should be used in not over-interpreting the approximate margins of error presented in Table 4; these reported margins of error are “average” margins of error, averaging across varying sample proportions that could conceivably be the actual sample proportion for any survey question at each selected sample size. Table 4 is provided for explanation to some audience, for example, of the “typical margin of error when investigating results for only males.” Note that the margin of error results recorded in Table 4 were directly calculated using the mathematical formula shown on page 13.

Table 4 Sample Sizes and Approximate Margins of Error Within Demographic Subgroups (weighted by gender, age, education, residence type, and phone ownership)

Sample Sizes (within commonly-compared demographic subgroups)

By Gender		By Age		By Education		By Income		By Cigarette Use	
Male	n=196	18-24	n=60	HSG or less	n=178	<\$25,000	n=47	Smoker	n=81
Female	n=204	25-34	n=58	Some College	n=120	\$25-\$50k	n=90	Non-smoker	n=319
		35-44	n=58	4+ YD	n=103	\$50-\$75k	n=57		
		45-54	n=78			\$75,000+	n=52		
		55-64	n=63						
		65+	n=83						

Margins of Error (approximate, average across all possible values of sample proportions)

By Gender		By Age		By Education		By Income		By Cigarette Use	
Male	±5.6%	18-24	±10.1%	HSG or less	±5.9%	<\$25,000	±11.4%	Smoker	±8.7%
Female	±5.5%	25-34	±10.3%	Some College	±7.1%	\$25-\$50k	±8.3%	Non-smoker	±4.4%
		35-44	±10.3%	4+ YD	±7.7%	\$50-\$75k	±10.4%		
		45-54	±8.9%			\$75,000+	±10.9%		
		55-64	±9.9%						
		65+	±8.6%						

Regional Comparisons – How does one decide if Broome County is “statistically significantly” different?

A table is provided for each survey question in this study that includes the summarized overall results for a group of twenty-one county-wide studies in Central, Northern, and Western New York that were completed by tobacco community partnerships throughout December 2012 – December 2013 (each of the twenty-one studies has been completed by *Joel LaLone Consulting*, using similar methodology to that which has been used in December 2013 in Broome County). These summarized results include the minimum, maximum, and average values found for each survey question among the twenty-one studies. The research question that is being investigated in these comparisons is: “Is Broome County statistically significantly different from the typical current result for the region regarding some tobacco-related attribute?” In this instance, the statistical approach that is used to determine if the difference between the observed sample percentage in Broome County and the overall regional average percentage is “statistically significant” necessitates the use of only one confidence interval. One must only use Table 3 once, with the appropriate sample percentage and sample size for Broome County, construct the appropriate confidence interval, and the decision is made as follows: if the constructed confidence interval *does* include the regional average result then Broome County is *not* statistically significantly different from the current regional average; conversely, if the constructed confidence interval *does not* include the regional average result then Broome County *is* statistically significantly different from the current regional average. Since there is only one of these comparison-to-regional-average analyses required for each survey question in the study, all comparisons for all survey questions have been calculated and reported for the reader throughout the Detailed Statistical Results section of this report. A comment is made above each regional comparison table that describes whether or not any difference that can be observed between Broome County and the current regional average is statistically significant.

To illustrate a regional comparison, again consider the “attitude about pharmacies *not* being allowed to sell tobacco” variable. Reference to Table 13 shows that:

In Broome County: n=397 participants, and p=59.6% respond with *should not*; therefore from Table 3 the approximate margin of error is $\pm 4.8\%$. The resulting confidence interval is: $59.6\% \pm 4.8\%$, or **(54.8%,64.4%)**.

Since this confidence interval does not contain the estimated regional average of 54.7%, the difference between Broome County and the current regional average is considered statistically significant. In other words, based upon the sample data collected in this survey, attitude in Broome County about whether pharmacies *should not* be allowed to sell tobacco products is significantly different from the current regional average attitude distribution – Broome County adults are more likely to be against the sale of tobacco in pharmacies than is the typical situation in upstate New York counties.

Trend Analysis – How does one decide if Broome County has “statistically significantly” changed over time?

Whenever possible in this report, comparisons are made between the current results and the results in earlier tobacco community assessment studies completed in Broome County (in 2006, 2009, and 2011). The research question that is being investigated in these comparisons is, “Has there been any statistically significant change in tobacco-related attributes among the Broome County residents between 2006 and 2013?”

When interpreting the comparisons that have been provided, the reader should consider the following factors. *Joel LaLone Consulting* also completed the earlier Broome County studies. The earlier studies used telephone-interviewing methodology that was virtually identical to that which was utilized in the present 2013 Broome County study, as well as similar post-stratification weighting procedures. However, the earlier survey instruments that were used are not exactly the same instrument that has been used in 2013. Therefore, only the questions/items that were also measured in earlier studies are available for trend analysis to compare with the current 2013 results. With the similar methodologies and weighting procedures that have been applied, it is valid to make comparisons between the studies – observe changes or trends.

The same concept of statistical significance that was described in the preceding pages regarding “Correlational Analyses” is also applied when a researcher attempts to investigate whether or not results in Broome County have changed significantly over the past seven years; however, the focus now becomes the comparison of the 2013 Broome County result to the earlier Broome County results (rather than comparing males to females, for example, in a correlational analysis), and the same *overlap-vs.-non-overlap* rule recommended by the NYSDOH may be applied to determine whether or not the observed sample difference between years should be considered statistically significant.

To illustrate a trend analysis, once more please consider the “attitude about pharmacies *not* selling tobacco” variable. Reference to Table 13 shows that:

In 2009: n=400 participants, and p=73.3% respond *should not*; therefore from Table 3 the approximate margin of error is $\pm 4.3\%$. The resulting confidence interval for 2009 is: $73.3\% \pm 4.3\%$, or **(69.0%,77.6%)**.

In 2013: n=397 participants, and p=59.6% respond with *should not*; therefore from Table 3 the approximate margin of error is $\pm 4.8\%$. The resulting confidence interval for 2013 is: $59.6\% \pm 4.8\%$, or **(54.8%,64.4%)**.

Since these two confidence intervals do not overlap, the difference between 2009 and 2013 (the 4-year trend) is considered statistically significant. In other words, based upon the sample data collected in this survey, attitude about whether pharmacies *should not* be allowed to sell tobacco products in Broome County has significantly changed between 2009 and 2013, which is what is described in the (“Should not” has decreased significantly between 2009 and 2013) comment directly above the trend analysis table with Table 13.

Finally, the preceding comments regarding statistically significant differences between subgroups, statistically significant differences between Broome County and the current regional average, and statistically significant differences or changes between study years, are comments addressing **statistical significance** ... which, of course, is not one-and-the-same as **practical significance**. The reader should be reminded that statistical significance with respect to sample differences found addresses the concept of *probability*, as follows – “is this difference likely to occur in a sample(s) of size n=400 (or, in the case of subgroups, samples of less than 400, at times) if there is no difference in the entire sampled populations... could the result simply be due to chance?” However, practical significance is an interpretation that is left to the subject area expert, since practical significance addresses the concept of *usefulness*, as follows – “is this difference identified in the collected data useful in the real world?” A *difference* identified in a sample (or, samples) may be statistically significant without being practically significant, however, a *difference* identified in a sample (or, samples) may *not* be practically significant without being statistically significant. To summarize, readers are warned not to over-interpret some practical significance or meaning for a difference in this study data that is mathematically deemed to be *not* statistically significant.

We now begin the presentation of the detailed quantitative results of the 2013 Broome County Tobacco Study, including results for each of the following nine sets of survey questions:

1. Spreading the Message about the Dangers of Tobacco
2. Tobacco Marketing – *Displays in Stores*
3. Tobacco Marketing – *Advertising*
4. Tobacco Marketing – *To Youths in the Media*
5. Tobacco Point of Sale
6. Outdoor Tobacco Policies
7. Smoke Free Housing
8. Tobacco Use
9. Tobacco Purchase, Use, and Cessation Issues – Among *Current Smokers*

Section 2

Detailed Statistical Results

This section of the final report of study findings provides a detailed presentation of the results for each of the questions in the survey. There are nine separate sections of presentation of detailed statistical results to follow (2.1-2.9). Each section is comprised of an analysis of a set of related tobacco attitude and/or behavior questions. The survey questions included in this study and analyzed in this report have been organized into the following sections:

- 2.1 Spreading the Message about the Dangers of Tobacco (Table 5)**
- 2.2 Tobacco Marketing – *Displays in Stores* (Tables 6-8)**
- 2.3 Tobacco Marketing – *Advertising* (Tables 9-10)**
- 2.4 Tobacco Marketing – *To Youths in the Media* (Tables 11-12)**
- 2.5 Tobacco Point of Sale (Tables 13-15)**
- 2.6 Outdoor Tobacco Policies (Tables 16-21)**
- 2.7 Smoke Free Housing (Tables 22-23)**
- 2.8 Tobacco Use (Tables 24-30)**
- 2.9 Tobacco Purchase, Use, and Cessation Issues – Among *Current Smokers* (Tables 31-33)**

An outlined Summary of Findings is presented on the first page of each of these nine sections. These highlights are drawn from the tables of statistical results included in each of the sections.

The organization of the tabular presentation of statistical results in each of the nine sections is as follows. Whenever there are multiple items (survey questions) that are all posed with the same resulting scale (e.g. several different types of outdoor public locations, for each an investigating for opinions about not allowing smoking) then an overall comparison table for these comparative results is presented. Typically these multiple-item comparative summary tables are located at the beginning of a subsection of detailed statistical results presentation.

The most detailed statistical results, however, are presented within the next nine sections of this report on an *individual-question* basis. Whenever possible, the results for *each* of the approximately 20-25 individual tobacco-related survey questions are presented in this section of the report with the following organizational structure, each typically organized including the following four reporting components, as its own one page of this report:

- (1) The **Broome County results of the current study** (December 2013), are presented in a table for each survey question that was included in this study – including sample percentages, sample frequencies or counts, and the sample size (all weighted by gender, age, education level, residence type, and phone ownership). The benefit of this table is to provide a county-specific prevalence estimate data.

- (2) When possible, directly below each of the “2013 Results” tables, **a trend analysis comparison** of the current study results to the results from the previous 2006, 2009, and 2011 Broome County tobacco studies is provided. These “comparison for a trend” tables are only possible when the same survey questions have been asked in earlier studies, as well as in the current 2013 study. If the question phrasing and/or possible response distribution (choices, or answers) have been altered between earlier studies and the 2013 study, to an extent that it is likely that the actual variable or phenomena being measured has changed in definition or description, then no trend table is presented. These trend analysis tables provide information for an analysis of changes over the past seven years – an opportunity to attempt to identify community member attitude and behavior change, and potentially identify Tobacco Free Broome impact. Statistically significant changes or trends, or lack of a change or trend, are highlighted throughout the report (directly above each trend table).
- (3) **Regional Comparative results are provided**, reporting the summarized outcomes for each survey question for a group of twenty-one Central, Northern, and Western New York tobacco-related studies completed between December 2012 – December 2013. Each of these twenty-one studies had adults as the target population, investigated tobacco-related issues, used telephone methodology, and used similar sample sizes. The summarized results include the minimum, maximum, and average result among the twenty-one studied counties. The twenty-one studied counties combined for an overall sample size of 7,854 interviewed upstate New York adult residents. The twenty-one participating counties are Allegany, Broome, Cayuga, Chautauqua, Chemung, Genesee, Jefferson, Lewis, Livingston, Madison, Onondaga, Orleans, Oswego, St. Lawrence, Schuyler, Seneca, Steuben, Tioga, Tompkins, Wayne, and Wyoming Counties. To ease the interpretation of regional comparison results (as well as to satisfy requirements of statistical tests of significance that are applied), responses to survey questions that have a multinomial response distribution have typically been collapsed. For example, a survey question with possible responses of: “Use Every Day”, “Use Some Days”, “Do Not Use”, and “Don’t Know” would typically be collapsed to: “Use at least some” (Every Day + Some Days) versus “Do not indicate use” (Do Not Use + Don’t Know) before displaying regional comparison data and applying statistical tests of significance. These tables provide information for an analysis of the current relative magnitude of the result found in Broome County – is the rate in Broome County statistically significantly higher or lower than the typical rate in upstate New York? Statistical significance of comparative results, whether or not any Broome County current result differs significantly from the current regional average, are highlighted throughout (again, directly above each regional comparison table).
- (4) Finally, the Broome County 2013 results for each of the survey questions are **cross-tabulated by each of the demographic factors of Gender, Age, Education Level, and Household Income Level, as well as by Cigarette Smoking Status** (this report includes over 100 cross-tabulation tables of results). The results for these correlational investigations are provided in tables along with the “current”, “trend”, and “regional comparison” tables for each survey item. Note that at times, for survey questions that were only posed to smaller subgroups, such as those only posed for current cigarette smokers, or only posed for those participants who are currently employed, the sample sizes are not sufficiently large to complete valid tests of statistical significance with the cross-tabulation data – the resulting sample sizes within demographic subgroups are at times well less than 50 (minimum cell size required by NYSDOH standards). Readers are reminded that the method to determine which observed sample differences between subgroups (e.g. comparing males to females, or smokers to non-smokers, in Broome County) are *statistically significant* differences is explained in detail in the “Technical Comments” section earlier in this report, Section 1.4. The statistics reported in the correlative tables (the cross-tabulations by Cigarette Smoking, Gender, Age, Education, and Income) are percentages within the sampled subgroups. To determine the sample size for each subgroup – to avoid over-interpretation – the reader should refer to the bottom row in each cross-tabulation table. Again, findings should be considered with sample sizes in mind. Statistical tests of significance take into consideration these varying sample sizes.

“Framing” a Statistic – Providing Perspective to Better Understand, Interpret, and Use this Survey Data

The rationale behind providing so many analyses (statistics) for every survey question included in this study is that one never fully understands the information contained in a reported statistic without “framing” that statistic. Framing involves adding a more rich perspective to the value, or size, of some reported statistic. For example, when Broome County residents were asked the survey question: “Would you support a local or state policy limiting the maximum

number of tobacco retailers allowed in a neighborhood or area?”, the result in the current 2013 community study is that 43.4% of the participants responded with “Yes” (reported later in Table 15). So what does this 43.4% really mean? Often-times community-based researchers will describe the process of framing a statistic as completing as many as possible of the five following comparisons (frames) to better understand a reported statistic from a sample:

- **Within Response Distribution**
(Is it a majority? 4:1 ratio? “Three times more likely to support than to oppose?)
- **Trend Across Time**
(Has it increased? Decreased?)
- **Compare to Target/Benchmark**
(Compare to 21-county regional average? Compare to the coalition’s workplan goal or target?)
- **Ranking Among Similar Variables**
(Among many different similar locations or attributes that all use the same response scale, is this specific item ranked first? Last?)
- **Cross-tabulations by Potential Explanatory Variables**
(Smokers and non-smokers differ? Age-dependent? Gender-dependent? Education-dependent? Income-dependent?)

The design of this final study report of findings includes all of the various types of tables that are explained in the preceding three pages precisely to allow community leaders to best frame the statistics included in this report, best understand the statistics included, and make best decisions in the future regarding how to use the statistics. As has been mentioned several times previously, if one has further questions about “framing a statistic” please contact the professional staff at *Joel LaLone Consulting*.

2.1 SPREADING THE MESSAGE ABOUT THE DANGERS OF TOBACCO FINDINGS

Summary of Findings – Spreading the Message about the Dangers of Tobacco

1. Approximately two-thirds of Broome County adult residents (68.0%) have ever **heard of the New York State Smokers' Quitline**; this level of familiarity is not significantly different from the current average rate found among residents of neighboring counties (68.5%). The rate in Broome County increased significantly between 2006 and 2009 from 51.3% to 73.2%, however, there has been no significant change in familiarity with the quitline in the county since 2009. *Current smokers* are far more likely to have heard of the quitline than non-smokers – 90.9% versus 61.2%, respectively. (Table 5)

Table 5 Have you ever heard of the New York State Smokers' Quitline?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Heard of the NYS Smokers' Quitline?	Yes	270	68.0%
	No	126	31.7%
	Don't know/Not sure	1	0.4%
	Totals	398	100.0%

Trend Analysis:

("Yes" currently is significantly higher than 2006 rate, but has not changed significantly between 2009-2013)

<i>Trend Analysis</i>	2006	2009	2011	2013
Yes	51.3%	73.2%	70.1%	68.0%
No	46.9%	26.7%	29.0%	31.7%
Don't Know/Not Sure	1.9%	0.1%	0.9%	0.4%

Regional Comparison: ("Yes" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Yes"	68.0%	68.5%	69.0%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Yes	69.8%	66.2%	78.0%	80.7%	48.4%	78.8%	82.0%	45.2%
No	30.2%	33.0%	22.0%	19.3%	51.6%	19.3%	18.0%	54.8%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	196	202	60	58	58	76	62	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Yes	90.9%	61.2%	61.4%	66.1%	81.3%	48.9%	84.7%	90.1%	74.0%
No	9.1%	38.3%	37.8%	33.9%	18.7%	51.1%	15.3%	9.9%	26.0%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	0.5%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	307	175	120	103	64	105	43	41

2.2

TOBACCO MARKETING – *DISPLAYS IN STORES* – FINDINGS

Summary of Findings – Tobacco Marketing – *Displays in Stores*

1. Less than one-half of adults in Broome County (39.5%) agree that when **stores that sell tobacco products often display cigarettes and other tobacco products behind the counter in a very visible location, seeing these displays of cigarettes and other tobacco products makes teens more likely to smoke** – when asked whether they think this is true, 24.8% responded with “definitely yes” and another 14.7% responded with “probably yes.” This rate of 39.5% agreeing that tobacco ad exposure makes teens more likely to smoke in Broome County is not significantly different from the current regional average of 38.7%, and has not changed significantly from the rate found in the county in 2011. Among *current smokers* in Broome County, 20.4% agree that seeing cigarette and other tobacco product displays in stores that sell tobacco products makes teens more likely to smoke. (Table 6)
2. The majority of Broome County adults (50.3%) report that are **in favor of a policy that would ban the display of tobacco products such as packs of cigarettes or cigars from stores** (31.3% strongly in favor and another 19.0% somewhat in favor), while only 34.8% are against such a policy. This level of support in Broome County is not significantly different from the current regional average of 49.1% in support. However, the likelihood that a resident is strongly in favor has increased significantly from 20.1% found in the county in 2011 to the current rate of 31.3%. Among *current smokers* in Broome County in 2013, 21.3% are in favor of a policy that would ban the display of tobacco products such as packs of cigarettes or cigars from stores. (Table 7)
3. Strong **support for tobacco retailers being required to keep tobacco products out of the view from customers in stores as a means to prevent youth tobacco use is present** among Broome County adults – 55.3% support this potential requirement for tobacco retailers, while only 36.7% oppose (not significantly different from the current regional average of 54.5% supporting, and not significantly changed from the 55.9% support rate found in the county in 2011). Notably, among *current smokers* in the county there is some support evident for this potential requirement – 29.0% of *current smokers* believe that retailers should be required to keep tobacco products out of view. (Table 8)

Table 6

Stores that sell tobacco products often display cigarettes and other tobacco products behind the counter in a very visible location. Do you think that seeing these displays cigarettes and other tobacco products makes teens more likely to smoke?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Stores that sell tobacco products often display cigarettes and other tobacco products in a visible location. Do you think that these displays make teens more likely to smoke?	Definitely yes	99	24.8%
	Probably yes	58	14.7%
	Probably not	78	19.6%
	Definitely not	115	28.9%
	No opinion	26	6.4%
	Don't know	19	4.9%
	Refused	3	0.7%
	Totals	398	100.0%

(39.5% "Definitely or Probably Yes")

Trend Analysis:

("Definitely or Probably Yes" has not changed significantly between 2011 and 2013)

Trend Analysis	2006	2009	2011	2013
Definitely Yes	--	--	21.0%	24.8%
Probably Yes	--	--	26.8%	14.7%
Probably Not	--	--	20.3%	19.6%
Definitely Not	--	--	26.5%	28.9%
No Opinion	--	--	1.4%	6.4%
Don't know	--	--	4.0%	4.9%
Refused	--	--	0.0%	0.7%

Regional Comparison: ("Definitely or Probably Yes" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Yes" (Definitely+Probably)	37.8%	38.7%	39.5%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Definitely yes	26.6%	23.0%	35.4%	18.5%	30.6%	26.1%	17.1%	22.1%
Probably yes	10.9%	18.3%	13.8%	7.4%	15.7%	9.8%	10.8%	27.2%
Probably not	17.7%	21.5%	6.6%	9.0%	8.4%	30.0%	39.9%	19.7%
Definitely not	32.9%	25.0%	25.0%	55.6%	28.4%	21.7%	29.0%	19.6%
No opinion	9.1%	3.9%	19.2%	5.4%	12.0%	2.7%	0.0%	2.2%
Don't know	2.2%	7.6%	0.0%	4.1%	4.8%	6.3%	3.2%	9.1%
Refused	0.6%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	196	202	60	58	58	76	62	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Definitely yes	16.3%	27.3%	29.5%	25.0%	16.6%	30.7%	21.5%	15.2%	25.3%
Probably yes	4.1%	17.8%	13.1%	17.3%	14.4%	25.2%	6.4%	11.2%	24.6%
Probably not	31.0%	16.3%	12.2%	30.7%	19.6%	24.0%	21.9%	20.3%	23.5%
Definitely not	32.4%	27.8%	28.3%	19.7%	40.4%	6.3%	47.2%	34.0%	15.5%
No opinion	14.6%	4.0%	8.8%	5.0%	4.0%	10.1%	0.2%	6.3%	5.2%
Don't know	0.0%	6.3%	7.2%	2.3%	3.8%	1.4%	2.7%	13.0%	6.0%
Refused	1.6%	0.4%	0.8%	0.0%	1.2%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	307	176	119	103	64	105	44	41

Table 7 What is your opinion about a policy that would ban the display of tobacco products such as packs of cigarettes or cigars from stores?

2013 Results:

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly in favor	125	31.3%
Somewhat in favor	76	19.0%
Neither in favor/against	52	13.1%
Somewhat against	62	15.5%
Strongly against	77	19.3%
Don't know	7	1.8%
Refused	0	0.0%
Totals	400	100.0%

(50.3% "Somewhat or Strongly In Favor")

Trend Analysis:

("Strongly In Favor" has increased significantly between 2011 and 2013)

<i>Trend Analysis</i>	2006	2009	2011	2013
Strongly in favor	--	--	20.1%	31.3%
Somewhat in favor	--	--	26.1%	19.0%
Neither in favor nor against	--	--	20.3%	13.1%
Somewhat against	--	--	14.3%	15.5%
Strongly against	--	--	17.2%	19.3%
Don't know	--	--	2.0%	1.8%
Refused	--	--	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: ("Somewhat or Strongly In Favor" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Favor" (Strongly+Somewhat)	37.7%	49.1%	60.3%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Strongly in favor	28.3%	34.2%	19.1%	52.7%	19.7%	38.3%	20.9%	34.7%
Somewhat in favor	20.3%	17.7%	0.0%	8.1%	52.0%	17.0%	26.9%	13.0%
Neither in favor/against	9.4%	16.7%	38.7%	2.2%	3.2%	15.3%	7.7%	11.1%
Somewhat against	15.3%	15.6%	0.0%	25.8%	3.8%	14.6%	15.7%	28.3%
Strongly against	25.4%	13.5%	42.2%	5.8%	21.4%	12.7%	26.6%	11.4%
Don't know	1.4%	2.3%	0.0%	5.4%	0.0%	2.1%	2.2%	1.5%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	62	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Strongly in favor	0.3%	40.4%	23.8%	33.0%	42.4%	42.7%	32.4%	28.0%	44.0%
Somewhat in favor	21.0%	18.4%	28.7%	9.7%	12.9%	20.8%	20.0%	23.8%	17.4%
Neither in favor/against	28.2%	8.7%	15.7%	14.2%	7.4%	12.6%	13.5%	2.4%	9.7%
Somewhat against	16.8%	15.1%	12.7%	18.4%	16.8%	6.9%	10.3%	29.7%	13.3%
Strongly against	33.7%	15.1%	18.4%	24.4%	15.0%	16.2%	23.4%	13.3%	12.4%
Don't know	0.0%	2.4%	0.8%	0.3%	5.4%	0.8%	0.4%	2.7%	3.2%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	309	178	119	103	64	105	43	41

Table 8

Would you support tobacco retailers being required to keep tobacco products out of the view from customers in stores, as a means to prevent youth tobacco use?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Support tobacco retailers being required to keep tobacco products out of view from customers as a means to prevent youth tobacco use?	Yes	221	55.3%
	No	146	36.7%
	Not sure/No opinion	32	8.0%
	Totals	399	100.0%

Trend Analysis:

("Yes" has not changed significantly between 2011 and 2013)

<i>Trend Analysis</i>	2006	2009	2011	2013
Yes	--	--	55.9%	55.3%
No	--	--	35.8%	36.7%
Not sure/No opinion	--	--	8.2%	8.0%

Regional Comparison: ("Yes" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Yes"	44.9%	54.5%	68.5%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Yes	51.7%	58.8%	51.8%	36.1%	92.2%	56.8%	37.5%	57.3%
No	44.3%	29.4%	42.3%	59.6%	7.8%	27.7%	56.1%	30.8%
Not sure/No opinion	4.1%	11.8%	6.0%	4.4%	0.0%	15.5%	6.4%	12.0%
Sample Size	195	204	60	58	58	78	62	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Yes	29.0%	63.0%	60.8%	54.0%	47.4%	60.5%	43.0%	54.5%	64.9%
No	57.2%	30.6%	30.5%	38.1%	45.5%	35.9%	45.3%	43.8%	26.1%
Not sure/No opinion	13.8%	6.3%	8.7%	7.8%	7.1%	3.6%	11.7%	1.8%	9.1%
Sample Size	90	309	177	120	103	63	105	44	41

2.3 TOBACCO MARKETING – *ADVERTISEMENTS* – FINDINGS

Summary of Findings – Tobacco Marketing – Advertisements

1. Almost one-half of adults in Broome County (49.8%) agree that seeing **cigarette and other tobacco product advertisements in stores that sell tobacco products makes teens more likely to smoke** – when asked whether they think this is true, 29.2% responded with “definitely yes” and another 20.6% responded with “probably yes”, while only 44.9% respond with “definitely or probably not.” This rate of 49.8% agreeing that tobacco ad exposure makes teens more likely to smoke in Broome County is not significantly different from the current regional average of 51.5%, and has not changed significantly from the 48.8% rate found in the county in 2011. Among *current smokers* in Broome County in 2013, 32.9% agree that seeing cigarette and other tobacco product advertisements in stores that sell tobacco products makes teens more likely to smoke. (Table 9)
2. A large majority of Broome County adults (75.1%) **believe that advertising of tobacco products in convenience stores and gas stations should be restricted or eliminated as a means to prevent youth tobacco use** – with approximately one-third of participants (33.3%) favoring complete elimination. This 33.3% rate of supporting complete elimination of tobacco advertising at convenience stores and gas stations is significantly above the current regional average of 25.7%, and has increased significantly from 22.3% found in the county in 2011. Among *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County in 2013, 65.1% believe that advertising of tobacco products in convenience stores and gas stations should be restricted or eliminated as a means to prevent youth tobacco use – with 29.0% of *current smokers* favoring complete elimination of tobacco advertising at convenience stores and gas stations. (Table 10)

Table 9

Stores that sell tobacco products often display advertisements for cigarettes and other tobacco products. Do you think that seeing these ads makes teens more likely to smoke?

2013 Results:

Stores that sell tobacco products often display advertisements for cigarettes and other tobacco products. Do you think that seeing these ads makes teens more likely to smoke?	Frequency	Percentage
	Definitely yes	116
Probably yes	82	20.6%
Probably not	88	22.2%
Definitely not	90	22.7%
No opinion	11	2.8%
Don't know	9	2.2%
Refused	1	0.3%
Totals	398	100.0%

(49.8% "Definitely or Probably Yes")

Trend Analysis:

("Definitely or Probably Yes" has not changed significantly between 2011 and 2013)

Trend Analysis	2006	2009	2011	2013
Definitely Yes	--	--	22.3%	29.2%
Probably Yes	--	--	26.5%	20.6%
Probably Not	--	--	22.2%	22.2%
Definitely Not	--	--	24.3%	22.7%
No Opinion	--	--	0.6%	2.8%
Don't know	--	--	4.2%	2.2%
Refused	--	--	0.0%	0.3%

Regional Comparison: ("Definitely or Probably Yes" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Yes" (Definitely+Probably)	44.0%	51.5%	64.9%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results):

(To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Definitely yes	32.0%	26.4%	35.4%	18.5%	44.3%	31.6%	21.1%	25.3%
Probably yes	9.6%	31.2%	19.5%	15.2%	9.4%	26.3%	14.4%	32.4%
Probably not	28.7%	15.9%	40.1%	18.9%	10.4%	18.8%	24.2%	21.6%
Definitely not	25.9%	19.6%	5.1%	43.7%	21.4%	17.9%	37.5%	14.9%
No opinion	1.7%	3.9%	0.0%	2.2%	12.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.5%
Don't know	1.9%	2.6%	0.0%	1.5%	1.3%	2.1%	2.7%	4.9%
Refused	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Sample Size	196	203	60	58	58	76	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Definitely yes	20.0%	31.8%	30.7%	31.2%	24.2%	32.4%	24.9%	15.8%	32.0%
Probably yes	12.9%	22.8%	19.5%	24.4%	17.9%	25.7%	19.5%	21.2%	29.2%
Probably not	37.8%	17.7%	28.1%	16.6%	18.6%	26.1%	10.2%	36.1%	15.9%
Definitely not	29.3%	20.8%	18.5%	20.1%	32.9%	8.1%	44.0%	20.0%	10.1%
No opinion	0.0%	3.6%	1.4%	5.5%	2.0%	7.7%	0.0%	4.7%	9.2%
Don't know	0.0%	2.9%	1.8%	2.1%	3.2%	0.0%	0.7%	2.1%	3.5%
Refused	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	308	176	120	103	64	105	44	41

Table 10

Do you think advertising of tobacco products in convenience stores and gas stations should be: allowed anywhere, restricted to certain areas, or not allowed at all, as a means to prevent youth tobacco use?

2013 Results:

Do you think that advertising of tobacco products in convenience stores and gas stations should be allowed, restricted, or not allowed as a means to prevent youth tobacco use?		Frequency	Percentage
		Allow Anywhere	89
Restrict to Certain Areas	167	41.8%	
Not Allowed at All	133	33.3%	
Not Sure/No Opinion	11	2.8%	
Totals	400	100.0%	

(75.1% "Restrict or Not Allow At All")

Trend Analysis:

("Not Allow At All" has increased significantly between 2011 and 2013)

Trend Analysis	2006	2009	2011	2013
Allow anywhere	--	--	21.1%	22.2%
Restrict to certain areas	--	--	51.3%	41.8%
Not allow at all	--	--	22.3%	33.3%
Not sure/No opinion	--	--	5.3%	2.8%

Regional Comparison: ("Not Allow At All" in Broome is significantly higher than the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 (includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Restrict or Not Allow At All"	67.1%	72.7%	75.1%
"Not Allow At All"	17.5%	25.7%	33.3%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Allow Anywhere	33.0%	11.8%	13.6%	44.4%	4.0%	14.2%	43.3%	17.1%
Restrict to Certain Areas	35.1%	48.2%	31.6%	34.5%	57.2%	49.6%	36.8%	39.9%
Not Allowed at All	30.8%	35.7%	47.8%	21.1%	38.8%	34.1%	16.2%	39.5%
Not Sure/No Opinion	1.1%	4.3%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	3.7%	3.5%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Allow Anywhere	34.4%	18.6%	13.9%	24.4%	33.8%	18.0%	30.3%	19.6%	14.3%
Restrict to Certain Areas	36.1%	43.4%	46.9%	35.1%	40.7%	30.0%	42.9%	50.9%	52.4%
Not Allowed at All	29.0%	34.5%	37.8%	36.0%	22.4%	44.4%	26.8%	27.8%	31.3%
Not Sure/No Opinion	0.5%	3.4%	1.4%	4.5%	3.1%	7.7%	0.0%	1.7%	2.0%
Sample Size	90	310	178	120	103	64	105	44	41

2.4

TOBACCO MARKETING – *TO YOUTHS IN THE MEDIA* – FINDINGS

Summary of Findings – Tobacco Marketing – *To Youths in the Media*

1. When asked their opinion about how much one agrees with the following statement, **“Internet sites, youth-rated movies, and TV shows that youth use and watch should not include tobacco use or images”** over 67% of Broome County adults (67.1%) agree (53.8% strongly agree, and 13.3% somewhat agree), while only 30.1% of participants disagree. The likelihood that Broome County adults agree with this statement has decreased significantly from 76.6% found in the county in 2011, however, the current agreement rate of 67.1% is not significantly different from the current regional average of 64.6%. Among *current smokers* in Broome County in 2013, 49.8% agree that “Internet sites, youth-rated movies, and TV shows that youth use and watch should not include tobacco use or images”. (Table 11)
2. **Strong support for a policy that restricts showing the use of tobacco in media rated for youth viewership** has been found in Broome County – 66.3% of participants would support this type of a policy, while only 25.9% would oppose. Level of support in Broome County has not changed significantly from the support found in 2011, and is currently not significantly different from the current regional average of 67.7% supporting. Among *current smokers* in Broome County in 2013, only 43.6% are opposed to a policy that would restrict showing the use of tobacco in media rated for youth viewership. (Table 12)

Table 11

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? “Internet sites, youth-rated movies, and TV shows that youth use and watch should not include tobacco use or images.”

2013 Results:

	Frequency	Percentage	
“Internet sites, youth-rated movies, and TV shows that youth use and watch should not include tobacco use or images.”	Strongly agree	215	53.8%
	Somewhat agree	53	13.3%
	Somewhat disagree	83	20.6%
	Strongly disagree	38	9.5%
	Don't know	11	2.8%
	Totals	400	100.0%

(67.1% “Strongly or Somewhat Agree”)

Trend Analysis:

(“Strongly or Somewhat Agree” has decreased significantly between 2011 and 2013)

Trend Analysis	2006	2009	2011	2013
Strongly agree	--	--	57.6%	53.8%
Somewhat agree	--	--	19.0%	13.3%
Somewhat disagree	--	--	10.9%	20.6%
Strongly disagree	--	--	7.0%	9.5%
Not sure/No opinion	--	--	5.5%	2.8%

Regional Comparison: (“Strongly or Somewhat Agree” in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
“Agree” (Strongly+Somewhat)	59.7%	64.6%	67.1%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results):

(To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Strongly agree	51.6%	55.8%	53.4%	65.4%	81.6%	42.1%	42.3%	45.9%
Somewhat agree	9.3%	17.2%	10.3%	6.9%	11.2%	18.3%	14.8%	15.6%
Somewhat disagree	22.1%	19.2%	20.9%	22.3%	1.3%	29.9%	16.9%	27.0%
Strongly disagree	15.3%	4.0%	15.5%	5.3%	5.9%	5.4%	23.7%	3.8%
Don't know	1.7%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	2.3%	7.7%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Strongly agree	47.6%	55.6%	60.7%	43.4%	53.8%	55.4%	67.9%	37.4%	36.2%
Somewhat agree	2.2%	16.6%	10.7%	15.5%	15.2%	2.8%	8.8%	18.3%	39.3%
Somewhat disagree	29.5%	18.1%	22.8%	21.8%	15.6%	41.0%	10.1%	31.0%	12.3%
Strongly disagree	17.9%	7.1%	3.4%	16.1%	12.4%	0.0%	12.3%	12.3%	6.1%
Don't know	2.8%	2.8%	2.4%	3.2%	3.0%	0.8%	0.8%	1.0%	6.1%
Sample Size	90	310	178	120	103	64	105	44	41

Table 12 Would you support a policy that restricts showing the use of tobacco in media rated for youth viewership?

2013 Results:

Support a policy that restricts showing the use of tobacco in media rated for youth viewership?		Frequency	Percentage
		Yes	265
No	No	104	25.9%
	Don't know/Not sure	31	7.8%
Totals		400	100.0%

Trend Analysis:

("Yes" has not changed significantly between 2011 and 2013)

Trend Analysis	2006	2009	2011	2013
Yes	--	--	73.8%	66.3%
No	--	--	20.9%	25.9%
Don't know/Not sure	--	--	5.3%	7.8%

Regional Comparison: ("Yes" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 (includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Yes"	66.3%	67.7%	69.1%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Yes	54.4%	77.7%	44.4%	75.5%	92.2%	64.8%	53.7%	68.6%
No	36.3%	16.0%	29.4%	22.3%	7.8%	29.5%	41.5%	23.6%
Don't know/Not sure	9.3%	6.3%	26.1%	2.2%	0.0%	5.8%	4.8%	7.8%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Yes	41.1%	73.7%	68.5%	59.3%	70.6%	64.0%	82.0%	56.2%	72.6%
No	43.6%	20.8%	21.8%	33.1%	24.8%	26.7%	17.1%	37.0%	20.0%
Don't know/Not sure	15.3%	5.6%	9.7%	7.7%	4.6%	9.3%	0.9%	6.7%	7.3%
Sample Size	90	309	177	120	103	64	105	44	41

2.5

TOBACCO POINT OF SALE FINDINGS

Summary of Findings – Tobacco Point of Sale

1. By a large margin, Broome County adults **believe that pharmacies should not be allowed to sell tobacco products** (59.6% indicated “Should not,” while only 35.7% indicated “Should”). However, the current rate of believing that pharmacies should not sell tobacco products found in Broome County represents a significant decrease from the rates found in 2009 and 2011 (73.3% and 66.4%, respectively). It should be noted, however, that the current level of opposition to selling tobacco products at pharmacies in Broome County is significantly higher than the current regional average of 54.7% opposed. Belief that pharmacies *should not* be allowed to sell tobacco is even evident among *current cigarette smokers* with 48.0% of *current smokers* responding “Should not”, and only 46.3% responding with “Should.” (Table 13)
2. When asked their opinion about **a policy that would restrict the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools** a large majority of Broome County adults (57.0%) are in favor (38.2% strongly in favor, and 18.8% somewhat in favor), while only 34.7% of participants are opposed. Level of support in 2013 in Broome County (57.0%) is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 54.4%, and has not changed significantly from 56.1% found in the county in 2011. Among *current smokers* in Broome County in 2013, 44.8% are in favor of this restriction of tobacco sales near schools. (Table 14)
3. Broome County adults show opposition for a local or state policy that would **limit the maximum number of tobacco retailers allowed in a neighborhood or area** (less than one-half – 43.4% – voice support to this type of potential policy, while 52.3% voice opposition). The Broome County level of support is not significantly different from the current regional average result (Broome County level of support is 43.4%, regional average is currently 45.4% support). Level of support in Broome County has not changed significantly from the rates found in either 2009 or 2011 (39.6% and 47.4%, respectively). Among *current smokers* in the county in 2013, only 6.0% indicate support for having a maximum number of tobacco retailers allowed in a neighborhood or area. (Table 15)

Table 13 Do you think that pharmacies should or should not be allowed to sell tobacco products (cigarettes, cigars, etc.)?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Pharmacies should or should not be allowed to sell tobacco products?	Should	142	35.7%
	Should not	237	59.6%
	Don't know	19	4.7%
	Totals	397	100.0%

(59.6% "Should not")

Trend Analysis:

("Should not" has decreased significantly between 2009 and 2013)

<i>Trend Analysis</i>	2006	2009	2011	2013
Should	--	20.2%	26.7%	35.7%
Should not	--	73.3%	66.4%	59.6%
Don't know	--	6.5%	6.9%	4.7%

Regional Comparison: ("Should not" in Broome is significantly higher than the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Should not"	40.7%	54.7%	70.2%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Should	47.1%	24.9%	15.4%	59.4%	16.2%	26.3%	59.7%	38.1%
Should not	50.8%	68.0%	84.6%	33.9%	83.8%	66.4%	35.1%	54.8%
Don't know	2.2%	7.1%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	7.3%	5.2%	7.1%
Sample Size	193	204	60	58	56	78	62	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Should	46.3%	32.6%	24.3%	36.1%	54.8%	25.4%	36.8%	43.2%	33.4%
Should not	48.0%	63.0%	72.3%	58.1%	39.7%	73.2%	58.3%	51.2%	63.4%
Don't know	5.8%	4.4%	3.5%	5.8%	5.5%	1.4%	4.9%	5.6%	3.2%
Sample Size	90	307	175	120	103	64	105	41	41

Table 14 What is your opinion about a policy that would restrict the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools? Are you in favor or against this policy that would restrict sales?

2013 Results:

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly in favor	153	38.2%
Somewhat in favor	75	18.8%
Neither in favor/against	30	7.5%
Somewhat against	67	16.7%
Strongly against	72	18.0%
Don't know	3	0.7%
Refused	0	0.0%
Totals	400	100.0%

(57.0% "Somewhat or Strongly In Favor")

Trend Analysis:

("Somewhat or Strongly In Favor" has not changed significantly between 2011 and 2013)

Trend Analysis	2006	2009	2011	2013
Strongly in favor	--	--	29.6%	38.2%
Somewhat in favor	--	--	26.5%	18.8%
Neither in favor nor against	--	--	11.4%	7.5%
Somewhat against	--	--	11.5%	16.7%
Strongly against	--	--	17.8%	18.0%
Don't know	--	--	1.4%	0.7%
Refused	--	--	1.8%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: ("Somewhat or Strongly In Favor" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Favor" (Strongly+Somewhat)	44.1%	54.4%	65.6%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Strongly in favor	30.1%	46.0%	31.9%	39.5%	72.2%	32.3%	20.5%	37.0%
Somewhat in favor	13.6%	23.9%	14.4%	4.1%	3.2%	34.1%	29.1%	21.4%
Neither in favor/against	8.2%	6.8%	0.0%	6.5%	8.3%	9.6%	7.8%	10.8%
Somewhat against	22.4%	11.2%	8.2%	43.3%	10.4%	10.2%	7.8%	21.4%
Strongly against	24.7%	11.7%	45.5%	4.4%	5.9%	13.8%	33.4%	8.4%
Don't know	1.1%	0.4%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Strongly in favor	24.9%	42.1%	44.2%	32.9%	34.1%	32.5%	39.2%	46.1%	43.4%
Somewhat in favor	19.9%	18.5%	18.5%	19.1%	19.1%	31.1%	15.7%	13.9%	22.6%
Neither in favor/against	8.7%	7.1%	5.8%	8.8%	8.9%	0.4%	6.0%	1.0%	9.2%
Somewhat against	13.8%	17.5%	11.2%	18.8%	23.8%	10.5%	26.2%	15.5%	6.2%
Strongly against	32.7%	13.7%	19.8%	20.4%	12.1%	25.5%	13.0%	23.4%	14.6%
Don't know	0.0%	1.0%	0.5%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	309	178	120	103	64	105	44	41

Table 15 Would you support a local or state policy limiting the maximum number of tobacco retailers allowed in a neighborhood or area?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Would you support a local or state policy limiting the maximum number of tobacco retailers allowed in a neighborhood or area?	Yes	174	43.4%
	No	209	52.3%
	Not sure/No opinion	17	4.3%
	Totals	400	100.0%

Trend Analysis:

("Yes" has not changed significantly between 2009 and 2013)

Trend Analysis	2006	2009	2011	2013
Yes	--	39.6%	47.2%	43.4%
No	--	50.5%	46.9%	52.3%
Not sure/No opinion	--	9.9%	6.0%	4.3%

Regional Comparison: ("Yes" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 (includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Yes"	34.3%	45.4%	61.3%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Yes	37.5%	49.1%	36.7%	33.5%	67.6%	44.9%	30.5%	46.7%
No	60.7%	44.2%	63.3%	64.3%	31.1%	47.3%	69.0%	42.7%
Not sure/No opinion	1.8%	6.7%	0.0%	2.2%	1.3%	7.8%	0.5%	10.6%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Yes	6.0%	54.4%	48.9%	41.0%	36.8%	50.6%	34.6%	49.2%	52.3%
No	87.8%	41.9%	48.0%	53.6%	58.1%	45.0%	59.9%	50.2%	39.8%
Not sure/No opinion	6.2%	3.8%	3.1%	5.4%	5.1%	4.4%	5.5%	0.6%	7.9%
Sample Size	90	309	178	120	103	64	105	44	41

2.6 OUTDOOR TOBACCO POLICIES FINDINGS

Summary of Findings – Outdoor Tobacco Policies

1. There is a very high level of **support among Broome County residents for reducing secondhand smoke exposure at public outdoor locations**, with at least 74% of the residents supporting either restricting or completely eliminating cigarette smoking at each of the three types of outdoor locations studied (public park or outdoor recreation areas; public building entryways; and public beaches or municipal pools). More strikingly, at public building entryways 57.3% of the interviewed adults in Broome County support *complete elimination of smoking*, and at public beaches or municipal pools 55.6% of the interviewed adults in Broome County support *complete elimination of smoking*. In general, current support for complete elimination of smoking at public outdoor locations in Broome County has increased significantly between 2006 and 2013, and levels of support are currently not significantly different from the current regional average levels of support. Results for the three types of public outdoor locations are summarized in the following table. (Tables 18-20)

Table 16 Attitudes About Restricting or Eliminating Smoking at Public Outdoor Locations – *Among All Participants*

Type of Outdoor Location	Among all surveyed residents, % who support either restricting or entirely eliminating smoking.											
	2006			2009			2011			2013		
	Restrict	Eliminate	R or E	Restrict	Eliminate	R or E	Restrict	Eliminate	R or E	Restrict	Eliminate	R or E
Public Park or Outdoor Recreation Area	37%	30%	67%	34%	34%	68%	40%	34%	74%	32%	42%	74%
Public Building Entryways	40%	36%	76%	27%	55%	82%	45%	44%	89%	31%	57%	88%
Public Beach or Municipal Pool	38%	28%	66%	35%	34%	69%	34%	43%	77%	27%	56%	83%

2. **Among current cigarette smokers, there is a large degree of support for the notion of at least restricting cigarette smoking to certain areas at public outdoor locations.** At each of the three studied public outdoor locations, at least 45% of *Broome County current cigarette smokers* believe that smoking should be restricted or not allowed at all. Note the high level of support among *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County for reducing secondhand smoke exposure at public building entryways – 35.3% of the *smokers* support complete elimination of smoking at public building entryways. Results for *current cigarette smokers* are summarized in the following table. (Tables 18-20)

Table 17 Attitudes About Restricting or Eliminating Smoking at Public Outdoor Locations – *Among Current Cigarette Smokers (2013 results only)*

Type of Outdoor Location	Among surveyed <i>Current Cigarette Smokers</i> , % who support either restricting or entirely eliminating smoking.		
	Restrict	Eliminate	Restrict or Eliminate
Public Park or Outdoor Recreation Area	38%	7%	45%
Public Building Entryways	35%	35%	70%
Public Beach or Municipal Pool	43%	18%	61%

3. A large majority of the Broome County respondents **support a law prohibiting smoking inside cars when a person under the age of 18 present**, 60.4% agree with this type of law if passed in the future (with 43.1% *strongly* agreeing), while only 34.7% are in opposition to this possible law. This 60.4% rate of agreement in Broome County is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 64.3% supporting the prohibition of smoking inside cars with minors present. However, the likelihood that Broome County adult residents express support for this possible smoking-in-vehicles law has decreased significantly from 74.6% found in the county in 2009. Among *current smokers* in Broome County in 2013, only 21.1% support this potential new law. (Table 21)

Table 18 When walking through an area around building entryways, smoking should be ...?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Public Building Entryways	Allow Anywhere	40	10.0%
	Restrict to Certain Areas	123	30.7%
	Not Allowed at All	229	57.3%
	Not Sure/No Opinion	8	2.1%
Totals		400	100.0%

(88.0% "Restrict or Not Allow At All")

Trend Analysis:

("Not Allow At All" has increased significantly between 2006 and 2013)

Trend Analysis	2006	2009	2011	2013
Allowed Anywhere	21.1%	16.7%	11.0%	10.0%
Restricted to Certain Areas	39.6%	26.9%	44.6%	30.7%
Not Allowed At All	35.8%	55.3%	43.5%	57.3%
Not Sure/No Opinion	3.4%	1.0%	0.9%	2.1%

Regional Comparison: (Results in Broome are not significantly different from the current regional averages)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 (includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Restrict or Not Allow At All"	79.7%	86.3%	91.9%
"Not Allow At All"	47.5%	59.5%	71.2%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Allow Anywhere	11.4%	8.6%	35.0%	8.9%	0.0%	10.0%	2.4%	5.2%
Restrict to Certain Areas	32.4%	29.0%	33.2%	26.2%	53.9%	16.0%	27.7%	31.7%
Not Allowed at All	52.3%	62.0%	31.8%	65.0%	46.1%	74.1%	58.0%	62.1%
Not Sure/No Opinion	3.8%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.9%	1.0%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Allow Anywhere	22.4%	6.3%	8.6%	13.1%	8.6%	13.9%	11.9%	7.0%	7.0%
Restrict to Certain Areas	34.6%	29.5%	38.6%	24.9%	23.8%	18.4%	25.5%	34.6%	30.6%
Not Allowed at All	35.3%	63.7%	52.6%	56.0%	66.8%	67.7%	55.5%	58.4%	62.4%
Not Sure/No Opinion	7.7%	0.4%	0.3%	5.9%	0.7%	0.0%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	310	178	120	103	64	105	44	41

Table 19 At a public park or outdoor recreational area, smoking should be ...?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Public Park or Outdoor Recreational Area	Allow Anywhere	100	25.0%
	Restrict to Certain Areas	127	31.9%
	Not Allowed at All	168	41.9%
	Not Sure/No Opinion	5	1.2%
	Totals	400	100.0%

(73.8% "Restrict or Not Allow At All")

Trend Analysis:

("Not Allow At All" has increased significantly between 2006 and 2013)

<i>Trend Analysis</i>	2006	2009	2011	2013
Allowed Anywhere	29.3%	29.3%	24.0%	25.0%
Restricted to Certain Areas	36.9%	34.3%	40.3%	31.9%
Not Allowed At All	29.8%	34.2%	34.0%	41.9%
Not Sure/No Opinion	4.0%	2.1%	1.7%	1.2%

Regional Comparison: (Results in Broome are not significantly different from the current regional averages)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Restrict or Not Allow At All"	67.4%	76.0%	82.8%
"Not Allow At All"	25.8%	37.4%	45.5%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Allow Anywhere	23.4%	26.5%	23.1%	15.9%	16.9%	15.8%	45.2%	31.7%
Restrict to Certain Areas	34.5%	29.4%	37.8%	24.2%	37.0%	43.2%	21.9%	26.1%
Not Allowed at All	40.8%	43.0%	39.0%	60.0%	46.1%	40.4%	28.7%	40.0%
Not Sure/No Opinion	1.4%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	4.2%	2.2%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Allow Anywhere	55.6%	16.0%	29.6%	22.8%	19.5%	20.6%	30.9%	30.5%	12.8%
Restrict to Certain Areas	37.7%	30.1%	32.3%	33.4%	29.2%	21.4%	24.4%	32.2%	40.1%
Not Allowed at All	6.7%	52.2%	36.4%	43.6%	49.6%	57.3%	44.4%	33.8%	47.1%
Not Sure/No Opinion	0.0%	1.6%	1.7%	0.2%	1.7%	0.7%	0.3%	3.6%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	310	178	120	103	64	105	44	41

Table 20 At a public beach or municipal pool, smoking should be ...?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Public Beach or Municipal Pool	Allow Anywhere	61	15.2%
	Restrict to Certain Areas	109	27.2%
	Not Allowed at All	222	55.6%
	Not Sure/No Opinion	8	2.0%
	Totals	400	100.0%

(82.8% "Restrict or Not Allow At All")

Trend Analysis:

("Not Allow At All" has increased steadily and significantly between 2006 and 2013)

<i>Trend Analysis</i>	2006	2009	2011	2013
Allowed Anywhere	30.2%	29.8%	18.9%	15.2%
Restricted to Certain Areas	37.9%	34.9%	33.5%	27.2%
Not Allowed At All	28.3%	34.2%	43.0%	55.6%
Not Sure/No Opinion	3.7%	1.1%	4.5%	2.0%

Regional Comparison: (Results in Broome are not significantly different from the current regional averages)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Restrict or Not Allow At All"	77.5%	80.1%	82.8%
"Not Allow At All"	47.9%	51.8%	55.6%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results):

(To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Allow Anywhere	19.4%	11.1%	10.4%	17.8%	1.3%	11.8%	34.8%	14.8%
Restrict to Certain Areas	22.5%	31.6%	37.8%	17.5%	27.8%	39.9%	24.7%	15.8%
Not Allowed at All	56.5%	54.8%	51.8%	62.6%	70.9%	48.3%	38.3%	62.8%
Not Sure/No Opinion	1.6%	2.5%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	6.6%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Allow Anywhere	37.7%	8.6%	11.7%	20.2%	15.2%	16.5%	15.3%	23.0%	11.5%
Restrict to Certain Areas	43.3%	22.5%	26.4%	28.9%	26.5%	17.9%	29.7%	30.6%	31.3%
Not Allowed at All	17.6%	66.7%	58.1%	50.7%	57.1%	65.0%	54.8%	46.4%	56.6%
Not Sure/No Opinion	1.4%	2.2%	3.8%	0.2%	1.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.5%
Sample Size	90	309	178	120	103	64	105	44	41

Table 21 If New York State implemented a law prohibiting smoking inside a car when a person under the age of 18 is present, would you agree or disagree with this law?

2013 Results:

Law prohibiting smoking inside a car when a person under age 18 present.	Frequency		Percentage	
Strongly agree	173	43.1%		
Agree	69	17.3%		
Neutral	19	4.7%		
Disagree	113	28.3%		
Strongly disagree	26	6.4%		
Don't know/Not sure	1	0.2%		
Totals	400	100.0%		

(60.4% "Strongly agree or Agree")

Trend Analysis:

("Strongly agree or Agree" has decreased significantly between 2009 and 2013)

Trend Analysis	2006	2009	2011	2013
Strongly agree	--	38.1%	47.7%	43.1%
Agree	--	36.5%	25.6%	17.3%
Neutral	--	3.4%	3.5%	4.7%
Disagree	--	16.2%	10.7%	28.3%
Strongly disagree	--	3.6%	10.3%	6.4%
Don't know/Not sure	--	2.4%	2.2%	0.2%

Regional Comparison: ("Strongly agree or Agree" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Agree" (Strongly Agree + Agree)	60.4%	64.3%	69.6%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Strongly agree	41.0%	45.1%	45.8%	30.9%	69.5%	36.4%	32.9%	45.2%
Agree	15.7%	18.7%	17.3%	5.4%	7.7%	30.2%	13.2%	23.3%
Neutral	7.5%	2.1%	19.2%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	4.5%
Disagree	29.8%	26.9%	17.7%	48.2%	17.5%	25.8%	41.4%	22.1%
Strongly disagree	5.7%	7.1%	0.0%	11.1%	5.3%	7.6%	10.1%	4.7%
Don't know/Not sure	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.3%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Strongly agree	9.3%	53.0%	48.0%	43.6%	34.2%	41.2%	29.8%	40.3%	53.9%
Agree	11.8%	18.9%	10.2%	27.6%	17.3%	25.5%	11.1%	13.7%	25.0%
Neutral	13.0%	2.3%	8.7%	2.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.4%	6.0%	1.3%
Disagree	55.1%	20.5%	30.5%	21.5%	32.3%	28.1%	54.7%	18.1%	11.0%
Strongly disagree	10.8%	5.1%	2.6%	4.7%	14.9%	5.3%	3.9%	21.9%	7.0%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Sample Size	90	310	178	120	103	64	105	44	41

2.7

SMOKE FREE HOUSING FINDINGS

Summary of Findings – Smoke Free Housing

1. Approximately three-in-ten residents in Broome County live in a multi-unit dwelling or apartment. It is common among residents in Broome County who live in multiple-unit dwellings (apartments) to indicate that **there is a policy in their building that prohibits indoor smoking, not allowing smoking in any residential units** – 51.7% of renters currently report this to be true (dramatic and significant increase from the rates found in the county in 2006, 2009, and 2011). As recently as 2009 in Broome County it was found that 69.8% of multi-unit dwellings had no smoking policy at all, smoking was allowed in all residential units. The rate found in 2013 is that smoking is allowed in all residential units in only 31.4% of the multi-unit dwellings. The 51.7% rate of not allowing smoking in any residential units that has been found in 2013 in Broome County is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 51.2% living in smoke-free housing. (Table 22)
2. **Strong support for policies that prohibit indoor smoking everywhere inside the building, including living areas** has been found in Broome County – over one-half of the adults who currently live in MUDs (51.3%) indicate that they are in favor of not allowing smoking anywhere in their building (significantly decreased from 70.6% in favor found in the county in 2011), while only 37.2% are currently opposed. Level of support for prohibiting smoking in MUDs among Broome County residents is not significantly different from the current regional average support level (average=54.5% “prohibit indoors”). Notably – 26.3% of the *MUD-dwelling current smokers* in Broome County favor a smoking prohibition policy inside their residence/apartment. (Table 23)

Table 22

Which statement best describes the rules that your landlord has set regarding smoking tobacco inside the residential units in your building?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Rules inside your rental residential unit	Allowed in all residential units	38	31.4%
	Allowed in some residential units	7	5.5%
	Not allowed in any residential units	62	51.7%
	Don't know/Not sure	14	11.4%
	Totals	120	100.0%

(51.7% "Not Allow At All")

Trend Analysis:

("Not Allow At All" has increased significantly between 2009 and 2013)

Trend Analysis	2006	2009	2011	2013
Smoking is allowed in all residential units	67.6%	69.8%	48.8%	31.4%
Smoking is only allowed in some residential units		4.7%	4.5%	5.5%
Smoking is not allowed in any residential units	30.8%	18.5%	31.8%	51.7%
Don't Know/Not Sure	1.6%	6.9%	14.9%	11.4%

Regional Comparison: ("Not Allow At All" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Smoking is not allowed in any residential units"	10.1%	51.2%	87.7%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results):

(To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Allowed in all residential units	10.7%	49.5%	0.0%	19.3%	28.6%	66.7%	41.9%	17.9%
Allowed in some residential units	11.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.9%	0.0%	0.0%	10.6%
Not allowed in any residential units	53.1%	50.5%	0.0%	80.7%	15.5%	33.3%	58.1%	71.5%
Don't know/Not sure	24.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	43.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	56	64	0	30	32	16	20	23

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Allowed in all residential units	79.9%	11.6%	32.3%	33.0%	26.6%	34.2%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%
Allowed in some residential units	0.0%	7.7%	4.8%	9.5%	0.0%	7.6%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Not allowed in any residential units	20.1%	64.6%	36.5%	57.5%	73.4%	58.3%	58.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	16.1%	26.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	35	85	52	43	25	33	52	6	0

Table 23

Would you be (or, "Are you") in favor of a (or "the") policy that prohibits indoor smoking everywhere inside your building, including living areas?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Favor a policy that prohibits smoking everywhere inside your building?	Yes	62	51.3%
	No	45	37.2%
	Don't know/Not sure	14	11.4%
	Totals	120	100.0%

Trend Analysis:

("Yes" has decreased significantly between 2011 and 2013, but still remains higher than 2006 findings)

<i>Trend Analysis</i>	2006	2009	2011	2013
Yes	39.9%	52.4%	70.6%	51.3%
No	48.5%	41.4%	27.6%	37.2%
Don't Know/Not Sure	11.6%	6.2%	1.8%	11.4%

Regional Comparison: ("Yes" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Favor a smoke-free policy"	15.8%	54.5%	79.3%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Yes	52.5%	50.4%	0.0%	80.7%	41.5%	33.3%	11.1%	73.3%
No	23.1%	49.6%	0.0%	19.3%	15.5%	66.7%	88.9%	26.7%
Don't know/Not sure	24.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	43.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	56	64	0	30	32	16	20	23

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Yes	26.3%	61.5%	48.8%	39.3%	77.2%	44.1%	72.6%	0.0%	0.0%
No	73.7%	22.4%	24.8%	60.7%	22.8%	55.9%	27.4%	100.0%	0.0%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	16.1%	26.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	35	85	52	43	25	33	52	6	0

2.8

TOBACCO USE FINDINGS

Summary of Findings – Tobacco Use

1. The **current cigarette smoking rate found in Broome County is:** a total estimate of **22.6% current smokers**, with 16.3% smoking every day and 6.3% smoking on only some days. This cigarette smoking rate has not changed significantly in Broome County between 2006 and 2013. The current 22.6% smoking rate in Broome County is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 19.3% current cigarette smokers found among the twenty-one Northern, Central, and Western New York counties studied in December 2012 – December 2013. The New York State Department of Health published the results for the Expanded Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) in December 2009. This overall health study includes an estimate of adult current cigarette smoking prevalence. The methodology utilized in the BRFSS is very similar to that used in this current December 2013 Broome County adult tobacco community assessment (both studies used a random telephone survey, sample sizes were n=640 vs. n=400, weighting algorithms were similar while not identical, the BRFSS interviews spanned July 2008-June 2009; for more details regarding this BRFSS study, visit: <http://www.nyhealth.gov/statistics/brfss/expanded/2009/county/>). The adult smoking prevalence rate reported for Broome County in the 2009 Expanded BRFSS was 20.3%. The 22.6% smoking rate found in Broome County in this December 2013 Broome County adult tobacco community assessment is not significantly different from the finding in the Expanded BRFSS. (Tables 25-26)
2. Significant **correlations with cigarette smoking – potential explanatory factors that are related with the likelihood that a Broome County adult resident will be a current cigarette smoker** – that were discovered include that younger adult residents (48.3% of those age 18-24 are smokers), residents with an educational background of less than a 4-year college degree (≈28% are smokers), and those from lower income households (40.1% of those from households with annual income of \$25,000-\$50,000 are smokers) are most likely to be current cigarette smokers. (Table 26)
3. Less than one-half of the adults in Broome County (44.6%) have **smoked at least 100 cigarettes in their lifetime**, a rate that has not changed significantly from the rates found in the county in earlier studies between 2006 and 2011, and a rate that is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 46.3%. This 44.6% who have smoked at least 100 cigarettes in their lifetime is not equally distributed between “former” and “current” smokers – 22.0% of the adult population in Broome County are former smokers, and 22.6% are current smokers. (Tables 24 and 26)
4. Use of **other tobacco products (those other than cigarettes)** among Broome County residents has not changed significantly throughout 2006-2013, with the current rate in the county being 2.8%. The current non-cigarette tobacco product use rate in Broome County is not significantly different from the current regional average of 6.0%. Use of non-cigarette types of tobacco products is strongly related to cigarette smoking – 9.7% of *current cigarette smokers* also use at least one type of other tobacco product, while only 0.8% of non-smokers do so. (Table 27)
5. The current **overall tobacco-use rate** among Broome County residents is 23.2% (use at least one type of tobacco product), which is not significantly different from the results in any of the three preceding community tobacco assessments completed in the county. The current 23.2% overall tobacco use rate among Broome County residents is not significantly different from the current regional average of 22.2% using at least one type of tobacco product. Younger adult residents (48.3% of those age 18-24 use tobacco), residents with an educational background of less than a 4-year college degree (≈28% use tobacco), and those from lower income households (40.1% of those from households with annual income of \$25,000-\$50,000 use tobacco) are most likely to be current tobacco users in Broome County. (Table 28)

6. Use of **e-cigarettes** and **reasons** why Broome County residents use these tobacco alternatives were measured for the first time in 2013. Use of e-cigarettes is very uncommon among county residents – only 0.1% of participants report to use e-cigarette on *at least some days* (a rate that is significantly lower than the current regional average of 3.0%), and another 3.7% indicated that they use e-cigarettes *rarely*. There appears to be a connection between cigarette smoking and e-cigarette use – over 16% of *current smokers* in Broome County also use e-cigarettes at least rarely, while only 0.1% of non-smokers indicate e-cigarette use. “As a means to quit tobacco use” is the reason cited by the one participant who indicated use on at least some days. (Tables 29-30)

Table 24 Have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your entire life?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Smoked 100+ cigarettes in your entire life?	Yes	178	44.6%
	No	222	55.4%
	Don't know/Not sure	0	0.0%
	Totals	400	100.0%

Trend Analysis:

("Smoked 100+" has not changed significantly between 2006 and 2013)

<i>Trend Analysis</i>	2006	2009	2011	2013
Yes	42.8%	47.5%	45.0%	44.6%
No	57.2%	52.5%	55.0%	55.4%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: ("Smoked 100+" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Yes, smoked 100+"	29.5%	46.3%	54.4%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Yes	39.6%	49.3%	48.3%	31.6%	36.6%	51.0%	49.2%	47.0%
No	60.4%	50.7%	51.7%	68.4%	63.4%	49.0%	50.8%	53.0%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Yes	100.0%	28.4%	51.7%	51.5%	24.3%	47.3%	54.0%	43.7%	21.1%
No	0.0%	71.6%	48.3%	48.5%	75.7%	52.7%	46.0%	56.3%	78.9%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	310	178	120	103	64	105	44	41

Table 25 Do you now smoke cigarettes every day, some days, or not at all?

2013 Results:

Current cigarette smoking frequency	Frequency		Percentage	
	Smoke Every Day	Smoke Some Days	Do Not Smoke At All	Don't Know/Not Sure
	65	25	310	0
	16.3%	6.3%	77.4%	0.0%
Totals	400			100.0%

(16.3% "Every Day")

Trend Analysis:

("Every Day" has not changed significantly between 2006 and 2013)

<i>Trend Analysis</i>	2006	2009	2011	2013
Every day	22.2%	21.4%	11.7%	16.3%
Some days	2.7%	3.6%	4.7%	6.3%
Not at all	75.1%	75.0%	83.6%	77.4%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: ("Every Day" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Every day"	6.1%	13.4%	21.9%
"Some days"	2.6%	5.9%	11.8%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Smoke Every Day	11.8%	20.6%	37.9%	12.0%	15.6%	18.4%	12.5%	5.0%
Smoke Some Days	11.6%	1.3%	10.4%	7.1%	5.8%	4.6%	9.6%	2.3%
Do Not Smoke At All	76.7%	78.1%	51.7%	80.9%	78.6%	77.1%	77.9%	92.8%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Smoke Every Day	72.1%	0.0%	23.9%	14.3%	5.6%	5.1%	33.7%	14.1%	0.0%
Smoke Some Days	27.9%	0.0%	5.4%	11.9%	1.4%	11.3%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Do Not Smoke At All	0.0%	100.0%	70.7%	73.8%	93.1%	83.6%	59.9%	85.9%	100.0%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	310	178	120	103	64	105	44	41

Table 26 Cigarette Smoking Status – Current, Former, or Never Smoker

2013 Results:

Cigarette Smoking Status	Frequency	Percentage
	Current smoker	90
Former smoker	88	22.0%
Never a smoker	222	55.4%
Don't know/Not sure	0	0.0%
Totals	400	100.0%

(22.6% "Current Smokers")

Trend Analysis:

("Current Smoker" has not changed significantly between 2006 and 2013)

<i>Trend Analysis</i>	2006	2009	2011	2013
Current smoker	24.9%	25.0%	16.4%	22.6%
Former smoker	17.9%	22.5%	28.6%	22.0%
Never a smoker	57.2%	52.5%	55.0%	55.4%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: ("Current Smoker" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <i>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</i>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Current smoker"	10.6%	19.3%	26.4%
"Former smoker"	17.3%	27.1%	32.2%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results):

(To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Current smoker	23.3%	21.9%	48.3%	19.1%	21.4%	22.9%	22.1%	7.2%
Former smoker	16.3%	27.4%	0.0%	12.5%	15.2%	28.1%	27.1%	39.8%
Never a smoker	60.4%	50.7%	51.7%	68.4%	63.4%	49.0%	50.8%	53.0%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

Cigarette Smoking Status	Education Level				Annual Household Income				
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Current smoker	100.0%	0.0%	29.3%	26.2%	6.9%	16.4%	40.1%	14.1%	0.0%
Former smoker	0.0%	28.4%	22.4%	25.3%	17.4%	31.0%	14.0%	29.5%	21.1%
Never a smoker	0.0%	71.6%	48.3%	48.5%	75.7%	52.7%	46.0%	56.3%	78.9%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	310	178	120	103	64	105	44	41

Table 27 Non-cigarette Tobacco Use – Do you currently use any other types of tobacco products? (other than cigarettes)

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Do you currently use any other types of tobacco products? (other than cigarettes)	Yes	11	2.8%
	No	389	97.2%
	Don't know/Not sure	0	0.0%
	Totals	400	100.0%

Trend Analysis:

("Use non-cigarette tobacco" has not changed significantly between 2006 and 2013)

Trend Analysis	2006	2009	2011	2013
Yes	5.6%	3.2%	4.0%	2.8%
No	94.4%	96.8%	96.0%	97.2%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: ("Use non-cigarette tobacco" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveied Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Yes, use non-cigarette tobacco."	0.7%	6.0%	11.3%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Yes	4.4%	1.2%	0.0%	6.7%	1.9%	6.0%	2.0%	0.4%
No	95.6%	98.8%	100.0%	93.3%	98.1%	94.0%	98.0%	99.6%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Yes	9.7%	0.8%	2.0%	5.3%	1.2%	2.2%	3.5%	0.7%	2.2%
No	90.3%	99.2%	98.0%	94.7%	98.8%	97.8%	96.5%	99.3%	97.8%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	310	178	120	103	64	105	44	41

Table 28 Overall Tobacco Use

2013 Results:

	Frequency	Percentage
Overall Tobacco Use		
Use No Tobacco Products	307	76.8%
Other Tobacco Only	2	0.6%
Cigarettes Only	82	20.4%
Both Cigarettes and Other Tobacco	9	2.2%
Not Sure	0	0.0%
Totals	400	100.0%

(23.2% "Use At Least One Type of Tobacco Product")

Trend Analysis: ("Use some tobacco" has not changed significantly between 2006 and 2013)

Trend Analysis	2006	2009	2011	2013
Use <u>no</u> tobacco products	73.6%	73.4%	80.8%	76.8%
Use <u>only non-cigarette</u> tobacco products	1.5%	1.6%	2.7%	0.6%
Use <u>only cigarettes</u>	20.8%	23.4%	15.2%	20.4%
Use <u>both</u> cigarettes and non-cigarette tobacco products	4.1%	1.6%	1.3%	2.2%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: ("Use some tobacco" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 (includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Use some type of tobacco products"	11.2%	22.2%	31.1%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Use No Tobacco Products	75.6%	77.9%	51.7%	80.9%	78.6%	75.5%	75.9%	92.8%
Other Tobacco Only	1.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	2.0%	0.0%
Cigarettes Only	20.0%	20.8%	48.3%	12.4%	19.5%	18.6%	22.1%	6.8%
Both Cigarettes and Other Tobacco	3.3%	1.1%	0.0%	6.7%	1.9%	4.4%	0.0%	0.4%
Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	196	204	60	58	58	78	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Use No Tobacco Products	0.0%	99.2%	70.2%	73.5%	91.9%	83.6%	59.9%	85.1%	97.8%
Other Tobacco Only	0.0%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	2.2%
Cigarettes Only	90.3%	0.0%	27.8%	21.1%	6.9%	14.1%	36.5%	14.1%	0.0%
Both Cigarettes and Other Tobacco	9.7%	0.0%	1.5%	5.1%	0.0%	2.2%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	310	178	120	103	64	105	44	41

Table 29

Do you now smoke Electronic Cigarettes or E-cigarettes, such as Ruyan or NJOY, every day, some days, rarely, or not at all?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Use E-cigarettes?	Every day	0	0.0%
	Some days	0	0.1%
	Rarely	15	3.7%
	Not at all	382	96.0%
	Don't know	1	0.2%
	Refused	0	0.0%
Totals		398	100.0%

(0.1% "Use at least some days")

Trend Analysis: Not measured in previous studies in Broome County.

Regional Comparison: ("Use at least some days" in Broome is significantly lower than the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 (includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey) "Use at least some days."	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
	0.1%	3.0%	8.1%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Every day	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Some days	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%
Rarely	3.6%	3.8%	12.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%
Not at all	96.0%	96.0%	87.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	86.9%	100.0%
Don't know	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	195	203	60	58	58	76	63	83

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Every day	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Some days	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%
Rarely	16.2%	0.0%	4.4%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Not at all	83.8%	99.6%	95.1%	93.9%	100.0%	100.0%	86.1%	99.3%	100.0%
Don't know	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	307	176	119	103	64	105	44	41

Table 30

If yes (you use e-cigarettes at least some days), which of the following are reasons why you choose to use them? (choose all that apply)

2013 Results:

	% Among those who use E-cigs
Healthier alternative to cigs.	0.0%
Use in places where tobacco is banned.	0.0%
As a means to quit tobacco.	100.0%
Never used tobacco.	0.0%
To not bother others near you.	0.0%
E-cigs are cheaper.	0.0%

Trend Analysis: Not measured in previous studies in Broome County.

Regional Comparison: Sample sizes too small to compare counties.

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): Sample sizes too small to compare demographic subgroups.

2.9

FURTHER TOBACCO PURCHASE, USE, AND CESSATION ISSUES – *AMONG CURRENT SMOKERS FINDINGS*

Summary of Findings – Further Pruchase, Use, and Cessation Issues – *Among Current Smokers*

1. More than one-half (58.2%) of the current smokers in Broome County **have stopped smoking for one day or longer in the past twelve months while trying to quit smoking**. This quit attempt rate is not significantly different from the current regional average (54.5% of smokers attempted to quit in past year), and has not changed significantly in Broome County between 2006 and 2013. (Table 31)
2. Less than 1% of the current cigarette smokers (0.4%) in Broome County have **purchased their cigarettes from a website or on the Internet** in the past year at least rarely, a significant decrease from 10.0% found in the county in 2011, but a rate that is currently not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 3.4% purchasing at over the Internet at least rarely. (Table 32)
3. A minority of Broome County **current smokers indicate that they want to quit smoking now** (39.6%). The interest-in-quitting rate in Broome County is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 48.3%, however, it has decreased significantly from the 2011 Broome County rate found (64.6% of smokers wanted to quit at that time). (Table 33)

Table 31

During the past 12 months, have you stopped smoking for one day or longer because you were trying to quit smoking?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Stopped smoking for one day or longer in past year trying to quit?	Yes	53	58.2%
	No	31	34.8%
	Don't know/Not sure	6	6.9%
	Totals	90	100.0%

Trend Analysis:

("Yes" has not changed significantly between 2006 and 2013)

<i>Trend Analysis</i>	2006	2009	2011	2013
Yes	48.3%	57.6%	53.3%	58.2%
No	50.6%	40.2%	46.7%	34.8%
Don't Know/Not Sure	1.1%	2.3%	0.0%	6.9%

Regional Comparison: ("Yes" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Yes"	50.8%	54.5%	58.2%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Yes	65.0%	51.3%	78.5%	76.3%	8.9%	17.7%	100.0%	52.7%
No	21.2%	48.7%	0.0%	23.7%	91.1%	82.3%	0.0%	47.3%
Don't know/Not sure	13.8%	0.0%	21.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	46	45	29	11	12	18	14	6

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Yes	58.2%	0.0%	68.1%	36.0%	83.7%	68.9%	50.9%	92.7%	0.0%
No	34.8%	0.0%	31.9%	44.0%	16.3%	31.1%	49.1%	7.3%	0.0%
Don't know/Not sure	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	20.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	0	52	31	7	10	42	6	0

Table 32

In the past 12 months, have you or a friend or relative purchased cigarettes for your own use from a website or on the Internet?

2013 Results:

	Frequency	Percentage	
Purchasing Cigarettes from a website or over the Internet?	Yes, all the time	0	0.4%
	Yes, sometimes	0	0.0%
	Yes, but rarely	0	0.0%
	No, never	90	99.6%
	Don't know/Not sure	0	0.0%
	Totals	90	100.0%

(0.4% "Yes, at least rarely.")

Trend Analysis:

("Yes, at least rarely" has decreased significantly between 2011 and 2013)

Trend Analysis	2006	2009	2011	2013
Yes, all the time.	2.8%	4.3%	0.0%	0.4%
Yes, some of the time.	2.1%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%
Yes, rarely.	4.6%	0.6%	8.0%	0.0%
No, never.	90.5%	95.1%	89.9%	99.6%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: (Results in Broome are not significantly different from the current regional averages)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 (includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Yes, at least rarely."	0.4%	3.4%	6.4%
"Yes, all of the time."	0.4%	0.6%	0.8%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Yes, all the time	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%
Yes, sometimes	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Yes, but rarely	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
No, never	99.2%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	93.9%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	46	45	29	11	12	18	14	6

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Yes, all the time	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Yes, sometimes	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Yes, but rarely	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
No, never	99.6%	0.0%	100.0%	98.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	0	52	31	7	10	42	6	0

Table 33 Would you like to quit smoking now?

2013 Results:

		Frequency	Percentage
Want to quit smoking now?	Yes	36	39.6%
	No	54	60.1%
	Don't know/Not sure	0	0.3%
	Totals	90	100.0%

Trend Analysis:

("Yes" has decreased significantly between 2011 and 2013)

<i>Trend Analysis</i>	2006	2009	2011	2013
Yes	51.1%	59.7%	64.6%	39.6%
No	44.8%	35.2%	33.3%	60.1%
Don't Know/Not Sure	4.0%	5.1%	2.1%	0.3%

Regional Comparison: ("Yes" in Broome is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 21 Central, Western, and Northern New York Counties Surveyed Between December 2012 and December 2013 <small>(includes only those counties that used this question in their version of the survey)</small>	Minimum in Any County	Regional Average	Maximum in Any County
"Yes"	36.6%	48.3%	62.6%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2013 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-18 of this report)

	Gender		Age					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Yes	42.3%	36.9%	21.5%	76.3%	8.9%	61.7%	49.7%	35.4%
No	57.7%	62.5%	78.5%	23.7%	91.1%	38.3%	50.3%	60.3%
Don't know/Not sure	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
Sample Size	46	45	29	11	12	18	14	6

	Cigarette Smoking Status		Education Level			Annual Household Income			
	Smoker	Non-smoker	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$75,000+
Yes	39.6%	0.0%	24.4%	55.8%	80.1%	86.3%	20.2%	92.7%	0.0%
No	60.1%	0.0%	75.6%	44.2%	16.3%	13.7%	79.2%	7.3%	0.0%
Don't know/Not sure	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Sample Size	90	0	52	31	7	10	42	6	0

Section 3

Concluding Comments

This report is a summary of the data collected in a community tobacco survey completed in Broome County, New York on behalf of Tobacco Free Broome during December 2013. The data provides a tremendous amount of rich information that can be used to *plan* future programs and services offered by the agency, as well as current data against which past and future performance may be measured and *evaluated*. To accomplish this program and/or agency evaluation component, it is recommended that a comparable study to the one described in this report be repeated in Broome County in 2015. To maximize comparability and minimize the possibility of the introduction of confounding factors, it is recommended that the methodology, survey instrument, and data analysis be implemented in a manner similar to that which was used and described in this report for 2013. The only significant changes recommended for 2015 (and similarly, limitations to the current study) would be the slight rephrasing and reordering of a small number of the questions used in the interview, and the continued emphasis on survey questions that relate directly to the current community partnership workplan.

Finally, if further investigation of the data presented in this report is desired, for example, if any further sorts, cross-tabulations, or correlations to further investigate specific Broome County subpopulations is of interest, please contact *Joel LaLone Consulting*.

Appendix The Survey Instrument

Broome/Tioga Tobacco Survey 2013

Introductory Script

Hello, my name is _____, I'm calling on behalf of the New York State Department of Health. We are not selling anything, we are conducting a very short survey about health-related issues. The survey should only take about 4-5 minutes; would you be willing to help us out tonight?

If YES- "Great, thanks."

If NO-try to arrange a CALL BACK time.

NOTE: As you start the interview: "I would like to speak to a member of the household who is age 18 or older. Your help is voluntary, but important. If we come to a question you don't want to answer, we will skip over it. You can end the interview at any time. The information you provide will be kept strictly confidential."

Are you speaking on a cell phone or a landline?

READ ONLY IF NECESSARY: "By cell phone, we mean a telephone that is mobile and usable outside of your neighborhood."

- Cell (VERIFY THAT THEY LIVE IN THE CORRECT COUNTY!)
- Landline

If on a cell phone:

Are you driving a vehicle at this moment? Are you in a safe and private place to use your cell phone?

- If not driving, and in a safe and private place.
- If driving or in an unsafe or not private place.

If driving or in an unsafe place:

"I'm sorry, but for your safety we're not able to talk to you at this time. We will call you back another time. Thank you."

SECURE CALL-BACK TIME, TERMINATE CALL, USE "PREVIOUS BUTTONS" TO RETURN TO BEGINNING FOR NEXT INTERVIEW.

Smoking at Outdoor Public Locations - Allow, Restrict, or Eliminate?

I am going to start by reading you a short list of public outdoor locations, for each can you tell me if you think smoking should be allowed anywhere; be restricted to certain areas; or not allowed at all.

Broome/Tioga Tobacco Survey 2013

"At _____, smoking should be....?"

	Allowed anywhere	Restricted to certain areas	Not allowed at all	Not sure/No opinion
Q4: at building entryways?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q5: at a public park or outdoor recreational area?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q6: at a public beach or municipal pool?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q9: If New York State implemented a law prohibiting smoking inside a car when a person under the age of 18 is present, would you agree or disagree with this law?

(Probe for "Strongly")

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Strongly agree | <input type="radio"/> Disagree |
| <input type="radio"/> Agree | <input type="radio"/> Strongly disagree |
| <input type="radio"/> Neutral | <input type="radio"/> Don't know/Not sure |

MUD or Single-family home?

Next, we are interested in opinions about smoking among those who live in multiple unit dwellings.

Q13: Do you live in a multiple-unit dwelling (apartment) or a single family home?

- MUD/Apartment Single Don't Know/Not Sure

Further questions for MUD-dwellers

Q14: Which statement best describes the rules that your landlord has set regarding smoking tobacco inside the residential units in your building? (read choices)

- Smoking is allowed in all residential units
- Smoking is only allowed in some residential units
- Smoking is not allowed in any residential units
- Don't know/Not sure

Q15: Would you be"/"Are you" in favor of a/the policy that prohibits indoor smoking everywhere inside your building, including living areas?

- Yes No Don't Know/Not Sure

Dangers of Tobacco

The next question relates to efforts to spread messages about the dangers of tobacco.

Broome/Tioga Tobacco Survey 2013

Q19: Have you ever heard of the New York State Smokers' Quitline?

- Yes No Don't know/Not sure

Tobacco Marketing - Displays in Stores

The next set of questions involve tobacco displays in stores.

Q22: Stores that sell tobacco products often display cigarettes and other tobacco products behind the counter in a very visible location. Do you think that seeing these displays cigarettes and other tobacco products makes teens more likely to smoke? (Probe for "Definitely" vs. "Probably")

- Definitely Yes No Opinion
 Probably Yes DON'T KNOW
 Probably Not REFUSED
 Definitely Not

Q25: What is your opinion about a policy that would ban the display of tobacco products such as packs of cigarettes or cigars from stores? Are you in favor or against this policy that would ban displays?

(Probe for "Strongly" vs. "Somewhat")

- Strongly in favor
 Somewhat in favor
 Neither in favor nor against
 Somewhat against
 Strongly against
 DON'T KNOW
 REFUSED

Q27: Would you support tobacco retailers being required to keep tobacco products out of the view from customers in stores, as a means to prevent youth tobacco use?

- Yes No Not Sure/No Opinion

Tobacco Marketing - Advertisements

We are next interested in your opinions about tobacco advertisements.

Broome/Tioga Tobacco Survey 2013

Q29: Stores that sell tobacco products often display advertisements for cigarettes and other tobacco products. Do you think that seeing these ads makes teens more likely to smoke? (Probe for "Definitely" vs. "Probably")

- Definitely Yes
- Probably Yes
- Probably Not
- Definitely Not
- No Opinion
- DON'T KNOW
- REFUSED

Q31: Do you think advertising of tobacco products in convenience stores and gas stations should be: allowed anywhere, restricted to certain areas, or not allowed at all, as a means to prevent youth tobacco use?

- Allowed anywhere
- Restricted to certain areas
- Not allowed at all
- Not sure/No opinion

Tobacco Marketing in the Media to Youths

The next two questions relate to tobacco marketing to youths.

Q32: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement, "Internet sites, youth-rated movies, and TV shows that youth use and watch should not include tobacco use or images."

(Probe for "Strongly" vs. "Somewhat")

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Q33: Would you support a policy that restricts showing the use of tobacco in media rated for youth viewership?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know/Not sure

Tobacco Sales

Our next questions relate to Tobacco Sales.

Broome/Tioga Tobacco Survey 2013

Q35: Do you think that pharmacies should or should not be allowed to sell tobacco products (cigarettes, cigars, etc)?

- Should be allowed Should not be allowed Don't know/Not sure

Q37: What is your opinion about a policy that would restrict the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools? Are you in favor or against this policy that would restrict sales?

(Probe for "Strongly" vs. "Somewhat")

- Strongly in favor
 Somewhat in favor
 Neither in favor nor against
 Somewhat against
 Strongly against
 DON'T KNOW
 REFUSED

Q39: Would you support a local or state policy limiting the maximum number of tobacco retailers allowed in a neighborhood or area?

- Yes No Not Sure/No Opinion

SCREEN for CURRENT SMOKER vs. NOT:

Our last section of questions deals with Tobacco Use.

***Q41: Do you now smoke cigarettes everyday, some days, or not at all?**

- Every day Some days Not at all

Among FORMER or NEVER Smokers:

Q40: Have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your entire life?

- Yes No Don't Know/Not Sure

Q42: Do you currently use any other types of tobacco products? (other than cigarettes)

- Yes No Don't know/Not sure

Broome/Tioga Tobacco Survey 2013

Q43: Do you now smoke Electronic Cigarettes or E-cigarettes, such as Blu, Ruyan, or NJOY, every day, some days, rarely, or not at all?

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Every day | <input type="radio"/> Not at all |
| <input type="radio"/> Some days | <input type="radio"/> Don't know |
| <input type="radio"/> Rarely | <input type="radio"/> Refused |

Among FORMER or NEVER Smokers who now use e-cigarettes:

Q44: If yes (use e-cigarettes at least some days), which of the following are reasons why you choose to use them? (READ ALL 4, CHOOSE ALL THAT APPLY)

- switched to e-cigs because they are a healthier alternative to tobacco (plan to keep using)
- use e-cigs in places tobacco is banned
- as a way to quit using tobacco
- never used tobacco but use e-cigs
- Other reason (please specify)

CURRENT SMOKERS QUESTIONS START HERE

Q40: Have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your entire life?

- | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> Don't Know/Not Sure |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Q42: Do you currently use any other types of tobacco products? (other than cigarettes)

- | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> Don't know/Not sure |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Q43: Do you now smoke Electronic Cigarettes or E-cigarettes, such as Blu, Ruyan, or NJOY, every day, some days, rarely, or not at all?

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Every day | <input type="radio"/> Not at all |
| <input type="radio"/> Some days | <input type="radio"/> Don't know |
| <input type="radio"/> Rarely | <input type="radio"/> Refused |

Among CURRENT SMOKERS who now use e-cigarettes:

Broome/Tioga Tobacco Survey 2013

Q44: If yes (use e-cigarettes at least some days), which of the following are reasons why you choose to use them? (READ ALL 4, CHOOSE ALL THAT APPLY)

- switched to e-cigs because they are a healthier alternative to tobacco (plan to keep using)
- use e-cigs in places tobacco is banned
- as a way to quit using tobacco
- never used tobacco but use e-cigs
- Other reason (please specify)

Further CURRENT SMOKERS Questions:

Q45: During the past 12 months, have you stopped smoking for one day or longer because you were trying to quit smoking?

- Yes No Don't know/Not sure

Q46: In the past 12 months, have you or a friend or relative purchased cigarettes for your own use from a website or on the Internet?

- Yes, all the time. No, never.
 Yes, sometimes. Don't Know/Not Sure
 Yes, but rarely.

Q49: Would you like to quit smoking now?

- Yes No Don't Know/Not Sure

Demographics Start Here (all participants)

Finally, to better understand the many factors that may be related to adult health status and beliefs about health conditions, we have a few demographic questions for you.

***Q50: What is your age (read intervals...)?**

- 18-24 45-54 75-84
 25-34 55-64 85+
 35-44 65-74

Broome/Tioga Tobacco Survey 2013

Q10: What is your current employment status?

- Employed for wages
- Self-employed
- Out of work (1 year or MORE)
- Out of work (LESS than 1 year)
- Homemaker
- Student (even if part-time employed)
- Retired
- Unable to work (disabled)
- Don't Know/Not Sure

Q51: How many children live in your household who are under 18 years old?

- None
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5+

*Q52: What is the highest level of school you completed or the highest degree you received?

- Never attended school or only attended kind.
- Grades 1 through 8 (Elementary)
- Grades 9 through 12 (Some high school)
- Grade 12 (High school graduate)
- G.E.D.
- Some technical or vocational school
- Some college, no degree
- AA; technical or vocational school
- AA; academic
- BA, BS (College graduate)
- At least some grad or prof school
- Graduate or professional degree

Q53: Which of these groups would you say best represents your race or ethnicity?

- White
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- American Indian, Alaska Native
- Prefer not to answer
- Don't know/Not sure

Other (please specify)

Q54: What is your annual household income from all sources ... you can stop me when I get to your interval. READ INTERVALS. (Reason why asked: to allow determining whether the sample we select is representative of the population that lives in _____ County)

- Less than \$10,000
- \$10,000 to less than \$25,000
- \$25,000 to less than \$50,000
- \$50,000 to less than \$75,000
- \$75,000 to less than \$100,000
- \$100,000 or more
- Refused

Broome/Tioga Tobacco Survey 2013

*Q55: If you don't mind me asking, what is your gender?

- Male Female

*Which of the following best describes your phone ownership?

- You have both a CELL phone and a LANDLINE
 You only have a CELL phone
 You only have a LANDLINE
 Refused

*In what county do you reside?

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Allegany | <input type="radio"/> Orleans |
| <input type="radio"/> Broome | <input type="radio"/> Oswego |
| <input type="radio"/> Genesee | <input type="radio"/> Tioga |
| <input type="radio"/> Lewis | <input type="radio"/> Wyoming |

Onondaga

Other County

NOTE:

If calling a CELL PHONE, you must ask the following two questions.

You may hang up now and not ask them the next two questions if calling a LANDLINE. (if on a landline, just refer to the call sheet for ZIP and TOWN)

Broome/Tioga Tobacco Survey 2013

*What is your postal Zip code? (Only need to ask if calling a CELL)

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> 13730 | <input type="radio"/> 13790 | <input type="radio"/> 13864 |
| <input type="radio"/> 13732 | <input type="radio"/> 13795 | <input type="radio"/> 13865 |
| <input type="radio"/> 13734 | <input type="radio"/> 13797 | <input type="radio"/> 13901 |
| <input type="radio"/> 13736 | <input type="radio"/> 13802 | <input type="radio"/> 13902 |
| <input type="radio"/> 13743 | <input type="radio"/> 13803 | <input type="radio"/> 13903 |
| <input type="radio"/> 13744 | <input type="radio"/> 13811 | <input type="radio"/> 13904 |
| <input type="radio"/> 13745 | <input type="radio"/> 13812 | <input type="radio"/> 13905 |
| <input type="radio"/> 13746 | <input type="radio"/> 13813 | <input type="radio"/> 14817 |
| <input type="radio"/> 13748 | <input type="radio"/> 13827 | <input type="radio"/> 14859 |
| <input type="radio"/> 13754 | <input type="radio"/> 13833 | <input type="radio"/> 14883 |
| <input type="radio"/> 13760 | <input type="radio"/> 13835 | <input type="radio"/> 14889 |
| <input type="radio"/> 13777 | <input type="radio"/> 13848 | <input type="radio"/> 14892 |
| <input type="radio"/> 13778 | <input type="radio"/> 13850 | |
| <input type="radio"/> 13787 | <input type="radio"/> 13862 | |

Other (please specify)

Broome/Tioga Tobacco Survey 2013

*Finally, in what town do you reside? (Only need to ask if calling a CELL)

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> AFTON | <input type="radio"/> ENDICOTT | <input type="radio"/> NINEVEH |
| <input type="radio"/> APALACHIN | <input type="radio"/> GLEN AUBREY | <input type="radio"/> OWEGO |
| <input type="radio"/> BARTON | <input type="radio"/> GREENE | <input type="radio"/> PORT CRANE |
| <input type="radio"/> BERKSHIRE | <input type="radio"/> HARPURSVILLE | <input type="radio"/> RICHFORD |
| <input type="radio"/> BINGHAMTON | <input type="radio"/> JOHNSON CITY | <input type="radio"/> SPENCER |
| <input type="radio"/> BROOKTONDALE | <input type="radio"/> KIRKWOOD | <input type="radio"/> TUNNEL |
| <input type="radio"/> CANDOR | <input type="radio"/> LISLE | <input type="radio"/> VAN ETTEN |
| <input type="radio"/> CASTLE CREEK | <input type="radio"/> LOCKWOOD | <input type="radio"/> VESTAL |
| <input type="radio"/> CHENANGO BRG | <input type="radio"/> MAINE | <input type="radio"/> WAVERLY |
| <input type="radio"/> CHENANGO FKS | <input type="radio"/> MARATHON | <input type="radio"/> WHITNEY POINT |
| <input type="radio"/> CONKLIN | <input type="radio"/> NEWARK VALLEY | <input type="radio"/> WILLSEYVILLE |
| <input type="radio"/> DEPOSIT | <input type="radio"/> NICHOLS | <input type="radio"/> WINDSOR |
| <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify) | | |

THE SURVEY IS COMPLETE: thank you for taking the time to help out with this important study, if you have any questions please contact refer to FAQ sheet for correct contact information.

BOOKKEEPING - After the interview is complete.

*Phone number of the participant:

*Interviewer Name:

COMMENTS: