### 2019 Community Tobacco Survey of Adult Residents of Broome County (New York)

### Opinions, Behaviors, and Perceptions Related to:

- Home Tobacco Policies
- Outdoor Tobacco Policies
- Tobacco Point of Sale Potential Policies
- Protecting Youth from Tobacco in Media
- Smoke-Free Housing
- Tobacco and E-cigarette Use

### December 2019



Conducted for Tobacco Free Broome and Tioga Broome County Health Department Binghamton, New York

> Prepared by Joel LaLone Consulting Watertown, New York

## **Table of Contents**

### Section 1 – Topline Executive Summary of Study Findings...... 4

| 1.0 – Overall Stu<br>Figure 1 – B   | Jdy Highlights – The View from 30,000 Feet  | 5<br>5                           |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| 1.1 – Home Tob<br>Figure 2 – H  | acco Policies – Executive Summary<br>ome Tobacco Policies – Current Rules About Tobacco and E-cigarette Use in Your Home?   | 6                                |
| 1.2 – Outdoor To<br>Figure 3 – O  | obacco Policies – Executive Summary   | 7                                |
| 1.3 – Tobacco F<br>Figure 4 – T   | Point of Sale – Potential Policies – Executive Summary  | 9                                |
| 1.4 – Protecting<br>Figure 5 – P  | Youth from Tobacco in Media – Executive Summary   | <b>11</b>                        |
| 1.5 – Smoke-Fre<br>Figure 6 – S   | e Housing – Executive Summary<br>moke-Free Housing – Current Rules, and Opinions about Smoke-Free Policies  | <b>12</b>                        |
| 1.6 – Tobacco a<br>Figure 7 – T   | nd E-cigarette Use – Executive Summary<br>obacco Use, and E-Cigarette Use and Perceived Danger  | <b>13</b><br>13                  |
| Section 2 – Int   | roduction and Description of the Study  | 15                               |
| 2.1 – Purpose a   | nd Goals for this Study   | 16                               |
| 2.2 – Methodolo<br>Table 1 – Re   | gy – How These Data Were Collected<br>sponse Rates for the 2019 Broome County Community Tobacco Survey  | 18                               |
| 2.3 – Demograp<br>Table 3 – De  | hics of the Sample – Who was Interviewed?   | 20<br>21                         |
| 2.4 – Technical<br>Margin of Error<br>Table 4 – Ma<br>Table 5 – Sa<br>Significance Te | Comments to Assist Interpretation of the Data<br>– More Detail for Those Interested in Maximizing Precision and Reliability of Estimates<br>argins of Error for Varying Sample Sizes and Varying Sample Proportions<br>ample Sizes and Approximate Margins of Error within Demographic Subgroups<br>esting –Testing for Statistically Significant Differences, Trends, and Relationships                    | 23<br>23<br>25<br>26<br>27       |
| Section 3 – De  | tailed Statistical Results  | 33                               |
| 3.0 – "Framing a<br>Survey Da   | a Statistic" – Providing Perspective to Better Understand, Interpret, and U<br>ata  | /se<br>36                        |
| 3.1 – Home Tob<br>Table 6 – Th<br>Table 7 – Th  | acco Policies – Detailed Findings<br>le rules about smoking in your home?<br>le rules about the use of JUULs, vapes, e-hookahs, e-cigarettes etc. in your home?   | 37<br>38<br>39                   |
| 3.2 – Outdoor To<br>Table 8 – Op<br>Table 9 – Op<br>re<br>Table 10 – O<br>fe          | Dbacco Policies – Detailed Findings<br>Dinion about policy that would prohibit smoking: on the grounds of all workplaces?<br>Dinion about policy that would prohibit smoking: in outdoor public places such as a park, outdoor<br>creation area, or playground?<br>Dipinion about policy that would prohibit smoking: at a public outdoor community event such as a freestival, concert, or sporting event? | 40<br>41<br>                     |
| 3.3 – Tobacco F<br>Table 11 – C<br>Table 12 – C<br>s<br>Table 13 – C                  | Point of Sale – Potential Policies –Detailed Findings<br>Dipinion about policy that would: prohibit the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies?<br>Dipinion about policy that would: prohibit the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located new<br>chools?<br>Dipinion about policy that would: limit the number of stores that could sell tobacco in your commun                             | 44<br>45<br>ar<br>46<br>nity? 47 |

| Section 4 – Concluding Comments  | 64            |
|--|---------------|
| Table 26 – Breathing the aerosol from someone else's e-cigarettes or other electronic vaping products is   | 63            |
| Table 24 – Currently use e-cigarettes or other electronic vaping products?<br>Table 25 – Why would you say that you use e-cigarettes?  |               |
| Table 23 – Cigarette Smoking Status – Current, Former, Never Smokers?  |               |
| Table 22 – Smoked at Least 100 Cigarettes in entire line ?   |               |
| 3.6 – Tobacco and E-cigarette Use – Detailed Findings.   | 57            |
| 3.5 – Smoke-Free Housing – Detailed Findings (among those who live in MUD's)<br>Table 19 – Rules about smoking inside residential units in your building?<br>Table 20 – In favor or against a policy that would prohibit smoking inside all residential units in your building | 54<br>        |
| 3.4 – Protecting Youth from Tobacco in Media – Detailed Findings<br>Table 18 – "Media used in schools should not include tobacco use or imagery unless depicting historical fac  | 52<br>cts."53 |
| Table 16 – Opinion about policy that would: prohibit the sale of flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products?.<br>Table 17 – If favor to "flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products", are you in favor or against "menthol" bein<br>prohibited, too?                             | 50<br>g<br>51 |
| Table 15 – Opinion about policy that would: prohibit the sale of fruit, alcohol, or candy flavored tobacco prod<br>including e-cigarette liquids?  |               |
| Table 14 – Opinion about policy that would: prohibit discounts for tobacco products at stores such as coupo  | ns,           |
| Broome County (New York) – Adult Community Tobacco Survey – December 2019  |               |

| Appendix I – NYS January 2018 – December 2019 County- |      |
|---|------|
| Specific Comparative Results                          | . 65 |

### Appendix II – The 2019 Broome County Survey Instrument......79

### **Contact Information**

#### Tobacco Free Broome and Tioga

Sharon Fischer Public Health Educator - Tobacco Control Program Broome County Health Department 225 Front Street Binghamton, NY 13905 Phone number: 607-778-3068 Email: Sharon.Fischer@BroomeCounty.US Website: 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 Topline Executive Summary of Study Findings

A survey of adult residents of Broome County, New York is completed approximately once every two years (using a mixedmode sampling methodology including all three of landline and cellular phone random sampling, and email-invitation online surveying) with a goal of collecting tobacco-related information on behalf of *Tobacco Free Broome and Tioga*. The data are intended to be used by *Tobacco Free Broome and Tioga* to plan future initiatives, educate the public and decision-makers regarding tobacco-related issues, as well as used to evaluate and assess impact and effectiveness of past initiatives. In 2019 the study included interviews/surveys of 456 adult residents completed during the month of December. The survey instrument was constructed with approximately 30 survey questions, organized in six separate sections of tobacco-related attitude, opinion, and behavior survey items. This topline executive summary provides brief noteworthy highlighted findings in 2019 for each of the six areas of study.

## 1.0 Overall Study Highlights – *The View from 30,000 Feet*



### **Overall Study Highlights in 2019:**

**Home Tobacco Policies** – A very large majority of Broome County adults do not allow use of cigarettes or e-cigarettes in their homes.

**Outdoor Tobacco Policies** – By approximately a two-to-one ratio, residents show more support than opposition to policies that prohibit smoking a various public outdoor locations.

**Tobacco Point of Sale** – Residents show much more support than opposition to policies that restrict tobacco and e-cigarette sales at various locations, and of various product types, with tremendous recent increase in support for restricting electronic vaping products.

**Protecting Youth from Tobacco in Media** – Very high level of agreement is expressed that "Media used in schools should not include tobacco use or imagery unless depicting historical facts."

**Smoke-Free Housing** – There has been a dramatic increase between 2016 and 2019 in both the frequency of having smoke-free housing policies at multi-unit dwellings in the county, as well as rate of support for having these policies.

**Tobacco and E-cigarette Use** – The conventional cigarette smoking rate has remained stable over recent years in the county, while both use of electronic vaping products and the perception of their danger have increased tremendously.

## 1.1 Home Tobacco Policies – Executive Summary



- It continues to be very common that Broome County adults prohibit use of tobacco products that are burned inside their homes – a large majority of adults in the county (82%) indicate that they do not allow smoking anywhere inside their home, while only 6% express that smoking is allowed "anywhere" in their homes. This 82% rate of prohibiting smoking in one's home in 2019 in Broome County is not significantly different from the current regional average prohibition rate of 83%, and has not changed significantly from results found in earlier studies in the county (79% in 2015 and 84% in 2017). A majority of *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County in 2019 prohibit smoking in their homes (57% of *smokers* prohibit smoking in their homes, while only 25% allow smoking anywhere in their homes). (Table 6)
- 2. It is very common that Broome County adults prohibit electronic cigarette use inside their homes a large majority of adults in the county (80%) indicate that they do not allow use of electronic cigarette products anywhere inside their home, while only 6% express that e-cigarette is allowed "anywhere" in their homes. This 80% rate of prohibiting e-cigarette use is not significantly different from the current regional average of 83%. Approximately two-thirds of *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County in 2019 prohibit e-cigarette use in their homes (62% of *current cigarette smokers* prohibit e-cigarette use in their homes, while only 21% allow e-cigarette use anywhere in their homes). (Table 7)

## 1.2 Outdoor Tobacco Policies – Executive Summary



- 3. Very strong support for a policy that prohibits smoking on the grounds of all workplaces has been found in Broome County adults (all participants were asked this item, whether currently employed or not) in Broome County are far more likely to favor than oppose this type of smoke-free workplace policy, by more than a two-to-one ratio (60% indicate that they are in favor of a policy that prohibits smoking on the grounds of all workplaces, while only 27% express opposition to this potential policy). The 2019 support rate in Broome County (60%) is not significantly different from the current regional average support rate of 56%. Only approximately one-in-four among *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County in 2019 favor a smoking prohibition policy on the grounds of all workplaces (28% of *smokers* favor, while 49% are against). (Table 8)
- 4. Strong support for a policy that prohibits smoking in outdoor public places such as a park, outdoor recreation area, or playground has been found in Broome County a majority of adults in Broome County (52%) indicate that they are in favor of a policy that prohibits smoking in outdoor public places such as a public park, outdoor recreation area, or playground, while currently in Broome County only 32% express opposition to this potential policy. The 52% rate of favoring this potential policy in Broome County, however, is significantly lower than the current regional average support rate of 58%. Approximately one-fourth of *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County in 2019 favor a smoking prohibition policy in outdoor public places such as a public park, outdoor recreation area, or playground (23% of *smokers* favor, while 49% are against). (Table 9)
- 5. Large support for a policy that prohibits smoking at a public outdoor community event such as a fair, festival, concert, or sporting event has been found in Broome County a majority of adults in Broome County (54%) indicate that they are in favor of a policy that prohibits smoking at a public outdoor community event such as a fair, festival, concert, or sporting event, while currently in Broome County only 34% express opposition to this potential policy. The rate of support for this type of policy in the county has not changed significantly since first studied in 2015 (when the support rate was 58%). The current 54% rate of favoring this

#### Broome County (New York) – Adult Community Tobacco Survey – December 2019

type of smoking prohibition policy is not significantly different from the current regional average support rate of 60%. Approximately one-sixth of *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County in 2019 favor a smoking prohibition policy at a public outdoor community event such as a fair, festival, concert, or sporting event (17% of *smokers* favor, while 69% are against). (Table 10)

## 1.3 Tobacco Point of Sale – *Potential Policies* – Executive Summary



- 6. By a large margin, Broome County adults support a policy that would prohibit the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies (55% indicate "favor" in Broome County, while only 31% indicate "against"). The 2019 support rate in Broome County (55%) is not significantly different from the current regional average support rate of 61%, and has not changed significantly from earlier results found in the county (57% in 2015, and 57% in 2017). Support for a policy prohibiting all tobacco sales in pharmacies among *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County in 2019 is less common with 40% of *current cigarette smokers* in the county responding "favor", while 45% of *current cigarette smokers* in the county are opposed. (Table 11)
- 7. When asked their opinion about a policy that would prohibit the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools a large majority of Broome County adults (58% in the county) are in favor while only 31% are against the potential policy almost a two-to-one ratio of favor-to-against. The 58% rate of favoring this potential policy has not changed significantly from 56% found in the county when first studied in 2011, however, the 58% support rate in Broome County in 2019 is significantly lower than the current regional average support rate of 66%. Among *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County in 2019 there remains relatively high support for a policy that would prohibit the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools almost identically, 41% favor, while only 42% are against. (Table 12)
- 8. When asked whether one is in favor of a policy that would limit the number of stores that could sell tobacco in one's community, Broome County adults are more in support than in opposition (45% in Broome County are in favor, while 42% are against). The 45% rate of favoring this potential policy in 2019 is not significantly different from 51% found in the county in 2011, however, this 2019 Broome County support rate is significantly lower than the current regional average support rate of 54%. Among *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County in 2019 only 26% favor this limit on the number of stores that could sell tobacco in one's community, while 61% are against. (Table 13)
- 9. When asked their opinion about a policy that would prohibit discounts for tobacco products at stores such as coupons, rebates, multi-pack discounts or other special offers that reduce the price of tobacco, Broome County adults are more likely to support than oppose this type of policy (support rate is 49%, with

#### Broome County (New York) - Adult Community Tobacco Survey - December 2019

opposition at 40%). The 49% rate of favoring this potential policy in Broome County in 2019 is not significantly different from the current regional average support rate of 56%, and is not significantly different from 50% found in the county in 2015. Among *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County in 2019 there is a lesser level of support for this potential policy that would prohibit tobacco discounts – 31% favor, while 61% are against. (Table 14)

- 10. By a large margin, Broome County adults support a policy that would prohibit the sale of fruit, alcohol, or candy flavored tobacco products, including e-cigarette liquids (53% indicate "favor" in Broome County, while only 38% indicate "against"). The 53% rate of favoring this potential policy in Broome County in 2019 is not significantly different from the current regional average support rate of 47%. However, the rate of support rate of only 34% found in 2017. Support for a policy that would prohibit the sale of fruit, alcohol, or candy flavored tobacco products including e-cigarette liquids is not as strong among *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County in 2019 with only 24% of *current cigarette smokers* in the county responding "favor", while 64% of *current cigarette smokers* in the county are opposed. (Table 15)
- 11. By a large margin, Broome County adults support a policy that would prohibit the sale of flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products (52% indicate "favor" in Broome County, while only 37% indicate "against"). The 52% rate of favoring this potential policy in Broome County, however, is significantly lower than the current regional average support rate of 60%. Support for a policy that would prohibit the sale of flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products is not as strong among *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County in 2019 with only 26% of *current cigarette smokers* in the county responding "favor", while 59% of *current cigarette smokers* in the county are opposed. (Table 16)
- 12. Broome County adults are more in support than opposition of a policy that would prohibit the sale of "menthol" flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products (45% indicate "favor" in Broome County, while only 43% indicate "against"). This "menthol flavor" survey question was posed as a follow-up, using the preceding "prohibition of flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products" survey question as a screener. Therefore, only participants who indicated that they are, in fact, in support of "a policy that would prohibit the sale of flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products" were further asked whether or not in their opinion the policy should prohibit "menthol flavor", as well. Among the screened subgroup of participants who indicate support for "a policy that would prohibit the sale of flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products", 88% further indicate that this prohibition should include menthol flavor. The 88% rate of favoring this potential menthol-flavor policy among those who favor prohibiting the sale of flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products is not significantly different from the current regional average support rate of 85%. Support for a policy that would prohibit the sale of menthol flavored tobacco products and e-cigarette liquids remains strong among current cigarette smokers in Broome County in 2019 who had earlier expressed support for prohibiting the sale of flavored tobacco products, with 88% of current cigarette smokers in the county responding "favor" to this screened survey question, while only 3% of *current cigarette smokers* in the county are opposed (support rate is also 88% among non-smokers). (Table 17)

### 1.4 Protecting Youth from Tobacco in Media – Executive Summary



13. Broome County adult residents show very strong support that "Media used in schools should not include tobacco use or imagery unless depicting historical facts." (in 2019, 85% agree while only 14% disagree). The 2019 agreement rate in Broome County (85%) is not significantly different from the current regional average agreement rate of 86%. Among current adult cigarette smokers in the county in 2019, there remains overwhelming agreement with this statement (among current smokers: 81% agree while only 19% disagree). (Table 18)

## 1.5 Smoke-Free Housing – Executive Summary



- 14. Among residents in Broome County who live in multi-unit dwellings (apartments) a majority (52%) indicate that there is a rule set by their landlord in their building that prohibits smoking tobacco inside the residential units, while only 30% indicate that smoking is allowed in all residential units. The rate of living in a smoking-prohibited-everywhere-inside MUD housing has increased dramatically and significantly from only 31% found in the county in 2006. This rate in 2019 in Broome County (52%) is not significantly different from the current 2019 regional average rate of 49%. MUD-dwellers who are *current adult cigarette smokers* in 2019 are less likely to indicate that smoking is prohibited everywhere in the residential units of their building than are non-smokers 41% vs. 55%, respectively. (Table 19)
- 15. Broome County adult residents of multi-unit dwellings show strong support for a policy that would prohibit smoking inside all residential units in their building (in 2019 in Broome County: 56% favor while only 31% oppose). The support rate found in Broome County in 2019 (56%) is not significantly different from the current regional average support rate of 67%, however, it is a significant increase from only 40% found in the county in 2006. Among *current adult cigarette smokers* who live in MUD's in the county in 2019, there is much less support for this type of policy (11% favor to 50% against). (Table 20)

## 1.6 Tobacco and E-cigarette Use – Executive Summary



- 16. Approximately one-half of adults in Broome County (47%) have **smoked at least 100 cigarettes in their lifetime**. This rate has remained between 43%-50% each studied year throughout the past 13 years (was 43% in 2006), and in 2019 is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 42%. (Table 21)
- 17. The current cigarette smoking rate found in Broome County is: a total estimate of 19% current smokers, with 12% smoking cigarettes every day and 7% smoking on only some days. The current cigarette smoking rate ("current" is defined as "on at least some days", meaning every day or some days; and having smoked at least 100 cigarettes in one's entire life) in Broome County has not changed significantly from the rates found in Broome County tobacco studies completed between 2006-2017. The current 19% smoking rate in Broome County is not significantly different from the current regional average of 16%. More than one-fourth (28%) of participants in 2019 indicate that they are former smokers (have smoked 100+ cigarettes in their entire lifetime, but no longer smoke at all). (Tables 22 and 23)
- 18. Significant correlations with cigarette smoking potential explanatory factors that may be related with the likelihood that a Broome County adult resident in 2019 will be a current cigarette smoker that were discovered include that males (27% among males in Broome County are smokers), residents between the ages of 18-34 (33% of those in this age group in Broome County are smokers), those with some college education but less than a four-year degree (33% of those in this educational attainment group in Broome County are smokers), and residents from households earning between \$25,000 and \$50,000 annually (31% are smokers) are most likely to be current cigarette smokers. (Table 23)
- 19. Currently one-in-eight adults in Broome County (12%) report to use e-cigarettes or other electronic vaping products at least rarely. Use of e-cigarettes or other electronic vaping products among Broome County residents has increased significantly between 2013 and 2019 (2013 "at least rarely" rate was only 4%). The e-cigarette use rate in Broome County in 2019 is not significantly different from the current regional average of 9%. A possible and likely connection between smoking conventional cigarettes and using e-cigarettes is evident

#### Broome County (New York) - Adult Community Tobacco Survey - December 2019

among Broome County adults – approximately 28% of *current cigarette smokers* in Broome County in 2019 also use e-cigarettes *at least rarely*, while only 8% of *non-smokers* report to do so. (Table 24)

- 20. Among those who use e-cigarettes "at least rarely" in Broome County, 71% cite "help in tobacco cessation" as a reason for e-cigarette use. The tobacco-cessation as the reason rate (71%) has not changed significantly from 80% found in the county in 2015, and is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 49%. (caution should be exercised since these e-cigarette-user sample sizes are very small). (Table 25)
- 21. Residents of Broome County clearly believe that breathing the aerosol from someone else's e-cigarettes or other electronic vapor products is harmful to one's health with 37% indicating that they believe this exposure is "very harmful", and another 33% responding that they believe this exposure is "somewhat harmful". Only 7% of Broome County adults in 2019 believe that breathing the aerosol from someone else's e-cigarettes or other electronic vapor products is "not at all" harmful to one's health. These 2019 results are tremendous and statistically significant changes from that which was found in Broome County when first studied in 2015 when 47% responded "at least somewhat harmful" (rate is 71% in 2019). The 2019 regional average rates of responding "very", "somewhat", and "not at all" are 29%, 35%, and 8%, respectively. Broome County adults are significantly more likely to respond "very harmful" than the regional average. *Current conventional cigarette smokers* in the county in 2019 appear to have very different views regarding the danger of exposure to e-cigarette aerosol than do the non-smokers only 15% of *conventional cigarette smokers* feel that exposure to e-cigarette aerosol is "very harmful", while 43% of non-smokers express this opinion. (Table 26)

# Section 2 Introduction and Description of the Study

## 2.1 PURPOSE AND GOALS FOR THIS STUDY

The Prevention Agenda 2019-2024: New York State's Health Improvement Plan is the blueprint for state and local action to improve the health of New Yorkers in five priority areas and to reduce health disparities for racial, ethnic, disability, socioeconomic and other groups who experience them. One of the five action plans included in the Prevention Agenda is: "Prevent Chronic Diseases", and one of the four focus areas in this action plan is "Tobacco Prevention." The three goals that have been identified in the Prevention Agenda associated with this focus area are:

Goal #3.1: Prevent initiation of tobacco use.

Goal #3.2: Promote tobacco use cessation.

Goal #3.3: Eliminate exposure to secondhand smoke.

Tobacco Free Broome and Tioga is a tobacco coalition that is affiliated with the New York Tobacco Control Program, a program of the New York State Department of Health. The NYSDOH Tobacco Control Advancing Tobacco Free Communities grant for *Tobacco Free Broome and Tioga* is held by the Broome County Health Department, located in the city of Binghamton, New York. The goals of *Tobacco Free Broome and Tioga* include advocating, initiating, funding, and supporting activities and interventions that promote the prevention and cessation of tobacco use, and elimination of exposure to secondhand smoke, among residents of Broome and Tioga Counties (New York). (Source: <a href="https://health.ny.gov/prevention/prevention\_agenda/2019-2024/chr.htm#FA3">https://health.ny.gov/prevention/prevention\_agenda/2019-2024/chr.htm#FA3</a>)

To attain these goals in the Southern Tier Region of New York State, *Tobacco Free Broome and Tioga* has a need for current and accurate information regarding tobacco-related behaviors and attitudes among adult residents of these counties. To measure the necessary attitudes and behaviors regarding tobacco issues in the region, *Tobacco Free Broome and Tioga* contracted with *Joel LaLone Consulting*, Watertown, New York, to complete a community adult tobacco study in Broome County. The study involved completion of a mixed-mode methodology sample of 456 adult residents of the county, with surveying completed in December 2019.

This study was designed with the following three primary goals, essentially these goals are reasons why a tobacco community coalition would benefit from collecting this type of survey data.

#### Community Tobacco Assessment 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 health professionals to best make data-driven decisions about future health-related goals, objectives, programs, services, initiatives, interventions, promotions, and/or potential policies in their region. 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 and Tioga*.

#### Community Tobacco Assessment Study Goal #2

Education – 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 health professionals to best demonstrate and explain local residents' opinions regarding potential future tobacco-related policy and/or law changes in the region. In summary, the collected data will provide current measurements of public opinion and behavior to educate and assist local leaders, decision-makers, and elected officials make data-driven tobacco-related policy decisions in the future. The data assists Tobacco Control experts in shedding light upon local decision-maker questions such as "What does the public think about this possible tobacco-related change in policy or law in their community?"

#### Community Tobacco Assessment Study Goal #3

**Evaluation** – This goal involves using the adult survey data to allow for evaluation of the impact of past initiatives and activities provided by *Tobacco Free Broome and Tioga*. Previous similar tobacco-related surveys have been completed in Broome County between 2006 and 2017. Comparison of the current (2019) survey results to these earlier survey results with identification of any statistically significant trends is useful to 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 and Tioga* been successful in attaining their goals as outlined in its workplan?" and "Has there been any impact among the local population?"

This study, as with almost any other survey study, also has additional potential outcomes for the <u>participants</u> that could be effective and beneficial. The process of participating in an interview or survey could result with either or both of the following two outcomes, essentially these outcomes are also reasons why a coalition would benefit from collecting this type of survey data.

#### Community Tobacco Assessment Study Participant Outcome #1

**Awareness** – the conversation that transpires when an interview occurs, a conversation that is focused on tobacco-related topics, very likely provides educational information to participants that they were not already aware of – the survey process *educates the participants regarding tobacco issues*.

#### Community Tobacco Assessment Study Participant Outcome #2

**Engagement** – By virtue of the consideration of their views and behaviors regarding tobacco issues via completing an interview, participants have at a minimum cerebrally engaged in the health-related topic, and potentially, could become more likely to actually become further *actively engaged in Tobacco Free Broome and Tioga activities, initiatives, and goals.* 

The variables recorded in this study (survey questions) were developed with a focus of accomplishing these three study goals and two potential participant outcomes. The survey instrument included approximately 30 survey questions relating to the following six 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. Home Tobacco Policies
- 2. Outdoor Tobacco Policies
- 3. Tobacco Point of Sale Potential Policies
- 4. Protecting Youth from Tobacco in the Media
- 5. Smoke-Free Housing
- 6. Tobacco and E-cigarette Use

This report is a summary and explanation of the findings of the Broome County community tobacco study completed for *Tobacco Free Broome and Tioga* in December 2019. When possible, comparisons of the current results are made to the results of previous community tobacco surveys completed in the county between 2006 and 2017. Additionally, the current 2019 Broome County results are cross-tabulated by the possible explanatory factors of Gender, Age, Education Level, Annual Household Income, 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. Finally, Broome County results are compared to results that have been found in 34 separate New York State counties during the study interval of 2018 through 2019 to provide perspective surrounding the magnitudes of Broome County results. In summary, the results of this study provide important current information about contemporary thinking and behaviors of Broome County citizens; and, over time, will continue to provide important baseline and comparative information as well for healthcare leadership.

## 2.2 METHODOLOGY – HOW THESE DATA WERE COLLECTED

#### The Survey Instrument

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 and professional staff at Tobacco Free Broome and Tioga. The instrument, the introductory script used by interviewers on the telephone, the script included in an online version of the survey, and the required methodology to collect the data (complete interviews and surveys) were each approved by the Institutional Review Board of the New York State Department of Health and TSERT in November of 2019. The survey included approximately twenty-five tobacco-related items (questions) regarding the six sets of tobacco issues described in the preceding introductory section of this report, along with approximately five-to-ten demographic variables. Copies of the script and survey instrument are attached as an appendix.

#### Survey Methodology

This study in 2019 included completing a total of 456 interviews/surveys of Broome County adult residents. A mixedmode sampling methodology was employed in this study with two blended samples: 305 interviews/surveys completed using telephone-interview methodology (both landlines and cellular phones), and 151 additional surveys completed via an online survey using email invitation mode. In accordance with the American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) Transparency Initiative pledge, the following details and disclosure for the telephone-interviewing and online surveying employed in this study, including the following characteristics and facts should be considered by any reader:

1. (T) Dates of Data Collection: December 10 – December 31, 2019.

the survey.

Broome County, NY.

#### 2. (R) Recruitment:

Telephone: All telephone participants were recruited to participate via telephone by random selection from a list of all available valid active residential and cellular telephone lines in Broome County, New York, USA.

Online: All online participants were recruited to participate via an email invitation with a link to the survey embedded.

- (A) Population Under Study: All adult residents of Broome County, New York, USA. There are approximately 195,000 3. residents in the county. Approximately 155,000 of the 195,000 residents are adults, it is these adults who are the population of interest in this study.
- (N) List Source: Telephone: Electronic Voice Services, Inc., www.voice-boards.com Online:

Bulk Email Superstore, www.contactai.com, and InfoUSA,

#### (S) Sampling Design: 5.

Telephone: The entire phone list described in #2 was randomized, and approximately 4,000 valid residential and cellular phone numbers were selected to contact to invite to participate in the survey. Online: The entire email address lists described in #4 were randomized, and approximately 10,000 email addresses of residents of Broome County, NY were selected to contact to invite to participate in

#### **(P)** Population Sampling Frame: 6.

Telephone: As described in #2, the sampling frame includes all available residential listed phone numbers, for adults in Broome County, NY, both landlines and cellular phones included. As described in #5, the sampling frame includes all available email addresses of residents of

Online:

18

#### 7. **(A)** Administration:

Telephone: Survey administered via telephone from a call center in Watertown, NY, only in English, using SurveyMonkey as the CATI system.

Online: Survey administered online from an email invitation, only in English, using SurveyMonkey.

- 8. (R) Researchers: Joel LaLone Consulting, Watertown, NY, completed the research on behalf of the Broome County Health Department, Binghamton, NY
- 9. (E) Exact Wording of Survey: The survey instrument is attached as an appendix.
- **10. (N) Sample Sizes:** As is discussed in much greater detail for this study later in this report: n=456 overall for the study, with an overall average margin of error of ±5.5%, including the design effect due to weighting.
- 11. (C) Calculation of Weights: As is discussed in much greater detail for this study later in this report: results are weighted by gender, age, educational attainment, residence type, and phone ownership. Target weighting parameters are obtained from a combination of: the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) released by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for phone ownership; and the U.S. Census for gender, age, residence type, and educational attainment. Online survey results have been further slightly calibrated and trimmed toward telephone survey results to minimize social desirability bias.
- 12. (Y) Contact Information: Mr. Joel LaLone, Owner, Joel LaLone Consulting, contact information on page 3.

Further details of study methodology and sampling include that a total of 456 interviews of Broome County adult residents were completed. A mixed-mode sampling methodology was employed in this study with two blended samples: 305 interviews/surveys completed using telephone-interview methodology, and 151 additional surveys completed via an online survey after email invitation mode. Approximately 27% of the total sample selected (123 of the 456 interviews who provided their phone ownership information) indicated that they are "cell-only". After weighting, these cell-only participants account for 40% of this Upstate New York sample. To be eligible to complete the survey, the resident was required to be at least 18 years old. All telephone calls were made between 4:00 and 9:00 p.m. from a call center in Watertown, New York on evenings between December 10 – December 31, 2019. All interviewers had completed training in both human subject research methodology and effective interviewing techniques before commencing data collection. Professional staff *Joel LaLone Consulting*, with two reminder follow-up emails sent to any non-responders over the three week sampling time spanning December 10 – December 31, 2019. No rewards, neither pre-incentives nor post-incentives, were used in either of the two sampling modalities to encourage participation.

When each of the telephone numbers in the random telephone sampling portion of this study was attempted, one of four results occurred: Completion of an interview; a Decline to be interviewed; No Answer/Busy; or an Invalid Number (including both disconnected numbers, as well as numbers for individuals who do not currently reside in Broome County). Voluntary informed consent was obtained from each resident before the interview was completed. This sampling 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 of the questions on the survey had 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 telephone survey was approximately 5 minutes. Declines to be interviewed (refusals) were not called back in an attempt to convince the resident to reconsider the interview. If no contact was made at a telephone number (No Answer/Busy), a maximum of four call-backs were made to the number. Telephone numbers that were not successfully contacted were ultimately categorized as No Answer/Busy. No messages were left on answering machines at homes where no person answered the telephone. The introductory script of the online version of the survey acquired consent and validation of adult age and within-county residence. The response rate results for the study are summarized in Table 1.

Broome County (New York) - Adult Community Tobacco Survey - December 2019

| Table 1  | Response Rate<br>Tobacco Surve                           | es for the I<br>ey   | Dece           | ember  | 20           | 19 Broc  | ome (               | County  | / Co                         | mmur   | nity   |
|--|--|--|----------------|--|--------------|--|---------------------|---|------------------------------|--|--|
| Methodology (  | Jtilized   | Number of<br>Surveys<br>Completed<br>(unweighted<br>contribution to the<br>sample) | N<br>Co<br>con | umber o<br>Surveys<br>ompleted<br>(weighted<br>tribution to t<br>sample) | f<br>d<br>he | % of Tota<br>Sample<br>(weighted<br>contribution to<br>sample) | al<br>e<br>o the    | Number v<br>are "Ce<br>only" (weig<br>contribution t<br>sample) | who<br>II-<br>ghted<br>o the | % of<br>Sampl<br>are "<br>only" (<br>contributi<br>sam | Total<br>e who<br>Cell-<br>weighted<br>on to the<br>ple) |
| Telephone inter<br>Telephone inter<br>Online surveys | views on Landlines<br>views on Cell Phones               | 197<br>108<br>151  |                | 186<br>153<br>117  |              | 41%<br>34%<br>25%  |                     | 0<br>100<br>80  |                              | 0°<br>22<br>18   | %<br>%   |
| Totals   |  | 456  |                | 456  |              | 100%   |                     | 180   |                              | 40   | %  |
| Response<br>PHONE                                    | se rates for LANDLINES 8<br>S COMBINED attempted i       | • <b>CELL</b><br>n this study:   | Com<br>Inter   | plete<br>view  | De<br>Inte   | ecline to<br>be<br>erviewed                                    | No A<br>B           | Answer/<br>Busy To  |                              | TALS   |  |
| % of Va<br>% of Co                                   | lid Numbers<br>ntacted Residents                         |  | 10<br>37       | )%<br>'%   |              | 17%<br>63%   | 7                   | 2%<br>-   | 10<br>10                     | )0%<br>)0%   |  |
|  | Response rates for <b>ONLIN</b> attempted in this study: | IE SURVEYS   |                | Comj<br>Surv   | olete<br>vey | Did<br>Com<br>Sur  | Not<br>plete<br>vey | ΤΟΤΑ  | LS                           |  |  |
|  | Count  |  |                | 15   | 1            | 9.8  | 49                  | 10.000  |                              |  |  |

Within the fields of social science and public health research, when using a hybrid design including both cell phone and landline telephone interview methodology, a response rate of approximately 10% of all valid phone numbers attempted, and almost 40% of all successful contacts where a person is actually talking on the phone, are both considered quite successful. Response rates of approximately 1%-2% when email invitations are sent to opt-in email accounts with an invitation to complete a survey online with no incentives or rewards are typical, and show strong evidence of increasing over the past two years of experimentation at *Joel LaLone Consulting*. The methodology employed in this study continues to meet industry standards.

2%

98%

100%

Throughout this report when possible trend analyses will be completed. The sample sizes (# participants who completed the survey) in each year that a community tobacco adult assessment study has been completed in Broome County are summarized in the following Table 2.

#### Table 2 Years of Study and Sample Sizes Utilized

Percentage

| Year of Study:     | 2006 | 2009 | 2011 | 2013 | 2015 | 2017 | 2019 |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Broome County (n=) | 402  | 400  | 406  | 400  | 403  | 402  | 456  |

### 2.3 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 a sampled county (i.e. What is the current typical household size, 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 a county population for programming and interventions, and ultimately, measure impact and change within these subgroups. Finally, the 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 most current available estimated demographic characteristics of the entire adult population residing in the county that were reported by the U.S. Census Bureau are also summarized for each demographic variable and provided for comparison.

#### Table 3

#### Demographics of the Sample Compared to U.S. Census Estimates

(sample results weighted for gender, age, education, residence type, phone ownership; trimmed; and calibrated to adjust for social desirability bias)

| Demographic<br>Characteristics: | Broome County<br>(2019 Weighted Sample %'s) | Broome County<br>(U.S. Census) |
|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Gender                          |   |                                |
| Male                            | 49%   | 49%                            |
| Female                          | 51%   | 51%                            |
| Age                             |   |                                |
| 18-34                           | 24%   | 30%                            |
| 35-54                           | 32%   | 30%                            |
| 55-64                           | 20%   | 18%                            |
| 65+                             | 25%   | 23%                            |
| Children in the Household       | 1   |                                |
| None                            | 67%   |                                |
| 1                               | 14%   |                                |
| 2                               | 15%   | 25% "at least one member of    |
| 3                               | 3%  | age"                           |
| 4                               | 1%  | ugo                            |
| 5+                              | 0%  |                                |
| Education Level                 |   |                                |
| HS Graduate or less             | 37%   | 40%                            |
| Some College                    | 34%   | 35%                            |
| College Graduate (4+years)      | <b>29%</b>                                  | 26%                            |
| Household Income                |   |                                |
| Under \$25,000                  | 18%   | 26%                            |
| \$25,000-\$50,000               | 28%   | 25%                            |
| \$50,000-\$100,000              | 40%   | 31%                            |
| \$100,000 or more               | 13%   | 19%                            |
| Type of Residence               |   |                                |
| Multi-unit Dwelling             | 24%   | 30% (of households)            |
| Single-family home              | 75%   | 70%                            |
| Don't know/Not sure             | 1%  | -                              |

#### Weighting of Data

All survey results presented in this study have been weighted for age, gender, education level, phone ownership, and residence type (owner-occupied or multiple-unit dwelling) to statistically adjust for under and over representation of demographic subgroups captured in the raw unweighted sample. The gender, age, education level, and residence type

#### Broome County (New York) – Adult Community Tobacco Survey – December 2019

targets that are used for these weighting algorithms are derived from the most current U.S. Census updates for the Broome County adult population (http://quickfacts.census.gov/), 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). To address potential social desirability response bias, the online survey results were calibrated and trimmed according to a long-term tracked policy question distribution found within the telephone-collected results ("Do you support or oppose a policy that would limit the number of stores that could sell tobacco in your community?"). Finally, a layer of weighting was implemented to adjust so that online participation accounted for approximately 25% of the overall sample of 456 participants. In summary, all subsequent statistics that will be reported in this document are weighted by Gender, Age, Education Level, and Residence Type toward the most current U.S. Census reports that describe the Gender, Age, Educational Attainment, and Residence Type distributions of the actual entire adult population that resides in Broome County, and toward the Phone Ownership targets described above.

In general, Table 3 demonstrates that after weighting and calibrating the data collected in this study 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, or opted in to complete the survey online) 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.

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, this weighted and calibrated 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.

#### **Generalizability and Margin of Error**

With a sample of 456 completed surveys the average margin of error for this survey study is approximately  $\pm 5.5\%$ , including the design effect. In general, the results of this survey for any questions that were answered by the entire sample of 456 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  $\pm 5.5$  percentage points (there is an average margin of error of  $\pm 5.5\%$  with a sample size of n=456). For results that are investigated for certain specific subgroups in Broome County, such as results specifically for only adult residents who are 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 *the sampled current cigarette smokers* in Broome County to all current smokers in the county) with a 95% confidence level to within a margin of error that will be larger than  $\pm 5.5$  percentage points. The utility of a margin of error is that one can be 95% confident that any sample statistic presented in the remainder of this report for the entire sample of n=456 adults from the county would/could only deviate from the true value that would be found if all 155,000 adults (approximately) in the county were in fact interviewed, by at most 5.5 percentage points.

An example illustrating the appropriate use of the margin of error for this study will be now 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 "favors a policy that would prohibit discounts for tobacco products at stores such as coupons, rebates, multi-pack discounts, or other special offers?", then reference to Table 14 later in this report shows that 49.2% of the 454 sampled adults who answered this question respond with *"Favor"*. Using a margin of error of *approximately*  $\pm$ 5.5 percentage points, the result is that we are 95% confident that if all  $\approx$ 155,000 adults in the county were interviewed and asked their opinion about a policy that would prohibit discounts for tobacco products at stores such as coupons, rebates, multi-pack discounts, or other special offers, the resulting percentage who would respond with *"Favor"* will be contained in the interval 49.2%  $\pm$ 5.5%, somewhere between 43.7% and 54.7%. This resulting interval is called a confidence interval (much more explanation of confidence intervals is provided in Section 2.4 of this report for interested readers).

It should be noted that 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 the sample statistics that result for each question, even when the confidence level of estimation is held constant at the customary 95% level. 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 recent laws have reduced the amount that they smoke) 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).

For more specific detail regarding the margin of error for this survey and the elements of statistical tests of significance, please continue to Section 2.4 – 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 25*.

## 2.4 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 Maximizing Precision and Reliability 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 or surveyed. However, it is typically the goal of the researcher to use this sample data to draw a conclusion, or estimate that which they believe 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 of 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 then the result for this entire population investigation would be that 40% (that would be 40,000 out of the 100,000) 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. The margin of error for questions that are answered by the entire sample of 456 participants in this study is approximately ±5.5%, therefore one may conclude that the tobacco-related statistics reported in the following sections of detailed statistical results fall within ±5.5% of the true value that would be found if all adult residents in the county did, in fact, complete the survey.

Once again, to illustrate the above-described concepts of margin of error and confidence intervals, note that in Table 11 it can be observed that 54.7% of the sample of 456 adults surveyed in Broome County in 2019 who answered this survey question responded to "Are in favor or against a policy that would prohibit the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies?" with an answer of *"Favor"*. With this sample result, one could infer with 95% confidence that if <u>all</u> Broome County adults were asked – somewhere between 49.2% and 60.2% of the population of approximately 155,000 adults in the county would respond to "Are in favor or against a policy that would prohibit the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies?" with an answer of *"Favor"* (started with the 54.7% that was found in the sample and added-and-subtracted a margin of error of ±5.5%). This resulting interval (49.2%–60.2%) is known as a *95% Confidence Interval*. The consumer of this report should use this pattern when attempting to generalize any of these survey findings for survey questions *that were answered by all* ≈456 *participants* to the entire adult population of the county. When attempting to generalize results for survey questions which had smaller sample sizes (the result of either screening questions such as smoker-only questions, or participants refusing to answer certain questions, or years when the within-county sample size was less than ≈456), the resulting margin of error will be *larger* than ±5.5 percentage points.

The preceding introductory example regarding tobacco sales at pharmacies used a margin of error of  $\pm 5.5\%$ , as a result of an illustration that used all  $\approx 456$  sampled participants in the 2019 Broome County study. However, again, the *exact* margin of error when using the sample results in this study to construct a confidence interval to estimate a population

#### Broome County (New York) - Adult Community Tobacco Survey - December 2019

percentage will not always be ±5.5%, or alternatively, one should note that if ±5.5% is used as the margin of error to make an inference about an entire population of interest, this ±5.5% is an approximation. 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 for generating a very precise measurement of the margin of error depend upon the following four factors:

- 1. The sample size is the number of adults who validly answered the survey question. The sample size will not always be n=456 since individuals have a right to omit any question. Additionally, some survey questions were only posed after screening questions. Further, if one investigates a certain subgroup, such as only current smokers, obviously the sample size will be smaller than n=456 in the county. 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 "Favor"). 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÷400=0.4=40%).
- 3. The *confidence level* 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.
- 4. The design effect (DEFF) is a factor used in the calculation of the margin of error that compensates for the impact upon the size of the margin of error of having a sample whose demographic distributions do not well-parallel the distributions of the entire population that the sampling is attempting to represent. In general, the further that the sample demographic distributions deviate from the population distributions then the larger the design effect (margin of error), and conversely, the closer that the sample demographic distributions parallel the population distributions then the smaller the design effect (margin of error). Essentially the design effect reflects the magnitude of the impact that reliance upon weighting of sample results will have upon the reliability of population estimates. Note that the design effect for this study is 2.221.

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

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

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

 $\Sigma$  ... 2

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

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

DEFF = the design effect and

$$DEFF = \frac{n \cdot \sum w_i}{\left(\sum w_i\right)^2}$$

with wi=the post-stratification weight associated with ith of the 456 sampled individuals

An example of using this Margin of Error formula would be that if 250 females are sampled and 100 of those 250 women report that they "agree" with some statement, then the sample proportion is p=(100/250)=0.4=40%. Therefore the margin of error for this smaller sample (whose n is only 250) that has a sample proportion that deviates from 50%, is found

by: 
$$ME = 1.96 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{p(100-p)}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{DEFF} = 1.96 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{(40)(100-40)}{250}} \cdot \sqrt{2.221} = 9.1\%$$

Please note this directly-calculated margin of error of ±9.1% with a sample size of n=250 is larger than the average margin of error reported for n=250 in the following Table 4 (which reports an average margin of error of  $\pm 7.4\%$  when n=250), as a result of the sample proportion (40%) being quite close to 50%. However, this ±9.1% calculation may be verified by cross-referencing p=40% and n=250 in Table 4.

Since the sample size varies (in fact, could conceivably be different for every question included in a survey) and the sample percentage varies (also, could conceivably be different for every question included in a survey) the following table (Table 4) 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 in the preceding paragraphs.

#### Broome County (New York) – Adult Community Tobacco Survey – December 2019

Note that the top portion of Table 4 includes the *average* margin of error for selected sample sizes that could result for specific investigations of the survey data. It is the bottom (larger) table in Table 4 referencing both the sample size and the sample proportion that provides the margins of error with the greatest degree of precision.

| Table          | e 4        | Marg    | ins of | Error  | for Va   | rying  | Sam             | ple Siz | zes ar   | nd Va          | rying | Sam          | ple F  | ropo           | rtions | 5         |        |
|----------------|------------|---------|--------|--------|----------|--------|-----------------|---------|----------|----------------|-------|--------------|--------|----------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Sample S       | Size (n=)  | 30      | 50     | 75     | 100      | 12     | 5 15            | ) 175   | 200      | 225            | 250   | 275          | 300    | 325            | 350    | 400       | 456    |
| Approximate    | e (Average | ) 21.3% | 16 5%  | 13 5%  | 11 7%    | 10.4   | 0/. 0.50        | / 8.8%  | 8 3%     | 7.8%           | 7 4%  | 7.0%         | 6.7%   | 6 5%           | 6.2%   | 5.8%      | 5 5%   |
| Margin o       | of Error   | 21.37   | 10.376 | 13.370 | 5 II.770 | 0 10.4 | /0 3.3/         | 0.076   | 0.5 //   | 1.0 /0         | 7.470 | 1.0 /0       | 0.7 /0 | 0.37           | 0.2 /0 | J.0 /6    | J.J /0 |
|                |            |         |        |        |          | ١      | /arying         | Sample  | Sizes (r | n=)            |       |              |        |                |        |           |        |
| Varying        | 20         | 50      | 75     | 100    | 125      | 150    | 175             | 200     | 225      | 250            | 275   | 200          | 225    | 250            | 40     | 0         | 156    |
| Sample<br>%'s: | 30         | 50      | 75     | 100    | 125      | 150    | 175             | 200     | 225      | 250            | 215   | 300          | 320    | 300            | 40     | U         | 400    |
| 2%             | 7.5%       | 5.8%    | 4.7%   | 4.1%   | 3.7%     | 3.3%   | 3.1%            | 2.9%    | 2.7%     | 2.6%           | 2.5%  | 2.4%         | 2.3%   | 2.2%           | 2.0    | %         | 1.9%   |
| 4%             | 10.5%      | 8.1%    | 6.6%   | 5.7%   | 5.1%     | 4.7%   | 4.3%            | 4.0%    | 3.8%     | 3.6%           | 3.5%  | 3.3%         | 3.2%   | 3.1%           | 2.9    | %         | 2.7%   |
| 6%             | 12.7%      | 9.8%    | 8.0%   | 6.9%   | 6.2%     | 5.7%   | 5.2%            | 4.9%    | 4.6%     | 4.4%           | 4.2%  | 4.0%         | 3.8%   | 3.7%           | 3.5    | %         | 3.2%   |
| 8%             | 14.5%      | 11.2%   | 9.2%   | 7.9%   | 7.1%     | 6.5%   | 6.0%            | 5.6%    | 5.3%     | 5.0%           | 4.8%  | 4.6%         | 4.4%   | 4.2%           | 4.0    | %         | 3.7%   |
| 10%            | 16.0%      | 12.4%   | 10.1%  | 8.8%   | 7.8%     | 7.2%   | 6.6%            | 6.2%    | 5.8%     | 5.5%           | 5.3%  | 5.1%         | 4.9%   | 4.7%           | 4.4    | %         | 4.1%   |
| 12%            | 17.3%      | 13.4%   | 11.0%  | 9.5%   | 8.5%     | 7.8%   | 7.2%            | 6.7%    | 6.3%     | 6.0%           | 5.7%  | 5.5%         | 5.3%   | 5.1%           | 4.79   | %         | 4.4%   |
| 14%            | 18.5%      | 14.3%   | 11.7%  | 10.1%  | 9.1%     | 8.3%   | 7.7%            | 7.2%    | 6.8%     | 6.4%           | 6.1%  | 5.9%         | 5.6%   | 5.4%           | 5.19   | %         | 4.7%   |
| 16%            | 19.6%      | 15.1%   | 12.4%  | 10.7%  | 9.6%     | 8.7%   | 8.1%            | 7.6%    | 7.1%     | 6.8%           | 6.5%  | 6.2%         | 5.9%   | 5.7%           | 5.4    | %<br>V    | 5.0%   |
| 18%            | 20.5%      | 15.9%   | 13.0%  | 11.2%  | 10.0%    | 9.2%   | 8.3%            | 7.9%    | 7.5%     | 7.1%           | 0.8%  | 0.5%         | 6.2%   | 6.0%           | 5.0    | 70<br>V   | 5.3%   |
| 20%            | 21.3%      | 16.5%   | 13.5%  | 11.7%  | 10.5%    | 9.5%   | 8.8%            | 8.3%    | 7.8%     | 7.4%           | 7.0%  | b./%         | 6.5%   | 6.2%           | 5.8    | %<br>//   | 5.5%   |
| 22%            | 22.1%      | 17.1%   | 14.0%  | 12.1%  | 10.8%    | 9.9%   | 9.1%            | 8.0%    | 8.1%     | 7.1%           | 7.5%  | 7.0%         | 6.0%   | 6.3%           | 6.1    | 70<br>N   | 5.0%   |
| 24 /0          | 22.0 %     | 10.40/  | 14.4%  | 12.3%  | 11.2%    | 10.2%  | 9.4%            | 0.0%    | 0.3%     | 0 40/          | 7.3%  | 7 40/        | 7 40/  | 0.1 %<br>C 00/ | 6.4    | /0<br>)/  | 5.0%   |
| 20 %           | 23.4%      | 19.5%   | 14.0%  | 12.0%  | 11.3%    | 10.5%  | 9.1%            | 9.1%    | 0.J%     | 0.1%<br>9.2%   | 7.0%  | 7.6%         | 7.1%   | 7.0%           | 6.6    | /0        | 6 1%   |
| 30%            | 23.5 %     | 18.9%   | 15.1%  | 13.1%  | 12.0%    | 10.7 % | 9.9 /0<br>10 1% | 9.5%    | 8.0%     | 0.J /0<br>8 5% | 8 1%  | 7.0%         | 7.3%   | 7.0%           | 6.7    | /0<br>)/_ | 6.3%   |
| 32%            | 24.470     | 19.3%   | 15.7%  | 13.4%  | 12.0%    | 11 1%  | 10.1%           | 9.6%    | 9.1%     | 8.6%           | 8.2%  | 7.9%         | 7.6%   | 7.3%           | 6.8    | /0<br>%   | 6.4%   |
| 34%            | 25.3%      | 19.6%   | 16.0%  | 13.8%  | 12.2%    | 11.3%  | 10.5%           | 9.8%    | 9.2%     | 8.8%           | 8.3%  | 8.0%         | 7.7%   | 7.4%           | 6.9    | %         | 6.5%   |
| 36%            | 25.6%      | 19.8%   | 16.2%  | 14.0%  | 12.5%    | 11.4%  | 10.6%           | 9.9%    | 9.3%     | 8.9%           | 8.5%  | 8.1%         | 7.8%   | 7.5%           | 7.0    | %         | 6.6%   |
| 38%            | 25.9%      | 20.1%   | 16.4%  | 14.2%  | 12.7%    | 11.6%  | 10.7%           | 10.0%   | 9.5%     | 9.0%           | 8.5%  | 8.2%         | 7.9%   | 7.6%           | 7.19   | %         | 6.6%   |
| 40%            | 26.1%      | 20.2%   | 16.5%  | 14.3%  | 12.8%    | 11.7%  | 10.8%           | 10.1%   | 9.5%     | 9.1%           | 8.6%  | 8.3%         | 7.9%   | 7.6%           | 7.2    | %         | 6.7%   |
| 42%            | 26.3%      | 20.4%   | 16.6%  | 14.4%  | 12.9%    | 11.8%  | 10.9%           | 10.2%   | 9.6%     | 9.1%           | 8.7%  | 8.3%         | 8.0%   | 7.7%           | 7.2    | %         | 6.8%   |
| 44%            | 26.5%      | 20.5%   | 16.7%  | 14.5%  | 13.0%    | 11.8%  | 11.0%           | 10.3%   | 9.7%     | 9.2%           | 8.7%  | 8.4%         | 8.0%   | 7.8%           | 7.2    | %         | 6.8%   |
| 46%            | 26.6%      | 20.6%   | 16.8%  | 14.6%  | 13.0%    | 11.9%  | 11.0%           | 10.3%   | 9.7%     | 9.2%           | 8.8%  | 8.4%         | 8.1%   | 7.8%           | 7.3    | %         | 6.8%   |
| 48%            | 26.6%      | 20.6%   | 16.9%  | 14.6%  | 13.1%    | 11.9%  | 11.0%           | 10.3%   | 9.7%     | 9.2%           | 8.8%  | 8.4%         | 8.1%   | 7.8%           | 7.3    | %         | 6.8%   |
| 50%            | 26.7%      | 20.7%   | 16.9%  | 14.6%  | 13.1%    | 11.9%  | 11.0%           | 10.3%   | 9.7%     | 9.2%           | 8.8%  | 8.4%         | 8.1%   | 7.8%           | 7.3    | %         | 6.8%   |
| 52%            | 26.6%      | 20.6%   | 16.9%  | 14.6%  | 13.1%    | 11.9%  | 11.0%           | 10.3%   | 9.7%     | 9.2%           | 8.8%  | 8.4%         | 8.1%   | 7.8%           | 7.3    | %         | 6.8%   |
| 54%            | 26.6%      | 20.6%   | 16.8%  | 14.6%  | 13.0%    | 11.9%  | 11.0%           | 10.3%   | 9.7%     | 9.2%           | 8.8%  | 8.4%         | 8.1%   | 7.8%           | 7.3    | %         | 6.8%   |
| 56%            | 26.5%      | 20.5%   | 16.7%  | 14.5%  | 13.0%    | 11.8%  | 11.0%           | 10.3%   | 9.7%     | 9.2%           | 8.7%  | 8.4%         | 8.0%   | 7.8%           | 7.2    | %         | 6.8%   |
| 58%            | 26.3%      | 20.4%   | 16.6%  | 14.4%  | 12.9%    | 11.8%  | 10.9%           | 10.2%   | 9.6%     | 9.1%           | 8.7%  | 8.3%         | 8.0%   | 7.7%           | 7.2    | %         | 6.8%   |
| 60%            | 26.1%      | 20.2%   | 16.5%  | 14.3%  | 12.8%    | 11.7%  | 10.8%           | 10.1%   | 9.5%     | 9.1%           | 8.6%  | 8.3%         | 7.9%   | 7.6%           | 7.2    | %         | 6.7%   |
| 62%            | 25.9%      | 20.1%   | 16.4%  | 14.2%  | 12.7%    | 11.6%  | 10.7%           | 10.0%   | 9.5%     | 9.0%           | 8.5%  | 8.2%         | 7.9%   | 7.6%           | 7.19   | %         | 6.6%   |
| 64%            | 25.6%      | 19.8%   | 16.2%  | 14.0%  | 12.5%    | 11.4%  | 10.6%           | 9.9%    | 9.3%     | 8.9%           | 8.5%  | 8.1%         | 7.8%   | 7.5%           | 7.0    | %         | 6.6%   |
| 66%            | 25.3%      | 19.6%   | 16.0%  | 13.8%  | 12.4%    | 11.3%  | 10.5%           | 9.8%    | 9.2%     | 8.8%           | 8.3%  | 8.0%         | 7.7%   | 7.4%           | 6.9    | %         | 6.5%   |
| 68%            | 24.9%      | 19.3%   | 15.7%  | 13.6%  | 12.2%    | 11.1%  | 10.3%           | 9.6%    | 9.1%     | 8.6%           | 8.2%  | 7.9%         | 7.6%   | 7.3%           | 6.8    | %         | 6.4%   |
| 70%            | 24.4%      | 18.9%   | 15.5%  | 13.4%  | 12.0%    | 10.9%  | 10.1%           | 9.5%    | 8.9%     | 8.5%           | 8.1%  | 7.7%         | 7.4%   | 7.2%           | 6.79   | %         | 6.3%   |
| 72%            | 23.9%      | 18.5%   | 15.1%  | 13.1%  | 11.7%    | 10.7%  | 9.9%            | 9.3%    | 8.7%     | 8.3%           | 7.9%  | 7.6%         | 7.3%   | 7.0%           | 6.6    | %         | 6.1%   |
| 74%            | 23.4%      | 18.1%   | 14.8%  | 12.8%  | 11.5%    | 10.5%  | 9.7%            | 9.1%    | 8.5%     | 8.1%           | 7.7%  | 7.4%         | 7.1%   | 6.8%           | 6.4    | %         | 6.0%   |
| 76%            | 22.8%      | 17.6%   | 14.4%  | 12.5%  | 11.2%    | 10.2%  | 9.4%            | 8.8%    | 8.3%     | 7.9%           | 7.5%  | 7.2%         | 6.9%   | 6.7%           | 6.2    | %<br>     | 5.8%   |
| 78%            | 22.1%      | 17.1%   | 14.0%  | 12.1%  | 10.8%    | 9.9%   | 9.1%            | 8.6%    | 8.1%     | 7.1%           | 7.3%  | 7.0%         | 6.7%   | 6.5%           | 6.1°   | 70<br>V   | 5.7%   |
| 6U%            | 21.3%      | 10.3%   | 13.5%  | 11.7%  | 10.5%    | 9.5%   | 8.8%<br>9.5%    | 8.3%    | 7.6%     | 7.4%           | 7.0%  | 0.7%<br>C.E% | 6.0%   | 6.2%<br>6.0%   | 5.6    | 70<br>N   | 5.3%   |
| 8 <u>/</u> 9/  | 20.3%      | 15.9%   | 13.0%  | 10.7%  | 0.6%     | 9.2%   | 0.J%            | 7.6%    | 7.3%     | 6.9%           | 6.5%  | 6.3%         | 5.0%   | 5.7%           | 5.0    | /0        | 5.0%   |
| 86%            | 18.5%      | 14 30/- | 11 7%  | 10.7 % | 9.0%     | 8 3%   | 7 7%            | 7.2%    | 6.8%     | 6.4%           | 6.1%  | 5 00%        | 5.5%   | 5.1%           | 5.4    | 26        | 4 7%   |
| 88%            | 17.3%      | 13.4%   | 11.0%  | 9.5%   | 8.5%     | 7.8%   | 7.2%            | 6.7%    | 6.3%     | 6.0%           | 5.7%  | 5.5%         | 5.3%   | 5.1%           | 4.70   | %         | 4.4%   |
| 90%            | 16.0%      | 12.4%   | 10.1%  | 8.8%   | 7.8%     | 7.2%   | 6.6%            | 6.2%    | 5.8%     | 5.5%           | 5.3%  | 5.1%         | 4 9%   | 4.7%           | 4.1    | %         | 4.1%   |
| 92%            | 14.5%      | 11.2%   | 9.2%   | 7.9%   | 7.1%     | 6.5%   | 6.0%            | 5.6%    | 5.3%     | 5.0%           | 4.8%  | 4.6%         | 4.5%   | 4.2%           | 4.04   | %         | 3.7%   |
| 94%            | 12.7%      | 9.8%    | 8.0%   | 6.9%   | 6.2%     | 5.7%   | 5.2%            | 4.9%    | 4.6%     | 4.4%           | 4.2%  | 4.0%         | 3.8%   | 3.7%           | 3.5    | %         | 3.2%   |
| 96%            | 10.5%      | 8.1%    | 6.6%   | 5.7%   | 5.1%     | 4.7%   | 4.3%            | 4.0%    | 3.8%     | 3.6%           | 3.5%  | 3.3%         | 3.2%   | 3.1%           | 2.9    | %         | 2.7%   |
| 98%            | 7.5%       | 5.8%    | 4.7%   | 4.1%   | 3.7%     | 3.3%   | 3.1%            | 2.9%    | 2.7%     | 2.6%           | 2.5%  | 2.4%         | 2.3%   | 2.2%           | 2.0    | %         | 1.9%   |
| Average        | 21.3%      | 16.5%   | 13.5%  | 11.7%  | 10.4%    | 9.5%   | 8.8%            | 8.3%    | 7.8%     | 7.4%           | 7.0%  | 6.7%         | 6.5%   | 6.2%           | 5.8    | %         | 5.5%   |

#### Illustration of how to use Table 4 to determine the correct (most accurate and precise) margin of error:

To precisely estimate the percentage in the entire population of adults in Broome County who would respond *"Favor"* to the question "What is your opinion about policy that would limit the number of stores that could sell tobacco in your community?", one must simply refer to Table 13 to determine the sample size and percentage of this sample of Broome County adults who respond with *"Favor"*. From Table 13 it is found that 44.9% of the sampled Broome County adults indicate that they are in favor of this type of policy, and the sample size is n=456. Reference to Table 4 on the preceding page indicates that the appropriate margin of error would be  $\pm 6.8\%$  (used n=456, the closest entry to n=456 in the table; and used p=44%, the closest entry to p=44.9% in the table). Therefore, we can be 95% confident that if <u>all</u> Broome County adults were asked, the resulting percentage who would indicate that they favor limiting the number of stores that could sell tobacco in their community among this population of adults would be within  $\pm 6.8\%$  of the 44.9% found in our sample. The interpretation of this would be that we are 95% confident that among <u>all</u> Broome County adults the percentage who favor limiting the number of stores that could sell tobacco in their community and the sample points is larger than the earlier-cited "average" margin of error of 5.5 percentage points as a result of the sample proportion (44.9%) being quite close to 50%. Again, this resulting interval (38.1%-51.7%) is known as a <u>95% Confidence Interval</u>.

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 5 is provided with sample sizes and resulting *approximate* margins of error for the common demographic subgroups that will be compared *within* Broome County throughout the remainder of this report. Again, caution should be used in not over-interpreting the approximate margins of error presented in Table 5; 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 5 is provided for explanation to some audience, for example, of the "typical margin of error when investigating tobacco-related results for only males in Broome County." Note that the margin of error results recorded in Table 5 were directly calculated using the mathematical formula shown on page 24.

| Table 5 | Sample Sizes (unweighted<br>Key Demographic Study S | l) and Approx<br>ubgroups           | kimate Margins  | of Error Within |
|---------|---|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------|
|         | Broome County<br>Demographic Subgroups              | Raw Sample<br>Sizes<br>(unweighted) | Approximate<br>(Average) Within-<br>Subgroup Margin<br>of Error |                 |
|         | Genders:  |                                     |   |                 |
|         | Male  | 200                                 | ±8.3%   |                 |
|         | Female  | 256                                 | ±7.3%   |                 |
|         | Age Groups:   |                                     |   |                 |
|         | 18-34   | 29                                  | ±21.7%  |                 |
|         | 35-54   | 110                                 | ±11.1%  |                 |
|         | 55-64   | 223                                 | ±7.8%   |                 |
|         | 65+   | 94                                  | ±12.0%  |                 |
|         | Education Levels:                                   |                                     |   |                 |
|         | No College  | 106                                 | ±11.3%  |                 |
|         | Some College  | 138                                 | ±9.9%   |                 |
|         | 4+ Year Degree                                      | 212                                 | ±8.0%   |                 |
|         | Annual Household Income Lev                         | /els:                               |   |                 |
|         | Less than \$25,000                                  | 44                                  | ±17.6%  |                 |
|         | \$25,000-\$50,000                                   | 89                                  | ±12.4%  |                 |
|         | \$50,000-\$100,000                                  | 176                                 | ±8.8%   |                 |
|         | \$75,000-\$100,000                                  | 76                                  | ±13.4%  |                 |
|         | Cigarette Use:                                      |                                     |   |                 |
|         | Current Cigarette Smoker                            | 56                                  | ±15.6%  |                 |
|         | Non-smoker of Cigarettes                            | 400                                 | ±5.8%   |                 |

Finally, for those who wish to estimate a percentage in some entire <u>sub</u>population of adults in Broome County with more precision than has been suggested above in Table 5, the process is similar to that which has been outlined earlier with one added step. To estimate the percentage in the entire subpopulation of adult *males* in Broome County who would respond *"Favor"* to the question "What is your opinion about policy that would prohibit the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies?", one must simply refer to Table 11 to determine the percentage of this sample of Broome County adult *males* who respond with *"Favor"*. From Table 11 it is found that 47.6% of the sampled Broome County adult *males* indicate that they are in favor of this type of policy. However, knowledge of the sample size is also necessary to be able to use Table 4

to identify the most precise margin of error. This raw/unweighted sample size of *males* (n=200) is recorded at the bottom of each cross-tabulation table in Section 3 of this study. Now, reference to Table 4 indicates that the appropriate margin of error would be  $\pm 10.3\%$  (used n=200, the closest entry to n=200 in the table; and used p=48%, the closest entry to p=47.6% in the table). Therefore, we can be 95% confident that if <u>all</u> Broome County adult *males* were asked, the resulting percentage who would indicate that they favor prohibiting the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies among this population of adult *males* would be within  $\pm 10.3\%$  of the 47.6% found in our sample. The interpretation of this would be that we are 95% confident that among <u>all</u> Broome County adult *males* the percentage who favor prohibiting the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies of all tobacco products in pharmacies would be somewhere between 37.3% and 57.9%. Note that this margin of error of 10.3 percentage points is larger than the earlier-cited "average" margin of error of 5.5 percentage points as a result of the sample size being less than 456 (only n=200 *males* are included in the sample). Again, this resulting interval (37.3%-57.9%) 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. However, in survey research 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, acquiescence bias, 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), application of post-stratification algorithms, calibration algorithms, and trimming of large weights. 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 thus far has focused on the statistical inference referred to as *estimation* – construction of confidence intervals using the margins of error described in Table 4. To take full advantage of the data collected in this study, other statistical techniques are of value. Tests for significant <u>trends over time</u>, tests for <u>significantly correlated factors</u> with measured tobacco-related outcome variables, tests to <u>compare response distributions</u> for <u>similarly-scaled variables</u> within the Broome County data in 2019, and tests to <u>compare these county-specific results to</u> regional average results, are 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 this Broome County tobacco survey is based on a *sample* of 456 adult residents, as opposed to obtaining information from every single adult resident in the 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 *male* Broome County residents appear to *favor* a policy that would prohibit the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools less commonly than *female* residents (52.8% of Broome County *males favor*, while 62.9% of Broome County *females favor*, please refer to Table 12), the researcher would want to know if this lower proportion among males would likely still be present if they interviewed *every* Broome County adult male and every adult female rather than just the sample of 456 adults who were actually interviewed/surveyed in the county. 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  $n\approx456$  randomly selected adults from the approximately 155,000 adults in Broome County), then the results of these samples would *not* consistently show that the Broome County adult males *favor* a policy prohibiting the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools less commonly than adult females; some Broome County samples of  $\approx456$  adults might result with the male support rate higher, and some samples might show the male rate lower, than the corresponding female *favor* rate. In this case, the researcher could <u>not</u> report *with high levels of confidence* that the Broome County male support rate is statistically significantly different from the Broome County female support rate. Rather, the difference found within the one actually-selected sample of size  $n\approx456$  Broome County residents when partitioning into male and female subgroups would be interpreted as small enough that it could be due simply to the random chance of sampling when interviewing only  $\approx456$  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 adult males are less likely to *favor* a policy prohibiting the sale of all tobacco products in stores located near schools than adult females in the county. Furthermore, if *every* adult in Broome County were interviewed, we are confident that this population favor-a-policy-prohibiting-tobacco-sales-in-stores-located-near-schools rate among all males in the county would be lower than the rate among all females. One can never be 100% certain (or confident) that the result of a sample will indicate appropriately

#### Broome County (New York) – Adult Community Tobacco Survey – December 2019

whether two population values (in this illustration that would be: the results for *all* Broome County male residents, and the results for *all* Broome County female residents) are, in fact, different from one another. 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).

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

Throughout this report, cross-tabulation comparisons for "relationships between collected variables" have been completed. With investigations for *relationships between variables*, the focus is 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 "opinion about a policy prohibiting the sale of all tobacco products located near schools" scenario, one could observe in Table 12 that the "Favor" rate *among males is 52.8% support a policy that would prohibit the sale of tobacco in stores located near schools*, and compare this to the rate *among females (which is 62.9%)*. 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 <u>not</u> a statistically significant difference (p>0.05). Conversely, a very large difference between these within-subgroup proportions could be large enough to be quite *un*likely 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? The rule that should be applied to determine statistical significance is:

- 1. Sample percentages in the same row and subtable <u>not sharing</u> the same subscript <u>are</u> significantly different at p<0.05.
- 2. Sample percentages in the same row and subtable <u>sharing</u> the same subscript <u>are not</u> significantly different at p<0.05.

All tests have been completed using the two-proportion z-test. Subsequent cell adjustment for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost sub-table using the Bonferroni Multiple Comparison corrections has been completed when necessary. Tests assume equal variances. All results for all significance tests are reported in the associated cross-tabulation contingency tables using APA-style subscripts.

As an example, the demographic cross-tabulations for opinions about *a policy that would prohibit the sale of tobacco in stores located near schools* for Broome County in 2019 is shown below (later in this report in Section 3 this is Table 12):

|                            |           |                   |     | Gen                  | der             |                | Age Groups      |                                      |                 |                 |                   |                   |                |                 | Cigarette Use   |               |                 |                |
|----------------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
|                            |           |                   | M   | ale                  | Fem             | ale            | 18-             | 34                                   | 35-             | 54              | 55                | -64               | 65             | i+              | Smo             | ker           | Non-sr          | noker          |
|                            | Favor     |                   | 52. | 8% <sub>a</sub>      | 62.9            | ‰ <sub>b</sub> | 41.3            | % <sub>a</sub>                       | 60.0            | )% <sub>b</sub> | 56.0              | )% <sub>a,b</sub> | 72.6           | 5% <sub>b</sub> | 41.4            | %a            | 61.9            | % <sub>b</sub> |
| Policy that would prohibit | Against   |                   | 35. | 8% <sub>a</sub>      | 25.4            | % <sub>b</sub> | 48.0            | % <sub>a</sub>                       | 27.3            | 8% <sub>b</sub> | 31.4              | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub>  | 17.2           | 2% <sub>b</sub> | 42.4            | %a            | 27.6            | % <sub>b</sub> |
| he sale of tobacco         | Neither   |                   | 11. | .0% <sub>a</sub> 8.3 |                 | a 8.3%a 4      | 4.7             | 4.7% <sub>a</sub> 12.7% <sub>a</sub> | % <sub>a</sub>  | 12.             | 3% <sub>a</sub>   | 8.4               | % <sub>a</sub> | 16.2            | %a              | 8.19          | % <sub>b</sub>  |                |
| located near schools?      | Don't kno | w                 | 0.4 | 1% <sub>a</sub>      | 3.4             | % <sub>b</sub> | 6.0             | ‰ <sub>a</sub>                       | a 0.0%          |                 | 0.4% <sub>a</sub> |                   | 1.8            | % <sub>a</sub>  | 0.0%            |               | 2.4             | % <sub>a</sub> |
|                            | Total     |                   | 100 | .0%                  | 100.            | 0%             | 100.            | 0%                                   | 100             | .0%             | 100               | ).0%              | 100            | .0%             | 100.            | 0%            | 100.            | 0%             |
|                            | Unweight  | ted Sample Size   | 1   | 99                   | 25              | 5              | 29              | Э                                    | 11              | 0               | 2                 | 21                | 9              | 4               | 5               | 5             | 39              | 9              |
|                            |           |                   |     |                      | Ed              | ucatio         | n Leve          | el                                   |                 |                 |                   | Annual            | House          | hold Ir         | ncome           |               |                 |                |
|                            |           |                   |     | No Co                | ollege          | So<br>Coll     | me<br>lege      | 4+ \<br>Deg                          | Ƴear<br>gree    | <\$2            | 5,000             | \$25,0<br>\$50,   | 000-<br>000    | \$50,<br>\$100  | 000-<br>,000    | \$100,        | 000+            |                |
|                            | Fa        | vor               |     | 63.                  | 5% <sub>a</sub> | 58.            | 0% <sub>a</sub> | 50.                                  | 7% <sub>a</sub> | 62.             | 0% <sub>a</sub>   | 66.4              | % <sub>a</sub> | 56.2            | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 50.3          | 8% <sub>a</sub> |                |
| Policy that would pro      | hibit Ag  | ainst             |     | 30.2                 | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 29.            | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 31.                                  | 7% <sub>a</sub> | 28.             | 6% <sub>a</sub>   | 23.9              | % <sub>a</sub> | 33.8            | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 34.0          | )% <sub>a</sub> |                |
| the sale of tobacco        | Ne Ne     | either            |     | 6.3                  | %a              | 12.            | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 10.                                  | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 9.4             | 4% <sub>a</sub>   | 5.8               | %a             | 8.6             | % <sub>a</sub>  | 15.6          | 5%a             |                |
| located near schools       | ? Do      | on't know         |     | 0.0                  | )%              | 0.0            | 0%              | 6.8                                  | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 0.              | 0%                | 3.8               | % <sub>a</sub> | 1.5             | % <sub>a</sub>  | 0.0           | %               |                |
|                            | То        | otal              |     | 100                  | .0%             | 100            | .0%             | 100                                  | ).0% 100        |                 | 0.0% 100          |                   | 0.0% 10        |                 | .0%             | 1 <b>00</b> . | .0%             |                |
|                            | Un        | weighted Sample S | ize | 10                   | 05              | 1:             | 37              | 2                                    | 12              | 4               | 4                 | 88                | В              | 17              | 76              | 7             | 6               |                |

The table above shows that in 2019, 52.8% of male participants favor a policy that would prohibit the sale of tobacco in stores located near schools, while 62.9% of female participants are in favor, and since these two groups <u>do not</u> share a subscript (males are designated as "a", while females are designated as "b"), the two groups <u>do differ statistically significantly</u>. In Broome County men are less likely to be in favor of this potential policy than are females. 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.

#### Broome County (New York) - Adult Community Tobacco Survey - December 2019

#### 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 thirty-four county-specific studies in New York State that were completed by tobacco community partnerships throughout 2018 and 2019 (each of the thirty-four studies has been completed by *Joel LaLone Consulting*, using similar methodology to that which has been used in December 2019 in Broome County). These summarized results include the minimum, maximum, and average values found for each survey question among the thirty-four 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 34-county combined 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 z-test. This z-test has been applied and is included for every survey question in this study in Appendix I.

To illustrate a regional comparison, again consider the "attitude about a policy prohibiting the sale of tobacco products near schools" variable. Reference to Table 12 in Section 3 of this report shows that the result for Broome County in 2019 are:

|                            |            | Unweighted | Weighted   |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
|                            |            | Frequency  | Percentage |
|                            | Favor      | 276        | 58.0%      |
| Policy that would prohibit | Against    | 113        | 30.5%      |
| the sale of tobacco        | Neither    | 60         | 9.6%       |
| located near schools?      | Don't know | 5          | 2.0%       |
|                            | Totals     | 454        | 100.0%     |

Reference to Table 12 in Section 3 of this report also shows the regional average, and the minimum and maximum rates found in any of the 34 studied counties (note that only 32 of the 34 studied counties included this specific survey question), along with a histogram of the county-specific result distribution.

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

(For greater detail, including county-specific results and tests of significance, refer to both pages 29-30 and Appendix I.)



Finally, reference to Table A.7 in Appendix I of this report shows the result of a test that determines whether or not Broome County differs significantly from the regional average favor rate. When interpreting the tables in Appendix I the following rules should be applied:

- 1. A sample statistic (percentage) in a column that is shaded RED is <u>statistically significantly higher</u> than the regional average rate.
- 2. A sample statistic (percentage) in a column that is shaded BRIGHT GREEN is <u>statistically</u> <u>significantly lower</u> than the regional average rate.
- 3. A sample statistic (percentage) in a column that has green and red percentages in it (the response of choice for comparison) that is BLACK is <u>not statistically significantly different</u> from the regional average rate.

The 32-county comparative table for the survey question do you favor a policy that would prohibit the sale of tobacco in stores located near schools is pasted on the following page from Appendix I.

| Table A 7           | ,                       | Policy that would prohibit the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools? |         |         |            |        |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------|-------------------------|--|---------|---------|------------|--------|--|--|--|--|
|                     |                         | Favor  | Against | Neither | Don't know | Total: |  |  |  |  |
| County of Residence | Orange (Jan. 2019)      | 79.1%  | 15.8%   | 4.3%    | 0.7%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
| sampling date)      | Dutchess (Jan. 2018)    | 79.1%  | 15.2%   | 4.9%    | 0.9%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)     | 76.6%  | 19.5%   | 3.7%    | 0.2%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2018) | 75.8%  | 18.0%   | 6.2%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Nassau (Jan. 2019)      | 75.3%  | 18.9%   | 5.1%    | 0.6%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2019)      | 73.5%  | 19.1%   | 5.7%    | 1.6%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Rockland (Jan. 2018)    | 72.0%  | 17.5%   | 10.1%   | 0.4%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Broome (Jan. 2018)      | 71.5%  | 19.0%   | 9.1%    | 0.4%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Ulster (Jan. 2018)      | 71.3%  | 21.2%   | 7.5%    | 0.1%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Nassau (June 2018)      | 68.9%  | 26.9%   | 3.6%    | 0.6%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2019) | 68.4%  | 26.7%   | 3.7%    | 1.2%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Suffolk (June 2018)     | 67.8%  | 20.4%   | 11.5%   | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)       | 67.7%  | 22.7%   | 9.1%    | 0.5%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Seneca (Jan. 2018)      | 67.0%  | 21.1%   | 10.8%   | 1.1%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Ontario (Jan. 2019)     | 66.9%  | 23.2%   | 8.5%    | 1.4%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Tioga (Jan. 2018)       | 66.9%  | 25.3%   | 7.4%    | 0.4%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)        | 66.7%  | 25.0%   | 8.3%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2018)      | 66.7%  | 24.0%   | 7.4%    | 1.9%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Yates (Jan. 2019)       | 63.9%  | 33.4%   | 2.7%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2019)    | 62.8%  | 35.2%   | 2.1%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Chenango (Jan. 2018)    | 62.7%  | 25.8%   | 11.1%   | 0.4%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Chemung (Jan. 2019)     | 62.4%  | 32.6%   | 5.0%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Wayne (Jan. 2018)       | 61.8%  | 27.9%   | 8.7%    | 1.6%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)    | 60.4%  | 32.6%   | 6.8%    | 0.1%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)      | 58.4%  | 32.5%   | 8.2%    | 0.9%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)      | 58.0%  | 30.5%   | 9.6%    | 2.0%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)     | 56.8%  | 35.5%   | 7.6%    | 0.1%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Steuben (Jan. 2019)     | 56.5%  | 31.7%   | 11.3%   | 0.5%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Madison (June 2018)     | 56.4%  | 33.1%   | 9.7%    | 0.7%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Schuyler (Jan. 2019)    | 56.3%  | 38.9%   | 4.8%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Jefferson (June 2019)   | 55.8%  | 35.2%   | 8.6%    | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)  | 54.8%  | 34.8%   | 9.7%    | 0.6%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES            | 65.9%  | 26.2%   | 7.3%    | 0.6%       | 100.09 |  |  |  |  |

Broome County (New York) - Adult Community Tobacco Survey - December 2019

Since the 58.0% favor rate in Broome County in 2019 is **bright green** the result of the test of significance is that the difference between Broome County in 2019 and the current regional average is considered statistically significant. In other words, based upon the sample data collected in this survey, the attitude in Broome County about a policy prohibiting the sale of tobacco products near schools is significantly different from the current 32-county regional average attitude distribution (regional average rate is 65.9%) – Broome County adults are significantly less likely to be *in favor* of a policy prohibiting the sale of all tobacco products near schools than is the typical situation in recently-studied New York State 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. The research question that is being investigated in these comparisons is, "Has there been any statistically significant change in tobacco-related attributes among the adult residents in Broome County between 2006 and 2019?"

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 sampling and interviewing methodology that was comparable to that which was utilized in the present December 2019 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 December 2019. Therefore, only the questions/items that were also measured in earlier studies are available for trend analysis to compare with the current results. With the similar sampling 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 has been described in the preceding pages regarding "Correlational Analyses" and "Comparison to Regional Averages" is also applied when a researcher attempts to investigate whether or not results in Broome County have changed significantly over the past 13 years. The focus now becomes the comparison of the 2019 Broome County result to earlier Broome County results (rather than comparing males to females, for example, as was the case in the correlational analysis illustration shown earlier). The technique that is recommended in this study to determine whether a statistically significant trend has occurred is to apply the following method that has also been recommended by the New York State Department of Health in its presentation of the Expanded Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). 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. For example, is one interested in only investigating use "Every Day", or is one more interested in collapsing the two possible response choices of "Every Day" and "Some Days" together into a response choice group that could be referred to as "At least some days"? Then, after observing the sample sizes for the years to be compared (in Table 2 of this report), one may refer to Table 4 in this study to identify the correct *approximate* margins of error (or directly calculate these margins of error with more accuracy and precision using the ME formula shown and demonstrated on page 24) if estimating proportions (or, "percentages" or "rates") for differing years. With these margins of error, two separate confidence intervals may be constructed, one for each year, 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 years should be considered statistically significant. This technique for testing for statistical significance does include the design effect in measuring the standard error.

To illustrate a trend analysis, please consider the "Current Cigarette Smoking Status" variable. Reference to Table 23 shows that:

- In 2006: in Broome County: n=402 participants (found in Table 2 earlier in this report), and in Table 23 p=24.9% indicated that they were *current cigarette smokers*; therefore from Table 4 the approximate margin of error is ±6.2%. The resulting confidence interval for 2006 is: 24.9%±6.2%, or (18.7%,31.1%).
- In 2019: in Broome County: n=456 participants, and in Table 23 p=19.2% indicate that they are *current cigarette smokers*; therefore from Table 4 the approximate margin of error is ±5.5%. The resulting confidence interval for 2019 is: 19.2%±5.5%, or (13.7%,24.7%).

Since these two confidence intervals <u>do</u> overlap, the difference between 2006 and 2019 in Broome County (the 13year trend) <u>is not</u> considered statistically significant. In other words, based upon the sample data collected in this survey, the cigarette smoking rate in Broome County <u>has not</u> changed significantly between 2006 and 2019. The 19.2% rate in 2019 is not far enough away from the 24.9% rate found in 2006 to be a statistically significant change, this 5.7% difference in smoking rate is not extremely unlikely to occur by random chance if the overall smoking rates in the entire adult populations in the county are truly the same in these two compared years.

#### <u>Comparing similarly-scaled variables (Survey Items) in 2019 – How does one determine whether two different</u> <u>survey question distributions differ "statistically significantly" from one another?</u>

Finally, to determine whether or not a difference observed between two similarly-measured items is statistically significant, the same significant testing method as that which was shown for trend analyses has been applied in this study. The focus now becomes the comparison of the level of support, or exposure, or whatever is measured for various similarly-scaled survey items ... for example, is there statistically significantly more (or less) support for one potential tobacco policy versus another potential policy? Again, first the reader must identify the specific response choice of interest. For example, is one interested in only investigating "Every day", or is one more interested in collapsing the two possible response choices of "Every day and Most days" together into a response choice group that could be referred to as "At Least Most Days"? Then, one may refer to Table 4 in this study to identify the correct *approximate* margins of error (or directly calculate these margins of error with more accuracy and precision using the ME formula shown and demonstrated on page 24) if estimating proportions (or, "percentages" or "rates") for differing survey questions that are measured on the same scale. With these margins of error, two separate confidence intervals may be constructed, one for each issue, and the overlap-vs.-non-overlap rule recommended earlier by the NYSDOH may be applied to determine whether or not the observed sample difference between the survey items should be considered statistically significant. This technique for testing for statistical significance does include the design effect in measuring the standard error.

To illustrate a comparison of strength of support for two separate survey items, please consider the following two potential-policy survey items among participants in 2019, both similarly measured on a Favor/Against scale: "Opinion about a policy that would prohibit the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies" (Table 11) and "Opinion about a policy that would prohibit the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools." (Table 12)

**Pharmacies:** in 2019 from Table 11, n=456 participants and p=54.7% responded "Favor"; therefore from Table 4 the approximate margin of error is ±6.8%. The resulting confidence interval for "Favor" in 2019 is: 54.7%±6.8%, or (47.9%,61.5%).

Stores Near Schools: in 2019 from Table 12, n=454 participants and p=58.0% responded "Favor"; therefore from Table 4 the approximate margin of error is ±6.8%. The resulting confidence interval for "Favor" in 2019 is: 58.0%±6.8%, or (51.2%,64.8%).

Since these two confidence intervals <u>do</u> overlap, the difference in support for "a policy that would prohibit the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies" (54.7%) and "a policy that would prohibit the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools" (58.0%) in 2019 among Broome County adults <u>is not</u> considered statistically significant. In other words, based upon the sample data collected in this survey in 2019, the rate of favoring a policy that would prohibit the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies in Broome County is not significantly different from the rate of favoring a policy that would prohibit the sale of all tobacco products in stores that are located near schools in the county. The 54.7% rate found for pharmacies is not far enough away from (below) the 58.0% rate found for stores located near schools be a statistically significant difference, this 3.3% difference in favoritism is not tremendously *un*likely to occur by random chance if the favor rates in the entire Broome County adult population are truly the same for these two compared similarly-scaled types of potential tobacco policies.

Finally, the preceding comments regarding statistically significant differences between subgroups, statistically significant differences or changes between study years, statistically significant differences between Broome County and the 34-county regional average, and statistically significant differences between similarly-scaled variables are comments addressing *statistical* significance ... which, of course, is not one-and-the-same as *practical* significance. The reader is 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 of size n≈456 (or, in the case of subgroups, samples of less than 456, 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. 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 December 2019 Broome County Tobacco Study, including results for each of the following six sets of survey questions:

- 1. Home Tobacco Policies
- 2. Outdoor Tobacco Policies
- 3. Tobacco Point of Sale Potential Policies
- 4. Protecting Youth from Tobacco in the Media
- 5. Smoke-Free Housing
- 6. Tobacco and E-cigarette Use

# Section 3 Detailed Statistical Results

#### Broome County (New York) – Adult Community Tobacco Survey – December 2019

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 six separate sections of presentation of detailed statistical results to follow (Sections 3.1-3.6). 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:

- 1. Home Tobacco Policies
- 2. Outdoor Tobacco Policies
- 3. Tobacco Point of Sale *Potential Policies*
- 4. Protecting Youth from Tobacco in the Media
- 5. Smoke-Free Housing
- 6. Tobacco and E-cigarette Use

The most detailed statistical results are presented within the next six sections of this report on an *individual-question* basis. Whenever possible, the results for *each* of the approximately 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 page of this report:

- (1) The <u>December 2019 Results Broome County</u> are presented in a table for each survey question that was included in this study including sample percentages (weighted by gender, age, education level, residence type, and phone ownership, and calibrated for social desirability), and sample frequencies or counts (unweighted), and the total sample size (unweighted). The benefit of this table is to provide current county-specific prevalence estimate data.
- (2) When possible, directly following the "December 2019 Results Broome County" tables, <u>a trend analysis for Broome County results over recent years</u> including an analysis of the current study results compared to the results from the previous 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 2019 study. If the question phrasing and/or possible response distribution (choices, or answers) have been altered between earlier studies and the 2019 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 13 years an opportunity to attempt to identify community coalition impact. Readers are reminded that the method to determine which observed sample differences over the past 13 years in Broome County are *statistically significant* trends is explained in detail in the "Technical Comments" section earlier in this report, Section 2.4. For ease of interpretation, whenever possible a line graph illustrating any trends visually has also been included.
- (3) Next, the Broome County 2019 results for each of the survey questions are cross-tabulated by each of the demographic factors of Gender, Age, Annual Household Income, and Education Level, as well as by Cigarette Smoking Status (this report includes hundreds of cross-tabulation tables of results). The results for these correlational investigations are provided in tables along with the "current", and "trend", 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 enough 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 2.4. The tobacco-related statistics reported in the correlative tables (the crosstabulations by Cigarette Smoking, Gender, Age, Annual Household Income, and Education) are weighted percentages within the sampled subgroups, with raw/unweighted sample sizes for each subgroup also included at the bottom of every column in every cross-tabulation table..
- (4) Finally, <u>Regional Comparative results are provided</u>, reporting the summarized outcomes for each survey question for a group of thirty-four county-specific New York State tobacco-related studies completed throughout 2018 and 2019. Each of these thirty-four studies had adults as the target population, investigated tobacco-related issues, used telephone methodology and possibly limited online sampling methodology, used similar sample sizes, and similar weighting algorithms and protocol. The summarized results include the minimum, maximum, and average result among the thirty-four studied counties. The thirty-four studied counties combined for an overall sample size of approximately 15,000 recently-interviewed New York adult residents. The thirty-four participating counties are

#### Broome County (New York) - Adult Community Tobacco Survey - December 2019

Broome (twice), Chemung, Chenango, Dutchess (twice), Erie, Herkimer, Jefferson, Livingston, Madison, Monroe (twice), Nassau (twice), Niagara, Oneida, Ontario, Orange, Rockland, Schuyler, Seneca (twice), Steuben, Suffolk (twice), Tioga (twice), Ulster, Wayne (twice), Westchester (twice), and Yates 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: "Strongly Favor", "Somewhat Favor", "Neither", "Somewhat Against", "Strongly Against", and "Don't Know" would typically be collapsed to: "Favor" (Strongly + Somewhat) versus "Do Not Favor" 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 New York State? For ease of interpretation, whenever possible a histogram of the county-specific result distribution has been included (must have at least six counties using that survey question to facilitate a meaningful or useful histogram). Statistical significance of comparative results, whether or not Broome County current results differ significantly from the current 34-county regional average, are highlighted in more expansive tables of county-specific results in Appendix I.

## 3.0 "FRAMING A STATISTIC" – *Providing Perspective to Better Understand, Interpret, and Use Survey Data*

The rationale behind providing so many analyses (statistics) for every survey question included in this study (all of those statistical analyses that are illustrated earlier in Section 2.4 – Technical Comments) 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 whether they favor or oppose a policy that would prohibit smoking on the grounds of all workplaces, the result in the current 2019 Broome County community study is that 59.5% of the participants responded with "Favor" (reported later in Table 8). So .... what does this 59.5% really mean? Often-times community-based researchers will describe the process of framing a statistic as completing as many as possible of the six following comparisons (frames) to better understand a reported statistic from a sample:

- Within Response Scale Distribution
   (Is it a majority? 4:1 ratio? "Three times more likely to favor .... than to oppose?)
- <u>Trend Across Time</u> (Has the "Favor" rate increased? Decreased?)
- Compare to Regional Average (Compare to local regional average? Compare to NYS statewide results?)
- Compare to Target/Benchmark (Compare to the coalition's workplan goal or target?)
- <u>Ranking/Relative Standing Among Similar Variables</u> (Among many different similar locations or attributes that all use the same response scale, is this specific item ranked first? Last?)
- <u>Cross-tabulations by Potential Explanatory Variables</u> (Smokers and non-smokers differ? Age-dependent? Gender-dependent? Education-dependent?)

The design of this final study report of findings includes as many as possible of the various types of tables that are listed above (and explained in the preceding Technical Comments 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 and utilize them in their tobacco-related decisions. 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*.
# 3.1 HOME TOBACCO POLICIES – DETAILED FINDINGS

### Table 6

For tobacco products that are burned, such as cigarettes, cigars, pipes or hookah, which statement best describes the rules about smoking in your home?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                         |                      | Unweighted | Weighted   |
|-------------------------|----------------------|------------|------------|
|                         |                      | Frequency  | Percentage |
|                         | Not allowed anywhere | 382        | 81.8%      |
|                         | Allowed sometimes    | 41         | 9.1%       |
| Cigarette Smoking Rules | Allowed anywhere     | 15         | 5.9%       |
| in One's Home           | There are no rules   | 18         | 3.2%       |
|                         | Don't know           | 0          | 0.0%       |
|                         | Totals               | 456        | 100.0%     |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses:           | 2015         | 2017  | 2019  |
|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|
| Not allowed anywhere | <b>79.1%</b> | 84.3% | 81.8% |
| Allowed some places  | 11.7%        | 6.8%  | 9.1%  |
| Allowed anywhere     | 7.7%         | 5.9%  | 5.9%  |
| No rules             | 1.5%         | 2.7%  | 3.2%  |
| Don't know           | 0.0%         | 0.3%  | 0.0%  |

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

(To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.)

|                            |                        | Gen                | der                |                    | Age (              |                    | Cigarette Use       |                           |                    |
|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
|                            |                        | Male               | Female             | 18-34              | 35-54              | 55-64              | 65+                 | Smoker                    | Non-smoker         |
|                            | Not allowed anywhere   | 80.0% <sub>a</sub> | 83.5% <sub>a</sub> | 83.0% <sub>a</sub> | 82.8% <sub>a</sub> | 75.6% <sub>a</sub> | 84.2% <sub>a</sub>  | 56.8% <sub>a</sub>        | 87.7% <sub>b</sub> |
| Cigarette Smoking Rules in | Allowed sometimes      | 6.1% <sub>a</sub>  | 11.9% <sub>b</sub> | 6.4% <sub>a</sub>  | 9.9% <sub>a</sub>  | 9.7% <sub>a</sub>  | 10.1% <sub>a</sub>  | 12.3% <sub>a</sub>        | 8.3% <sub>a</sub>  |
|                            | Allowed anywhere       | 9.6%a              | 2.5% <sub>b</sub>  | 10.6% <sub>a</sub> | 6.2% <sub>a</sub>  | 3.8% <sub>a</sub>  | <b>2.9%</b> a       | <b>25.1%</b> <sub>a</sub> | 1.4% <sub>b</sub>  |
| One's Home                 | There are no rules     | 4.3% <sub>a</sub>  | 2.1% <sub>a</sub>  | 0.0%               | 1.1% <sub>a</sub>  | 10.9% <sub>b</sub> | 2.8% <sub>a,b</sub> | 5.9% <sub>a</sub>         | 2.6% <sub>a</sub>  |
|                            | Don't know             | 0.0%               | 0.0%               | 0.0%               | 0.0%               | 0.0%               | 0.0%                | 0.0%                      | 0.0%               |
|                            | Total                  | 100.0%             | 100.0%             | 100.0%             | 100.0%             | <b>100.0%</b>      | 1 <b>00.0%</b>      | 100.0%                    | 100.0%             |
|                            | Unweighted Sample Size | 200                | 256                | 29                 | 110                | 223                | 94                  | 56                        | 400                |

|                            |                        | Ed                 | ucation Leve         | el                  | Annual Household Income |                       |                        |                    |  |  |  |
|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|
|                            |                        | No College         | Some<br>College      | 4+ Year<br>Degree   | <\$25,000               | \$25,000-<br>\$50,000 | \$50,000-<br>\$100,000 | \$100,000+         |  |  |  |
|                            | Not allowed anywhere   | 77.0% <sub>a</sub> | 80.6% <sub>a,b</sub> | 89.4% <sub>b</sub>  | 77.5% <sub>a</sub>      | 78.0% <sub>a</sub>    | 80.0% <sub>a</sub>     | 93.7% <sub>a</sub> |  |  |  |
|                            | Allowed sometimes      | 13.2% <sub>a</sub> | 5.0% <sub>b</sub>    | 8.6% <sub>a,b</sub> | <b>6.8%</b> a           | 8.0%a                 | 14.2% <sub>a</sub>     | 5.1% <sub>a</sub>  |  |  |  |
| Cigarette Smoking Rules in | Allowed anywhere       | 7.0% <sub>a</sub>  | 9.3% <sub>a</sub>    | 0.5% <sub>b</sub>   | 10.2% <sub>a</sub>      | 13.1% <sub>a</sub>    | 2.7% <sub>b</sub>      | 0.0%               |  |  |  |
| One's Home                 | There are no rules     | 2.8% <sub>a</sub>  | 5.0% <sub>a</sub>    | 1.5% <sub>a</sub>   | 5.5% <sub>a</sub>       | 0.9% <sub>a</sub>     | 3.1% <sub>a</sub>      | 1.2% <sub>a</sub>  |  |  |  |
|                            | Don't know             | 0.0%               | 0.0%                 | 0.0%                | 0.0%                    | 0.0%                  | 0.0%                   | 0.0%               |  |  |  |
|                            | Total                  | 100.0%             | <b>100.0%</b>        | 1 <b>00.0%</b>      | 100.0%                  | 100.0%                | 1 <b>00.0%</b>         | 100.0%             |  |  |  |
|                            | Unweighted Sample Size | 106                | 138                  | 212                 | 44                      | 89                    | 176                    | 76                 |  |  |  |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 7 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County | Which statement best describes the ru<br>(% "Not Allowe |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Not allowed anywhere inside   | 72.8%                       | 83.3%               | 88.6%                       |   |
| Allowed in some places or at some times   | 4.4%                        | 7.7%                | 14.3%                       |   |
| Allowed anywhere inside   | 4.4%                        | 5.9%                | 8.9%                        |   |
|   |                             |                     |                             | 1   |



Table 7

For electronic cigarette products such as JUULs, vapes, e-hookahs, etc. which statement best describes the rules about their use in your home?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                       |                      | Unweighted<br>Frequency | Weighted<br>Percentage |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
|                       | Not allowed anywhere | 368                     | 80.3%                  |
|                       | Allowed sometimes    | 30                      | 6.4%                   |
| Vaping Rules in One's | Allowed anywhere     | 19                      | 6.4%                   |
| Home                  | There are no rules   | 30                      | 5.0%                   |
|                       | Don't know           | 7                       | 1.9%                   |
|                       | Totals               | 454                     | 100.0%                 |

## <u>Trend Analysis – Graphically:</u> (Not measured in recent-past Broome County studies.)

Pa,b 6<sub>a</sub> 6<sub>a</sub> )%

#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(Not measured in recent-past Broome County studies.)

# <u>Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):</u> (To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.)

|                               |                        |       | Gen                | der                      |                    |                 |                      |                   | Age (            | Groups          | ;                |                |                     | Cigarette Use    |                |                   |                 |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|
|                               |                        | М     | ale                | Fem                      | ale                | 18-             | 34                   | 35-               | ·54              | 55              | -64              | 65             | <u>5</u> +          | Smo              | ker            | Non-sm            | oker            |
|                               | Not allowed anywhere   | 74.   | 7% <sub>a</sub>    | 85.6                     | i% <sub>b</sub>    | 78.9            | 78.9% <sub>a,b</sub> |                   | 5% <sub>a</sub>  | 76.             | 3% <sub>a</sub>  | 90.5           | 5% <sub>b</sub>     | 62.3             | % <sub>a</sub> | 84.6%             | ⁄₀ <sub>b</sub> |
|                               | Allowed sometimes      | 6.9   | 6.9% <sub>a</sub>  |                          | % <sub>a</sub>     | a <b>3.9%</b>   |                      | 11.3              | 3%a              | 7.19            | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub> | 2.0            | % <sub>b</sub>      | 10.2             | %a             | 5.5%              | Pa              |
| Vaping Rules in One's<br>Home | Allowed anywhere       | 11.   | 11.3% <sub>a</sub> |                          | % <sub>b</sub>     | 10.7            | 7% <sub>a</sub>      | 7.6               | % <sub>a</sub>   | 3.6             | ‰ <sub>a</sub>   | 3.2            | %a                  | 21.0             | % <sub>a</sub> | 3.0%              | b               |
|                               | There are no rules     | 5.9   | 5.9% <sub>a</sub>  |                          | % <sub>a</sub>     | 6.5             | % <sub>a</sub>       | 3.8% <sub>a</sub> |                  | 11.             | 4% <sub>a</sub>  | 0.0            | )%                  | 6.1              | % <sub>a</sub> | 4.7%              | Pa              |
|                               | Don't know             | 1.3   | 2% <sub>a</sub>    | <b>2.6%</b> <sub>a</sub> |                    | 0.0%            |                      | 1.6               | % <sub>a</sub>   | 1.6             | ‰ <sub>a</sub>   | 4.2            | %a                  | 0.5              | % <sub>a</sub> | 2.2%              | a               |
|                               | Total                  | 100   | 0.0% 100           |                          | 1 <b>00.0%</b>     |                 | .0%                  | 100               | .0%              | 100             | .0%              | 100            | . <b>0%</b>         | 100.             | 0%             | 100.0             | %               |
|                               | Unweighted Sample Size | 1     | 99                 | 25                       | 5                  | 2               | 8                    | 11                | 0                | 2               | 22               | 9              | 4                   | 5                | 6              | 398               | 3               |
|                               |                        |       |                    | Ed                       | ucatio             | on Level        |                      |                   | Ar               |                 | Annual Househol  |                | hold Ir             | ncome            |                |                   |                 |
|                               |                        | No Co | ollege             | So<br>Coll               | ome 4+<br>llege De |                 | ′ear<br>jree         | <\$25             | 25,000 \$2<br>\$ |                 | )00-<br>000      | \$50,<br>\$100 | 0,000-<br>00,000 \$ |                  | ,000+          |                   |                 |
|                               | Not allowed anywhere   |       | 83.1               | 1% <sub>a</sub>          | 75.4               | 4% <sub>a</sub> | 82.                  | 5% <sub>a</sub>   | 91.              | 9% <sub>a</sub> | 73.4             | % <sub>b</sub> | 77.7                | % <sub>a,b</sub> | 88.            | 3% <sub>a,b</sub> |                 |
|                               | Allowed sometimes      |       | 5.8                | 5.8%                     |                    | %               | 6.6                  | %                 | 0.0%             |                 | 5.6%             |                | 10.1%               |                  | 2.0            | )%_               |                 |

|                       |                        |                          |                          |                          |                          |                    | 1                        |       |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------|
|                       | Unweighted Sample Size | 106                      | 138                      | 210                      | 44                       | 89                 | 176                      | 76    |
|                       | Total                  | 100.0%                   | 1 <b>00.0%</b>           | 100.0%                   | 1 <b>00.0</b> %          | 100.0%             | 100.0%                   | 100.0 |
|                       | Don't know             | <b>2.6%</b> <sub>a</sub> | <b>0.3%</b> <sub>a</sub> | <b>2.9%</b> <sub>a</sub> | 0.0%                     | 1.3% <sub>a</sub>  | <b>0.9%</b> <sub>a</sub> | 4.3%  |
| Home                  | There are no rules     | <b>2.0%</b> <sub>a</sub> | 8.8% <sub>b</sub>        | 4.4% <sub>a,b</sub>      | <b>0.9%</b> <sub>a</sub> | 5.4% <sub>a</sub>  | 7.5% <sub>a</sub>        | 2.6%  |
| Vaping Rules in One's | Allowed anywhere       | 6.5% <sub>a</sub>        | 8.6% <sub>a</sub>        | 3.7% <sub>a</sub>        | 7.2% <sub>a,b</sub>      | 14.3% <sub>a</sub> | 3.9% <sub>b</sub>        | 2.3%  |
|                       | Allowed sometimes      | <b>5.0</b> %a            | 0.9%a                    | 0.0 %a                   | 0.0%                     | 5.0%a              | 10.1%a                   | 2.07  |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 2 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Not allowed anywhere inside   | 80.3%                       | 83.2%               | 86.1%                       |
| Allowed in some places or at some times   | 4.1%                        | 5.2%                | 6.4%                        |
| Allowed anywhere inside   | 3.7%                        | 5.1%                | 6.4%                        |

# 3.2 OUTDOOR TOBACCO POLICIES – DETAILED FINDINGS

 Table 8
 Opinion about a policy that would prohibit smoking: on the grounds of all workplaces?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                            |            | Unweighted | Weighted     |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
|                            |            | Frequency  | Percentage   |
|                            | Favor      | 306        | <b>59.5%</b> |
| Policy that would prohibit | Against    | 98         | <b>26.9%</b> |
| smoking on the grounds of  | Neither    | 46         | 11.4%        |
| all workplaces?            | Don't know | 6          | 2.3%         |
|                            | Totals     | 456        | 100.0%       |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:

(Not measured in recent-past Broome County studies.)

#### <u> Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:</u>

(Not measured in recent-past Broome County studies.)

#### <u>Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):</u> (To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.)

|                            |        |                     |        | Gen                | der             |                |                       |                | ,               | Age (              | Groups          | ;                  |                |                 | C                     | Cigare | tte Use         |                 |
|----------------------------|--------|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                            |        |                     | M      | ale                | Ferr            | ale            | 18-                   | 34             | 35-54           |                    | 55-64           |                    | 65+            |                 | Smo                   | ker    | Non-sr          | noker           |
|                            | Favor  |                     | 50.    | 9% <sub>a</sub>    | 67.7            | ‰ <sub>b</sub> | 45.1                  | %a             | 59.6            | % <sub>a,b</sub>   | 59.0            | )% <sub>a,b</sub>  | 73.3           | 8% <sub>b</sub> | 28.2                  | ‰a     | 66.9            | % <sub>b</sub>  |
| Policy that would prohibit | Agains | st                  | 31.    | 31.7% <sub>a</sub> |                 | ‰ <sub>b</sub> | 32.3                  | % <sub>a</sub> | 30.3            | 8% <sub>a</sub>    | 24.             | 7% <sub>a</sub>    | 19.2           | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 49.2                  | %a     | 21.6            | 5% <sub>b</sub> |
| smoking on the grounds of  | Neithe | er                  | 16.    | 1% <sub>a</sub>    | 6.9             | % <sub>b</sub> | 18.5                  | ‰ <sub>a</sub> | 9.1%            | ڥ <sub>a,b</sub>   | 12.5            | 5% <sub>a,b</sub>  | 6.7            | % <sub>b</sub>  | 19.5                  | %a     | 9.49            | % <sub>b</sub>  |
| all workplaces?            | Don't  | know                | 1.4    | 1% <sub>a</sub>    | 3.1             | % <sub>a</sub> | 4.19                  | % <sub>a</sub> | 1.1             | % <sub>a</sub>     | 3.8             | 3% <sub>a</sub>    | 0.8            | % <sub>a</sub>  | 3.09                  | %a     | 2.19            | % <sub>a</sub>  |
|                            | Total  |                     | 100.0% |                    | 100.            | 0%             | 100.                  | 0%             | 100             | .0%                | 100             | ).0%               | 100            | .0%             | 100.                  | 0%     | 100.            | 0%              |
|                            | Unwei  | ighted Sample Size  | 2      | 200 256            |                 | 29             | 9                     | 110 2          |                 | 2                  | 23              | 9                  | 4              | 56              | 6                     | 40     | 0               |                 |
|                            |        |                     |        | Education          |                 |                | n Level Annual Househ |                |                 |                    |                 | hold Ir            | ncome          |                 |                       |        |                 |                 |
|                            |        |                     |        | No Co              | ollege          | So<br>Coll     | me<br>ege             | 4+ )<br>Deg    | Year<br>gree    | <\$2               | 5,000           | \$25,0<br>\$50,    | 000-<br>000    | \$50,<br>\$100  | ,000-<br>,000         | \$100, | 000+            |                 |
|                            |        | Favor               |        | 56.                | 3% <sub>a</sub> | 54.            | 54.1% <sub>a</sub>    |                | 1% <sub>b</sub> | 52.6% <sub>a</sub> | 6% <sub>a</sub> | 62.1% <sub>a</sub> |                | 59.3            | .3% <sub>a</sub> 73.1 | l%a    |                 |                 |
| Policy that would pro      | hibit  | Against             |        | 30.                | 7% <sub>a</sub> | 26.            | 7% <sub>a</sub>       | 22.            | <b>2%</b> a     | 35.                | 3% <sub>a</sub> | 21.3               | % <sub>a</sub> | 30.7            | %a                    | 18.6   | 5% <sub>a</sub> |                 |
| smoking on the groun       | nds of | Neither             |        | 9.6                | % <sub>a</sub>  | 16.            | 4% <sub>a</sub>       | 7.6            | 5% <sub>a</sub> | 11.                | 3% <sub>a</sub> | 12.6               | ‰ <sub>a</sub> | 9.0             | % <sub>a</sub>        | 8.0    | % <sub>a</sub>  |                 |
| all workplaces?            |        | Don't know          |        | 3.4                | % <sub>a</sub>  | 2.8            | ‰ <sub>a</sub>        | 0.1            | 1% <sub>a</sub> | 0.8                | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 4.0                | % <sub>a</sub> | 1.0             | % <sub>a</sub>        | 0.3    | % <sub>a</sub>  |                 |
|                            |        | Total               |        | 100                | .0%             | 100            | .0%                   | 100            | 0.0%            | 100                | .0%             | 100.               | 0%             | 100             | .0%                   | 100    | .0%             |                 |
|                            |        | Unweighted Sample S | ize    | 1                  | 06              | 1:             | 38                    | 212            |                 | 4                  | 4               | 8                  | 9              | 17              | 76                    | 7      | 6               |                 |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 21 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Favor  | 47.5%                       | 56.3%               | 73.0%                       |
| Against  | 22.9%                       | 35.5%               | 44.5%                       |



Table 9

Opinion about policy that would prohibit smoking: *in outdoor public places such as a park, outdoor recreation area, or playground*?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                             |            | Unweighted | Weighted     |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
|                             |            | Frequency  | Percentage   |
| Policy that would prohibit  | Favor      | 272        | <b>51.9%</b> |
| smoking in outdoor public   | Against    | 124        | 31.5%        |
| places such as a park,      | Neither    | 53         | 14.8%        |
| outdoor recreation area, or | Don't know | 7          | 1.8%         |
| playground?                 | Totals     | 456        | 100.0%       |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:

(Not measured in recent-past Broome County studies.)

#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(Not measured in recent-past Broome County studies.)

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

(To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.)

|  |          |                    |           | Gender             |                 |                       | Age Groups                          |                 |                        |                 |                         |                  |                      | C              | tte Use        |                          |                    |
|--|----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
|  |          |                    | М         | ale                | Fem             | ale                   | 18-                                 | 34              | 35-                    | 54              | 55                      | -64              | 65+                  |                | Smo            | ker                      | Non-smoke          |
| Policy that would prohibit   | Favor    |                    | 45.       | 5.9%a              |                 | .7% <sub>b</sub> 42.7 |                                     | '% <sub>a</sub> | 60.2                   | 2% <sub>b</sub> | 46.7                    | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub> | 54.3% <sub>a,b</sub> |                | 22.6           | ‰a                       | 58.9% <sub>b</sub> |
| moking in outdoor public   | Against  |                    | 37.       | <b>6%</b> a        | 25.6            | 5% <sub>b</sub>       | 28.9                                | %a              | 32.4                   | 1%a             | 36.                     | 9%a              | 28.4                 | 1%a            | 49.3           | ‰a                       | 27.2% <sub>b</sub> |
| laces such as a park, Neither<br>utdoor recreation area, or Don't know |          |                    | 16.       | 16.5% <sub>a</sub> |                 | 1%a                   | 23.2% <sub>a</sub>                  |                 | 6.7% <sub>b</sub> 15.4 |                 | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub>        | 16.5             | % <sub>a,b</sub>     | 26.9           | %a             | 11.9% <sub>b</sub>       |                    |
|  |          | 0.                 | 0%        | 3.6                | %a              | 5.2                   | %a                                  | 0.7             | %a                     | 1.0             | )%a                     | 0.8              | %a                   | 1.2            | %a             | <b>2.0%</b> <sub>a</sub> |                    |
| blayground?  | Total    |                    | 100       | ).0%               | 100.            | 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 10 |                                     | 100             | 0.0% 100               |                 | .0%                     | 100.             | 0%                   | 100.0%         |                |                          |                    |
|  | Unweig   | hted Sample Size   | 2         | 200 256            |                 | 2                     | 9                                   | 110             |                        | 2               | 223                     |                  | 4                    | 5              | 6              | 400                      |                    |
|  |          |                    | Education |                    |                 | n Level Annual Ho     |                                     |                 |                        | House           | hold Ir                 | ncome            |                      |                |                |                          |                    |
|  |          |                    |           | No Co              | ollege          | So<br>Coll            | me<br>lege                          | 4+ )<br>Deg     | Year<br>gree           | <\$2            | 5,000                   | \$25,0<br>\$50,  | 000-<br>000          | \$50,<br>\$100 | ,000-<br>,000  | \$100                    | 000+               |
| Policy that would pro  | hibit F  | avor               |           | 48.                | 3% <sub>a</sub> | 48.                   | .0% <sub>a</sub> 61.4% <sub>a</sub> |                 | 32.5% <sub>a</sub>     |                 | 61.8% <sub>b,c</sub>    |                  | 49.9% <sub>a,b</sub> |                | 71.9           | 9% <sub>c</sub>          |                    |
| smoking in outdoor p   | ublic A  | gainst             |           | 37.1               | 1%a             | 28.                   | 7%a                                 | 27.             | 4%a                    | 38.6            | .6% <sub>a,b</sub> 23.9 |                  | .9% <sub>a</sub> 40. |                | % <sub>b</sub> | 22.1                     | % <sub>a,b</sub>   |
| places such as a park, Neither   |          | leither            |           | 14.                | 6%a             | 18.                   | 8%a                                 | 10.             | 1% <sub>a</sub>        | 26.             | 9%a                     | 10.3             | ‰ <sub>b</sub>       | 9.4            | % <sub>b</sub> | 5.7                      | % <sub>b</sub>     |
| outdoor recreation ar  | ea, or D | on't know          |           | 0.0                | )%              | 4.4                   | %a                                  | 1.1             | 1%a                    | 2.0             | )% <sub>a</sub>         | 4.0              | %a                   | 0.6            | %a             | 0.3                      | %a                 |
| playground?  | Т        | otal               |           | 100                | .0%             | 100                   | .0%                                 | 100             | 0.0% 100.              |                 | 100.0% 100              |                  | 0.0% 100             |                | .0%            | 100                      | .0%                |
|  | U        | nweighted Sample S | lize      | 10                 | 06              | 1:                    | 38                                  | 212             |                        | 44              |                         | 8                | 89                   |                | 176            |                          | 6                  |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 5 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County | Policy that would prohi<br>re |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Favor   | 51.9%                       | 57.5%               | 66.9%                       |                               |
| Against   | 23.8%                       | 32.1%               | 39.7%                       |                               |
|   |                             |                     |                             |                               |



Table 10

Opinion about policy that would prohibit smoking: at a public outdoor community event such as a fair, festival, concert, or sporting event?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                            |            | Unweighted | Weighted     |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
|                            |            | Frequency  | Percentage   |
| Policy that would prohibit | Favor      | 282        | <b>53.9%</b> |
| smoking at a public        | Against    | 121        | 34.1%        |
| outdoor community event    | Neither    | 48         | 10.7%        |
| concert, or sporting       | Don't know | 4          | 1.3%         |
| event?                     | Totals     | 455        | 100.0%       |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses: | 2015  | 2017  | 2019          |
|------------|-------|-------|---------------|
| Favor      | 58.3% | 59.8% | 53.9%         |
| Against    | 34.4% | 23.7% | 34.1%         |
| Neither    | 5.9%  | 15.7% | 1 <b>0.7%</b> |
| Don't know | 1.4%  | 0.8%  | 1.3%          |

# Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

| o determine statistically   | significant relationships, | refer to exp       | bianations c   | on pages z         | /-28.)             |                    |                    |                    |                    |  |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|
|                             |                            | Gei                | nder   |                    | Age (              | Groups             |                    | Cigare             | ette Use           |  |
|                             |                            | Male               | Female   | 18-34              | 35-54              | 55-64              | 65+                | Smoker             | Non-smoker         |  |
| Policy that would prohibit  | Favor                      | 52.4% <sub>a</sub> | 52.4% <sub>a</sub> 55.3% <sub>a</sub> 46.1% <sub>a</sub> |                    | 56.6% <sub>a</sub> | <b>50.8%</b> a     | 60.1% <sub>a</sub> | 16.7% <sub>a</sub> | 62.7% <sub>b</sub> |  |
| smoking at a public outdoor | Against                    | 39.5% <sub>a</sub> | 28.9% <sub>b</sub>                                       | 38.2% <sub>a</sub> | 36.9% <sub>a</sub> | 35.8% <sub>a</sub> | 25.4% <sub>a</sub> | 69.2% <sub>a</sub> | 25.7% <sub>b</sub> |  |
| community event such as a   | Neither                    | 8.1% <sub>a</sub>  | 13.2% <sub>a</sub>                                       | 11.6% <sub>a</sub> | 5.7% <sub>a</sub>  | 12.6% <sub>a</sub> | 14.5% <sub>a</sub> | 12.9% <sub>a</sub> | 10.2% <sub>a</sub> |  |
| fair, festival, concert, or | Don't know                 | 0.0%               | 2.6%a  | 4.1%a              | 0.7% <sub>a</sub>  | 0.8% <sub>a</sub>  | 0.0%               | 1.2% <sub>a</sub>  | 1.4%a              |  |
| sporting event?             | Total                      | 100.0%             | 100.0%   | 100.0%             | 100.0%             | 100.0%             | 100.0%             | 100.0%             | 100.0%             |  |
|                             | Unweighted Sample Size     | 200                | 255  | 29                 | 110                | 222                | 94                 | 56                 | 399                |  |
|                             |                            |                    |  |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |  |

|  |                        | Education Level      |                          |                    | Annual Household Income |                             |                        |                     |  |  |  |
|--|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
|  |                        | No College           | Some<br>College          | 4+ Year<br>Degree  | <\$25,000               | \$25,000-<br>\$50,000       | \$50,000-<br>\$100,000 | \$100,000+          |  |  |  |
| Policy that would prohibit smoking at a public outdoor | Favor                  | 52.6% <sub>a,b</sub> | 47.1% <sub>a</sub>       | 63.6% <sub>b</sub> | 31.9% <sub>a</sub>      | 56.1% <sub>b</sub>          | 56.7% <sub>b</sub>     | 69.9% <sub>b</sub>  |  |  |  |
|  | Against                | 38.6% <sub>a</sub>   | 37.3% <sub>a,b</sub>     | 24.5% <sub>b</sub> | 46.3% <sub>a</sub>      | <b>29.7%</b> <sub>a,b</sub> | 37.1% <sub>a,b</sub>   | 21.0% <sub>b</sub>  |  |  |  |
| community event such as a                              | Neither                | 8.8% <sub>a</sub>    | 11.7% <sub>a</sub>       | 11.8% <sub>a</sub> | <b>20.9%</b> a          | 10.2% <sub>a,b</sub>        | 5.6% <sub>b</sub>      | 9.1% <sub>a,b</sub> |  |  |  |
| fair, festival, concert, or<br>sporting event?         | Don't know             | 0.0%                 | <b>3.9%</b> <sub>a</sub> | 0.1% <sub>b</sub>  | 0.8% <sub>a</sub>       | 4.0% <sub>a</sub>           | 0.6% <sub>a</sub>      | 0.0%                |  |  |  |
|  | Total                  | 100.0%               | 100.0%                   | 1 <b>00.0%</b>     | 100.0%                  | 100.0%                      | 100.0%                 | 100.0%              |  |  |  |
|  | Unweighted Sample Size | 106                  | 137                      | 212                | 44                      | 89                          | 175                    | 76                  |  |  |  |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 3 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Favor   | 53.9%                       | 59.8%               | 67.1%                       |
| Against   | 21.4%                       | <b>29.4%</b>        | 34.1%                       |

# 3.3 TOBACCO POINT OF SALE – POTENTIAL POLICIES – DETAILED FINDINGS

Table 11

Opinion about a policy that would: *prohibit the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies*?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                            |            | Unweighted | Weighted   |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
|                            |            | Frequency  | Percentage |
|                            | Favor      | 262        | 54.7%      |
| Policy that would prohibit | Against    | 112        | 31.0%      |
| the sale of all tobacco    | Neither    | 78         | 13.6%      |
| products in pharmacies?    | Don't know | 4          | 0.6%       |
|                            | Totals     | 456        | 100.0%     |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses: | 2015           | 2017  | 2019  |
|------------|----------------|-------|-------|
| Favor      | 57.3%          | 57.3% | 54.7% |
| Against    | 29.3%          | 25.9% | 31.0% |
| Neither    | 11 <b>.3</b> % | 15.8% | 13.6% |
| Don't know | 2.0%           | 1.0%  | 0.6%  |

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

(To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.)

 Gender
 Age Groups

|                           |                        |      | ochaer             |                 |                           |                      |                       |                      |           |                 | organotto oco    |                          |                 |                            |       |                  |                |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-------|------------------|----------------|
|                           |                        | M    | ale                | Ferr            | nale                      | 18-                  | 34                    | 35-                  | 54        | 55              | -64              | 65                       | i+              | Smo                        | ker M | Non-sm           | okei           |
|                           | Favor                  | 47   | .6%a               | 61.4            | 1% <sub>b</sub>           | 50.5                 | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub>      | 48.5                 | 5%a       | 54.9            | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub> | 66.4                     | % <sub>b</sub>  | 39.5                       | %a    | 58.3%            | 6ь             |
| olicy that would prohibit | Against                | 38   | .6%a               | 23.8            | 8% <sub>b</sub>           | <sup>vb</sup> 40.6%; |                       | 33.7                 | ‰a        | 30.7            | % <sub>a,b</sub> | 18.9                     | 9% <sub>b</sub> | 45.0                       | %a    | 27.7%            | 6 <sub>b</sub> |
| e sale of all tobacco     | Neither                | 13   | 13.4% <sub>a</sub> |                 | 8%a                       | 8.9% <sub>a</sub>    |                       | 17.8                 | 3%a       | 12.             | 8%a              | 13.5                     | 5%a             | 14.8                       | ‰a    | 13.4%            | 6 <sub>a</sub> |
| products in pharmacies? D | Don't know             | 0.   | 3% <sub>a</sub> 0. |                 | %a                        | 0.0                  | %                     | 0.0%                 |           | 1.6             | 5%a              | 1.2                      | %a              | 0.7                        | ‰a    | 0.6%             | Pa             |
|                           | Total                  | 10   | <b>D.0%</b>        | 100.            | .0%                       | 100.                 | 0%                    | 100.                 | .0%       | 100             | .0%              | 100.                     | .0%             | 100.                       | 0%    | 100.0            | %              |
|                           | Unweighted Sample Size | 2    | 200                | 25              | 6                         | 29                   | 9                     | 11                   | 10 2      |                 | 23               | 9                        | 4               | 5                          | 6     | 400              |                |
|                           |                        |      | Education          |                 |                           | n Level Annual H     |                       |                      |           | House           | hold Ir          | ncome                    |                 |                            |       |                  |                |
|                           |                        |      | No College         |                 | No College Some<br>Colleg |                      | ome 4+ )<br>llege Deg |                      | <\$25,000 |                 | \$25,0<br>\$50,  | 000- \$50,0<br>000 \$100 |                 | 0,000-<br>\$100,<br>00,000 |       | 000+             |                |
|                           | Favor                  |      | 67.0% <sub>a</sub> |                 | 39.                       | 1% <sub>b</sub>      | 57.                   | ′.5% <sub>a</sub> 74 |           | 0% <sub>a</sub> | 43.6             | ‰ <sub>b</sub>           | 51.6            | 5% <sub>b</sub>            | 61.7% | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub> |                |
| Policy that would pro     | hibit Against          |      | 22.                | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 44.                       | 1% <sub>b</sub>      | 26.                   | 1% <sub>a</sub>      | 18.       | <b>0%</b> a     | 41.7             | ‰ <sub>b</sub>           | 34.3            | % <sub>a,b</sub>           | 21.5% | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub> |                |
| the sale of all tobacc    | o Neither              |      | 9.9                | %a              | 16.                       | 4%a                  | 15.                   | <b>2%</b> a          | 8.1       | <b>I%</b> a     | 14.2             | ‰a                       | 13.2            | 2%a                        | 16.6  | %a               |                |
| products in pharmacies    | es? Don't know         |      | 0.4                | %a              | 0.4                       | ₩a                   | 1.3                   | 2% <sub>a</sub>      | 0.        | 0%              | 0.5              | %a                       | 0.9             | %a                         | 0.3%  | ‰a               |                |
|                           | Total                  |      | 100                | .0%             | 100                       | .0%                  | .0% 100.0%            |                      | 0% 100.0% |                 | 100.0%           |                          | 100.            | .0%                        | 100.0 | 0%               |                |
|                           | Unweighted Sample      | Size | 1                  | 06              | 1:                        | 38                   | 2                     | 12                   | 4         | 4               | 8                | 9                        | 17              | 76                         | 76    | 5                |                |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 32 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Favor  | 46.4%                       | 61.2%               | 74.8%                       |
| Against  | 16.5%                       | 27.2%               | 40.1%                       |



Opinion about a policy that would: *prohibit the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools*?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

Table 12

|   |            | Unweighted | Weighted     |
|---|------------|------------|--------------|
|   |            | Frequency  | Percentage   |
| Policy that would prohibit<br>the sale of tobacco<br>products in stores that are<br>located near schools? | Favor      | 276        | <b>58.0%</b> |
|   | Against    | 113        | 30.5%        |
|   | Neither    | 60         | 9.6%         |
|   | Don't know | 5          | 2.0%         |
|   | Totals     | 454        | 100.0%       |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses: | 2011         | 2013         | 2015  | 2017         | 2019  |
|------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| Favor      | <b>56.1%</b> | <b>57.0%</b> | 61.2% | 71.5%        | 58.0% |
| Against    | 29.3%        | 34.7%        | 29.6% | <b>19.0%</b> | 30.5% |
| Neither    | 11.4%        | 7.5%         | 6.7%  | 9.1%         | 9.6%  |
| Don't know | 3.2%         | 0.7%         | 2.5%  | 0.4%         | 2.0%  |

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

(To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.)

|                            |        |                     |          | Ger                | nder            |                 |                     |             |                    | Age (                | Groups          | ;                      | Age Groups             |                 |                 |                 |                    |  |
|----------------------------|--------|---------------------|----------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|--|
|                            |        |                     | М        | ale                | Fen             | nale            | 18-                 | 34          | 35-                | 54                   | 55              | -64                    | 65                     | 5+              | Smc             | oker            | Non-smoke          |  |
|                            | Favo   | r                   | 52.      | 8%a                | 62.9            | 9% <sub>b</sub> | 41.3                | ‰a          | 60.0               | )% <sub>b</sub>      | 56.0            | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub>       | 72.6                   | 5% <sub>b</sub> | 41.4            | 1% <sub>a</sub> | 61.9% <sub>b</sub> |  |
| Policy that would prohibit | Again  | st                  | 35.      | 35.8% <sub>a</sub> |                 | 1% <sub>b</sub> | 6 <sub>b</sub> 48.0 |             | 27.3% <sub>b</sub> |                      | 31.4            | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub>       | 17.2                   | 2% <sub>b</sub> | 42.4            | 1% <sub>a</sub> | 27.6% <sub>b</sub> |  |
| ne sale of tobacco         | Neith  | er                  | 11.      | 11.0% <sub>a</sub> |                 | %a              | 4.7% <sub>a</sub> 1 |             | 12.7               | 7% <sub>a</sub> 12.3 |                 | 3% <sub>a</sub>        | 8.4                    | %a              | 16.2            | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 8.1% <sub>b</sub>  |  |
| located near schools?      | Don't  | know                | 0.4      | 4%a                | 3.4             | % <sub>b</sub>  | 6.0                 | %a          | 0.0                | %                    | 0.4             | 1%a                    | 1.8                    | %a              | 0.0             | %               | 2.4% <sub>a</sub>  |  |
| То                         |        |                     | 100.0%   |                    | 0% 100.0%       |                 | 100.                | 100.0% 100. |                    | .0%                  | 100.0%          |                        | 100.0%                 |                 | 100             | .0%             | 100.0%             |  |
|                            | Unwe   | ighted Sample Size  | 199      |                    | 25              | 55              | 2                   | 9           | 11                 | 0                    | 2               | 21                     | 9                      | 4               | 5               | 5               | 399                |  |
|                            |        |                     | Educatio |                    |                 | lucatio         | n Level An          |             |                    |                      | Annual          | nnual Household Income |                        |                 |                 |                 |                    |  |
|                            |        |                     |          | No Co              | ollege          | So<br>Coll      | me<br>lege          | 4+ `<br>Deg | Year<br>gree       | <\$2                 | 5,000           | \$25,0<br>\$50,        | 000-<br>000            | \$50,<br>\$100  | 000-<br>,000    | \$100           | ,000+              |  |
|                            |        | Favor               |          | 63.                | 5% <sub>a</sub> | 58.             | 0% <sub>a</sub>     | 50.         | 7% <sub>a</sub>    | 62.                  | 0% <sub>a</sub> | 66.4                   | 4% <sub>a</sub>        | 56.2            | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 50.             | 3% <sub>a</sub>    |  |
| Policy that would pro      | hibit  | Against             |          | 30.                | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 29.             | 8% <sub>a</sub>     | 31.         | 7% <sub>a</sub>    | 28.                  | 6% <sub>a</sub> | 23.9                   | 23.9% <sub>a</sub> 33. |                 | 3% <sub>a</sub> | 34.             | 0%a                |  |
| the sale of tobacco        | at are | Neither             |          | 6.3                | 3%a             | 12.             | 2%a                 | 10.         | 8%a                | 9.4                  | %a              | 5.8                    | %a                     | 8.6             | %a              | 15.             | 6%a                |  |
| located near schools       | ?      | Don't know          |          | 0.                 | 0%              | 0.0             | 0%                  | 6.8         | 3%a                | 0.0%                 |                 | % 3.8% <sub>a</sub>    |                        | 1.5%a           |                 | 0.              | 0%                 |  |
|                            |        | Total               |          | 100                | .0%             | 100             | .0%                 | 100         | .0%                | 100                  | 0.0% 100        |                        | .0% 100                |                 | .0%             | 100             | .0%                |  |
|                            |        | Unweighted Sample S | Size     | 1                  | 05              | 1:              | 37                  | 2           | 12                 | 4                    | 4               | 8                      | 8                      | 17              | 76              | 7               | 76                 |  |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 32 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Favor  | 54.8%                       | 65.9%               | 79.1%                       |
| Against  | 15.2%                       | 26.2%               | 38.9%                       |



Opinion about policy that would: limit the number of stores that could sell tobacco in Table 13 *your community?* 

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                             |            | Unweighted | Weighted     |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
|                             |            | Frequency  | Percentage   |
|                             | Favor      | 215        | <b>44.9%</b> |
| Policy that would limit the | Against    | 157        | 41.6%        |
| number of stores that       | Neither    | 75         | 11.2%        |
| community?                  | Don't know | 9          | 2.2%         |
|                             | Totals     | 456        | 100.0%       |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



Non-smoker

49.4%<sub>b</sub>

37.1%<sub>b</sub>

11.6%<sub>a</sub>

#### <u> Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:</u>

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses: | 2011  | 2015  | 2017          | 2019  |
|------------|-------|-------|---------------|-------|
| Favor      | 51.1% | 46.6% | 47.5%         | 44.9% |
| Against    | 41.3% | 41.8% | 40.1%         | 41.6% |
| Neither    | 15.3% | 9.7%  | 1 <b>0.9%</b> | 11.2% |
| Don't know | 2.3%  | 2.0%  | 1.5%          | 2.2%  |

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

(To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.) Gender Age Groups Cigarette Use 35-54 Smoker Male Female 18-34 55-64 65+ Favor 38.3%<sub>a</sub> 51.2%<sub>b</sub> 31.5%<sub>a</sub> 49.6%<sub>b</sub> 40.1%<sub>a,b</sub> 55.4%b 26.0%<sub>a</sub> Policy that would limit the 37.3%<sub>b,c</sub> 44.5%<sub>a,b</sub> Against 50.6%<sub>a</sub> 33.1%<sub>b</sub> 62.0%<sub>a</sub> 25.8% 60.8%<sub>a</sub> number of stores that could Neither 10.6%<sub>a</sub> 9.5%a 6.5%<sub>a</sub> 11.8%<sub>a</sub> 13.1%<sub>a</sub> 10.7%<sub>a</sub> 13.6%<sub>a</sub> sell tobacco in your

| nunity?         | Don't         | know                | 0.4               | 4%a 3              | .9% <sub>b</sub>                      | 0.0               | % 0                       | .0%   | 4.7             | %a                 | 5.2%              | o <sub>a</sub> 3.7     | % <sub>a</sub>   1 | <b>.9%</b> a |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
|                 | Total         |                     | 100               | ).0% 1             | 0.0%                                  | 100.              | 0% 10                     | 0.0%  | 100             | .0%                | 100.09            | % 100                  | .0% 10             | 0.0%         |
|                 | Unwei         | ighted Sample Size  | 2                 | 00                 | 256                                   | 29                | ) '                       | 10    | 223             |                    | 94                | 5                      | 6                  | 400          |
|                 |               |                     | 2                 |                    | Education Level Annual Household Inco |                   |                           |       |                 |                    |                   |                        |                    |              |
|                 |               |                     |                   | No Colleg          | e So<br>Col                           | ome<br>lege       | 4+ Year<br>Degree         | <\$25 | 5,000           | \$25,00<br>\$50,00 | 00-<br>00         | \$50,000-<br>\$100,000 | \$100,000+         |              |
|                 |               | Favor               |                   | 53.1% <sub>a</sub> | 38.                                   | 8% <sub>b</sub>   | 41.7% <sub>a,b</sub>      | 50.7  | 7% <sub>a</sub> | 42.3%              | 6 <sub>a</sub>    | 49.8% <sub>a</sub>     | 42.7% <sub>a</sub> |              |
| Policy that wou | Id limit the  | Against             |                   | 35.6% <sub>a</sub> | 47.                                   | 5%a               | <b>42.4%</b> <sub>a</sub> | 38.   | 6% <sub>a</sub> | 40.9%              | 6 <sub>a</sub>    | 42.1% <sub>a</sub>     | 43.2% <sub>a</sub> |              |
| number of store | es that could | Neither             |                   | 8.5% <sub>a</sub>  | 11.                                   | 8%a               | 14.0% <sub>a</sub>        | 8.6   | 5%a             | 16.2%              | 'oa               | 6.5% <sub>a</sub>      | 13.8% <sub>a</sub> |              |
| community?      | Don't know    |                     | 2.8% <sub>a</sub> | 1.9                | 9%a                                   | 1.9% <sub>a</sub> | 2.1                       | %a    | 0.5%            | a                  | 1.5% <sub>a</sub> | 0.3% <sub>a</sub>      |                    |              |
|                 | Total         |                     | 100.0%            | 100                | ).0%                                  | 100.0%            | 100                       | .0%   | 100.0           | %                  | 100.0%            | 1 <b>00.0%</b>         |                    |              |
|                 |               | Unweighted Sample S | lize              | 106                | 1                                     | 38                | 212                       | 4     | 4               | 89                 |                   | 176                    | 76                 | ٦            |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| in Any | Regional                           | in Any                                      |
|--------|------------------------------------|---|
| County | Average                            | County                                      |
| 42.0%  | 53.7%                              | 64.1%                                       |
| 26.8%  | 37.0%                              | 50.3%                                       |
|        | in Any<br>County<br>42.0%<br>26.8% | in Any<br>County<br>42.0%<br>26.8%<br>37.0% |



Table 14

Opinion about a policy that would: prohibit discounts for tobacco products at stores such as coupons, rebates, multi-pack discounts, or other special offers?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                            |            | Unweighted<br>Frequency | Weighted<br>Percentage |
|----------------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Policy that would prohibit | Favor      | 241                     | 49.2%                  |
| discounts for tobacco      | Against    | 147                     | <b>40.1%</b>           |
| products at stores such as | Neither    | 61                      | 9.6%                   |
| pack discounts or other    | Don't know | 5                       | 1.1%                   |
| special offers?            | Totals     | 454                     | 100.0%                 |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses: | 2015  | 2017         | 2019  |
|------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| Favor      | 50.0% | 49.9%        | 49.2% |
| Against    | 39.0% | <b>41.9%</b> | 40.1% |
| Neither    | 10.0% | 7.3%         | 9.6%  |
| Don't know | 1.0%  | 0.9%         | 1.1%  |

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

|   |                                  |       | Gen                      | der                   |                |                    |                            | Age (                    | Groups                  | ;                     |                      |                   | Cig              | arette Us                   | e                |
|---|----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
|   |                                  | М     | ale                      | Fem                   | ale            | 18-34              | 35                         | -54                      | 55                      | -64                   | 65                   | +                 | Smoke            | r Non-                      | smoker           |
| Policy that would prohibit  | Favor                            | 41.   | 41.0% <sub>a</sub> 57.0° |                       | % <sub>b</sub> | 44.7% <sub>a</sub> | 49.                        | 49.8% <sub>a</sub> 44    |                         | 4.8% <sub>a</sub> 56  |                      | % <sub>a</sub>    | 31.3%            | a 53                        | .5% <sub>b</sub> |
| discounts for tobacco   | Against                          | 51.   | .5% <sub>a</sub>         | 29.3                  | % <sub>b</sub> | 51.3% <sub>a</sub> | 37.0                       | % <sub>a,b</sub>         | 40.5                    | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub>      | 33.2                 | ‰ <sub>b</sub>    | 60.9%            | a 35                        | .2% <sub>b</sub> |
| products at stores such as  | Neither                          | 7.3   | 3% <sub>a</sub>          | 11.8                  | % <sub>a</sub> | 3.9% <sub>a</sub>  | 13.                        | 2% <sub>a</sub>          | 10.                     | 9% <sub>a</sub>       | 9.49                 | % <sub>a</sub>    | 4.8%             | 10                          | .7% <sub>a</sub> |
| pack discounts or other   | Don't know                       | 0.:   | 2% <sub>a</sub>          | 1.99                  | ‰a             | 0.0%               | 0.                         | 0%                       | 3.8                     | 8% <sub>a</sub>       | 1.49                 | % <sub>a</sub>    | 3.0%             | 0.                          | 6% <sub>b</sub>  |
| special offers?   | Total                            | 10    | 0.0%                     | 100.                  | 0%             | 1 <b>00.0%</b>     | 100                        | .0%                      | 100                     | .0%                   | 100.                 | 0%                | 100.0%           | 6 10                        | 0.0%             |
|   | Unweighted Sample Size           | 199 2 |                          | 25                    | 5              | 29                 | 1                          | 110                      |                         | 21                    | 94                   | 4                 | 55               | 3                           | 399              |
|   |                                  |       |                          | Ed                    | ucation        | Level              |                            |                          |                         | Annual                | House                | hold Ir           | ncome            |                             |                  |
|   |                                  |       | No Co                    | ollege                | Som<br>Colle   | ne 4-<br>ge D      | - Year<br>egree            | <\$2                     | 5,000                   | \$25,0<br>\$50,       | 000-<br>000          | \$50,<br>\$100    | ,000-<br>,000 \$ | 100,000+                    |                  |
| Policy that would pro   | hibit Favor                      |       | 44.3                     | 3% <sub>a</sub>       | 49.7%          | % <sub>a</sub> 5   | 5.0% <sub>a</sub>          | 50.                      | 7% <sub>a</sub>         | 45.9                  | % <sub>a</sub>       | 49.3              | %a               | 59.4% <sub>a</sub>          | 1                |
| discounts for tobacco   | Against                          |       | 47.5                     | 5% <sub>a</sub>       | 39.7%          | % <sub>a,b</sub> 3 | 1.0% <sub>b</sub>          | 44.                      | 2% <sub>a</sub>         | 42.7                  | ‰ <sub>a</sub>       | 41.7              | "%a              | 29.5% <sub>a</sub>          | 1                |
|   | ich ac                           |       | 5.7% <sub>a</sub>        |                       | 10.69          | % <sub>a</sub> 1   | 3.4% <sub>a</sub>          | <b>2.9%</b> <sub>a</sub> |                         | % <sub>a</sub> 11.5%, |                      | 8.8% <sub>a</sub> |                  | 10.4% <sub>a</sub>          |                  |
| products at stores su   | Iti-                             |       | 3.7                      | /°a                   |                |                    |                            |                          |                         |                       | 0% 0.2% <sub>a</sub> |                   |                  |                             |                  |
| products at stores su<br>coupons, rebates, mu<br>pack discounts or oth                    | ulti-<br>Neither<br>Don't know   |       | 2.5                      | %a                    | 0.0%           | %                  | .5% <sub>a</sub>           | 2.1                      | % <sub>a</sub>          | 0.0                   | %                    | 0.2               | % <sub>a</sub>   | 0.7% <sub>a</sub>           |                  |
| products at stores su<br>coupons, rebates, mu<br>pack discounts or oth<br>special offers? | ulti-<br>Ner Don't know<br>Total |       | 2.5 <sup>0</sup><br>100. | % <sub>a</sub><br>.0% | 0.0%<br>100.0  | % (<br>)% 1        | 0.5% <sub>a</sub><br>00.0% | 2.1<br>100               | l% <sub>a</sub><br>).0% | 0.0<br>100.           | %<br>0%              | 0.2<br>100        | % <sub>a</sub>   | 0.7% <sub>a</sub><br>100.0% |                  |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 24 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Favor  | 41.6%                       | 55.8%               | 70.8%                       |
| Against  | 24.0%                       | 36.3%               | 49.5%                       |



### Table 15

Opinion about a policy that would: *prohibit the sale of fruit, alcohol, or candy flavored tobacco products, including e-cigarette liquids?* 

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                                |            | Unweighted | Weighted     |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
|                                |            | Frequency  | Percentage   |
| Policy that would prohibit     | Favor      | 288        | <b>52.9%</b> |
| the sale of fruit, alcohol, or | Against    | 117        | 37.7%        |
| candy flavored tobacco         | Neither    | 43         | 8.2%         |
| products, including e-         | Don't know | 7          | 1.2%         |
| cigarette liquids?             | Totals     | 455        | 100.0%       |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses: | 2017           | 2019  |
|------------|----------------|-------|
| Favor      | 33.9%          | 52.9% |
| Against    | 38.6%          | 37.7% |
| Neither    | 1 <b>9.</b> 1% | 8.2%  |
| Don't know | 8.4%           | 1.2%  |

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

(To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.)

|   |                        |      | Ger               | nder                |                 |                  |                |                     | Age             | Groups              | 5               |                     |                   | (                    | Cigare             | tte Use |     |
|---|------------------------|------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------|-----|
|   |                        | M    | ale               | Fem                 | ale             | 18-:             | 34             | 35-                 | 54              | 55                  | -64             | 65                  | 5 <b>+</b>        | Smo                  | ker                | Non-sm  | ker |
| Policy that would prohibit  | Favor                  | 41   | .1% <sub>a</sub>  | 64.0                | )% <sub>b</sub> | 24.3             | % <sub>a</sub> | 59.5                | 5% <sub>b</sub> | 59.                 | 9% <sub>b</sub> | 65.8                | 8% <sub>b</sub>   | 24.1                 | % <sub>a</sub>     | 59.7%   | ъ   |
| Policy that would prohibit<br>the sale of fruit, alcohol, or<br>candy flavored tobacco<br>products, including e-<br>cigarette liquids?<br>Tot | Against                | 50   | .2% <sub>a</sub>  | 25.9                | % <sub>b</sub>  | 67.1             | % <sub>a</sub> | 30.5                | 5% <sub>b</sub> | b 33.7%b            |                 | 22.5                | 5% <sub>b</sub>   | 63.7% <sub>a</sub>   |                    | 31.6%   | ъ   |
|   | Neither                | 8.   | 8.5% <sub>a</sub> |                     | %a              | 8.6%             |                | % <sub>a</sub> 10.0 |                 | 0% <sub>a</sub> 5.3 |                 | 7.9                 | 7.9% <sub>a</sub> |                      | )% <sub>a</sub>    | 7.3%    | 4   |
|   | Don't know             | 0.   | 3% <sub>a</sub>   | % <sub>a</sub> 2.1% |                 | 0.0              | ı% <b>0</b> .  |                     | ).0%            | 1.2% <sub>a</sub>   |                 | 3.9% <sub>a</sub>   |                   | 0.2% <sub>a</sub>    |                    | 1.4%    | 3   |
| cigarette liquids?  | Total                  | 10   | 0.0%              | 100.                | 0%              | 100.             | 0%             | 100                 | .0%             | 100                 | ).0%            | 100                 | .0%               | 100.                 | .0%                | 100.09  | 6   |
| igarette liquids? Tota<br>Unw   | Unweighted Sample Size | 2    | 200 25            |                     | 5               | 29               | )              | 11                  | 0               | 222                 |                 | 94                  |                   | 55                   |                    | 400     |     |
|   |                        |      |                   | Ed                  | ucatio          | n Leve           | el             |                     |                 |                     | Annual          | House               | hold Ir           | ncome                |                    |         |     |
|   |                        |      | No C              | No College          |                 | me<br>ege        | 4+ )<br>Deg    | Year<br>gree        | <\$25,000       |                     | \$25,0<br>\$50, | 000-<br>000         | \$50,<br>\$100    | 0,000-<br>00,000 \$1 |                    | ,000+   |     |
| Policy that would prob  | Favor                  |      | 51.               | 1%a                 | 47.6            | 6%a              | 61.            | 5%a                 | 47.             | 47.0% <sub>a</sub>  |                 | 8%a                 | 53.8%a            |                      | 63.1% <sub>a</sub> |         |     |
| the sale of fruit, alcoho   | ol, or Against         |      | 42.               | 6%a                 | 39.9            | % <sub>a,b</sub> | 28.            | 8% <sub>b</sub>     | 43.             | 0%a                 | 37.3            | 3% <sub>a</sub> 38. |                   | 7%a                  | 27.                | 8%a     |     |
| candy flavored tobacco  | o Neither              |      | 5.5               | 5%a                 | 10.5            | 5%a              | 9.0            | )%a                 | 10.             | 0%a                 | 9.3             | %a                  | 7.0               | %a                   | 8.0                | )%a     |     |
| products, including e-<br>cigarette liquids?  | Don't know             |      | 0.8               | 8%a                 | 2.0             | %a               | 0.7            | 7%a                 | 0.              | 0%                  | 0.0             | %                   | 0.5               | %a                   | 1.3                | 2%a     |     |
|   | Total                  |      | 100               | .0%                 | 100             | .0%              | 100            | ).0%                | 100             | .0%                 | 100.            | .0%                 | 100               | 100.0% 100           |                    | 0.0%    |     |
|   | Unweighted Sample S    | Size | 1                 | 06                  | 13              | 37               | 2              | 12                  |                 | 14                  | 8               | R                   | 17                | 76                   |                    | 76      |     |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Ievel Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 6 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Favor  | 27.1%                       | 47.0%               | 63.9%                       |
| Against  | 22.7%                       | 32.6%               | 38.7%                       |



Opinion about a policy that would: prohibit the sale of flavored tobacco and e-Table 16 cigarette products?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                         |            | Unweighted | Weighted   |
|-------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
|                         |            | Frequency  | Percentage |
|                         | Favor      | 276        | 51.7%      |
| Prohibit the sale of    | Against    | 119        | 36.5%      |
| flavored tobacco and e- | Neither    | 51         | 10.3%      |
| cigarette products?     | Don't know | 9          | 1.5%       |
|                         | Totals     | 455        | 100.0%     |

## <u>Trend Analysis – Graphically:</u> (Not measured in recent-past Broome County studies.)

# <u>Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:</u> (Not measured in recent-past Broome County studies.)

# Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

|  |                        |     | Ger              | nder            |                |                  |                |                 | Age             | Groups                 | ;               |   |                 | C               | Cigare         | tte Use            |
|--|------------------------|-----|------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------|
|  |                        | М   | ale              | Fem             | ale            | 18-3             | 34             | 35-             | 54              | 55                     | -64             | 65  | <u>5</u> +      | Smo             | ker            | Non-smoke          |
| F  | avor                   | 41. | .5% <sub>a</sub> | 61.4            | % <sub>b</sub> | 29.0             | % <sub>a</sub> | 54.6            | 5% <sub>b</sub> | 54.                    | 3% <sub>b</sub> | 67.2  | 2% <sub>b</sub> | 25.7            | % <sub>a</sub> | 57.8% <sub>b</sub> |
| hibit the sale of flavored <sup>A</sup>  | gainst                 | 48. | .7% <sub>a</sub> | 24.9            | % <sub>b</sub> | 60.79            | % <sub>a</sub> | 29.9            | 9% <sub>b</sub> | 37.                    | 3% <sub>b</sub> | 21.6  | 5% <sub>b</sub> | 58.5            | ‰ <sub>a</sub> | 31.3% <sub>b</sub> |
| acco and e-cigarette   | leither                | 8.  | 9% <sub>a</sub>  | 11.6            | ‰ <sub>a</sub> | 10.39            | % <sub>a</sub> | 14.6            | 5% <sub>a</sub> | 7.0                    | )% <sub>a</sub> | 7.3   | % <sub>a</sub>  | 15.6            | ‰ <sub>a</sub> | 9.0% <sub>a</sub>  |
| ducts? D   | Don't know             | 0.  | 8% <sub>a</sub>  | 2.1             | % <sub>a</sub> | 0.0%             | %              | 0.8             | % <sub>a</sub>  | 1.4                    | 1% <sub>a</sub> | 3.9   | % <sub>a</sub>  | 0.2             | % <sub>a</sub> | 1.8% <sub>a</sub>  |
| Т  | otal                   | 10  | <b>).0%</b>      | 100.            | 0%             | 100.0            | )%             | 100             | .0%             | 100                    | <b>.0%</b>      | Cigarette Use           64         65+         Smoker         Non-smoker $%_b$ 67.2 $\%_b$ 25.7 $\%_a$ 57.8 $\%_b$ $\%_b$ 21.6 $\%_b$ 58.5 $\%_a$ 31.3 $\%_b$ $\%_a$ 7.3 $\%_a$ 15.6 $\%_a$ 9.0 $\%_a$ $\%_a$ 3.9 $\%_a$ 0.2 $\%_a$ 1.8 $\%_a$ 0%         100.0 $\%$ 100.0 $\%$ 100.0 $\%$ 2         94         55         400           Nunal Household Income           \$50,000         \$100,000         \$100,000+           \$53.0 $\%_a$ 53.7 $\%_a$ 58.7 $\%_a$ 34.3 $\%_a$ 37.0 $\%_a$ 28.0 $\%_a$ 12.7 $\%_a$ 8.8 $\%_a$ 9.7 $\%_a$ 0.0 $\%$ 0.5 $\%_a$ 3.6 $\%_a$ 100.0 $\%$ 100.0 $\%$ 100.0 $\%$ |                 |                 |                |                    |
| Fa<br>Prohibit the sale of flavored Ag<br>obacco and e-cigarette Ne<br>roducts? Do<br>To<br>Ur<br>Prohibit the sale of flavo<br>tobacco and e-cigarette<br>products? | Inweighted Sample Size | 2   | 200              |                 | 5              | 29               | )              | 11              | 0               | 2                      | 22              | 9   | 4               | 5               | 5              | 400                |
|  |                        |     |                  | Educatio        |                | n Leve           | I              |                 |                 |                        | Annual          | House   | hold Ir         | ncome           |                |                    |
|  |                        |     | No Col           |                 | So<br>Coll     | me<br>lege       | 4+ )<br>Deg    | Year<br>gree    | <\$2            | \$25,000 \$25,<br>\$50 |                 | 000-<br>000   | \$50,<br>\$100  | 000-<br>,000    | \$100          | ,000+              |
|  | Favor                  |     | 48.              | 3% <sub>a</sub> | 49.            | 6% <sub>a</sub>  | 58.            | 6% <sub>a</sub> | 47.             | 0% <sub>a</sub>        | 53.0            | % <sub>a</sub>  | 53.7            | 7% <sub>a</sub> | 58.7           | 7% <sub>a</sub>    |
| Prohibit the sale of flav  | ored Against           |     | 43.              | 0% <sub>a</sub> | 36.4           | % <sub>a,b</sub> | 28.            | 3% <sub>b</sub> | 43.             | 0% <sub>a</sub>        | 34.3            | ‰ <sub>a</sub>  | 37.0            | 0% <sub>a</sub> | 28.0           | 0% <sub>a</sub>    |
| tobacco and e-cigarette  | Neither                |     | 7.9              | % <sub>a</sub>  | 12.0           | 0% <sub>a</sub>  | 11.            | 3% <sub>a</sub> | 10.             | 0%a                    | 12.7            | % <sub>a</sub>  | 8.8             | %a              | 9.7            | '% <sub>a</sub>    |
| products?  | Don't know             |     | 0.8              | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 2.0            | )% <sub>a</sub>  | 1.7            | % <sub>a</sub>  | 0.              | 0%                     | )% 0.0          |   | 0.5             | % <sub>a</sub>  | 3.6            | % <sub>a</sub>     |
|  | Total                  |     | 100              | .0%             | 100            | .0%              | 100            | .0%             | 100             | 0.0%                   | 100.            | 0%  | 100             | .0%             | 100            | .0%                |
|  | Unweighted Sample S    | ize | 1                | 06              | 13             | 37               | 2              | 12              | 4               | 4                      | 8               | B   | 17              | 76              | 7              | 6                  |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 3 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Favor   | 51.7%                       | 59.9%               | 64.8%                       |
| Against   | 26.3%                       | 30.2%               | 36.5%                       |

If favor to "prohibit the sale of flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products", are you in Table 17 favor or against "menthol" being prohibited, too?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                             |            | Unweighted | Weighted   |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
|                             |            | Frequency  | Percentage |
| If "favor" to "prohibit the | Favor      | 232        | 87.5%      |
| sale of flavored tobacco    | Against    | 22         | 6.2%       |
| and e-cigarette products",  | Neither    | 13         | 4.0%       |
| are you in favor or against | Don't know | 7          | 2.2%       |
| too?                        | Totals     | 274        | 100.0%     |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:

(Not measured in recent-past Broome County studies.)

## <u>Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:</u> (Not measured in recent-past Broome County studies.)

## <u>Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):</u> (To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.)

|  |                        |      | Ger               | nder             |                 |                 |             |                     | Age (          | Groups               |                 |                         |                | C                  | Cigare         | tte Use            |
|--|------------------------|------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|
|  |                        | М    | ale               | Fem              | ale             | 18-:            | 34          | 35-                 | 54             | 55                   | ·64             | 65                      | i+             | Smo                | ker            | Non-smoker         |
| If "favor" toprohibit the sale   | Favor                  | 89.  | .4%a              | 86.4             | ‰a              | 85.2            | %a          | 89.9                | %a             | 82.                  | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 89.5                    | 5%a            | 88.2               | 2%a            | 87.5% <sub>a</sub> |
| of flavored tobacco and e-   | Against                | 5.   | 0%a               | 7.0              | % <sub>a</sub>  | 14.8            | %a          | 3.1                 | %a             | 12.                  | 6%a             | 2.0                     | %a             | 3.1                | % <sub>a</sub> | 6.6% <sub>a</sub>  |
| cigarette products, are you  | Neither                | 3.   | 6% <sub>a</sub>   | 4.2              | % <sub>a</sub>  | 0.0             | %           | 5.1                 | % <sub>a</sub> | 3.6                  | % <sub>a</sub>  | 4.7                     | % <sub>a</sub> | 7.5                | % <sub>a</sub> | 3.6% <sub>a</sub>  |
| If "favor" toprohibit the sale Fav<br>of flavored tobacco and e-<br>cigarette products, are you<br>in favor or against "enthol" be prohibited, Do<br>too? Toi<br>Un<br>If "favor" toprohibit the s<br>of flavored tobacco and e<br>cigarette products, are yo<br>in favor or against<br>"menthol" be prohibited,<br>too? | Don't know             | 2.   | 2.0% <sub>a</sub> |                  | % <sub>a</sub>  | 0.0             | %           | 1.9                 | % <sub>a</sub> | 1.6                  | % <sub>a</sub>  | 3.8                     | % <sub>a</sub> | 1.2                | % <sub>a</sub> | 2.3% <sub>a</sub>  |
| too?   | Total                  | 10   | <b>).0%</b>       | 100.             | .0%             | 100.            | 0%          | 100                 | .0%            | 100                  | .0%             | 100.                    | .0%            | 100.               | .0%            | 100.0%             |
| too? I ot:<br>Unv  | Unweighted Sample Size | 1    | 102               |                  | 2               | 10              | )           | 6                   | 5              | 1:                   | 33              | 6                       | 6              | 1                  | 8              | 256                |
|  |                        |      | Edi<br>No College |                  | Education Level |                 |             |                     |                |                      | Annual          | House                   | hold Ir        | ncome              |                |                    |
|  |                        |      |                   |                  | So<br>Coll      | me<br>lege      | 4+ `<br>Deg | Year<br>gree        | <\$25,000      |                      | \$25,0<br>\$50, | ,000- \$50<br>,000 \$10 |                | 0,000-<br>\$00,000 |                | ,000+              |
| If "favor" toprohibit th   | ne sale Favor          |      | 93.               | 1% <sub>a</sub>  | 93.             | 6% <sub>a</sub> | 75.         | .6% <sub>b</sub> 94 |                | 4.2% <sub>a</sub> 88 |                 | ‰ <sub>a</sub>          | 89.4           | 1% <sub>a</sub>    | 74.            | 8% <sub>a</sub>    |
| of flavored tobacco a  | nd e- Against          |      | 3.3               | % <sub>a,b</sub> | 2.0             | )% <sub>a</sub> | 13.         | 6% <sub>b</sub>     | 1.4            | .4%a 7.7             |                 | % <sub>a</sub>          | 4.1            | % <sub>a</sub>     | 15.            | 7% <sub>a</sub>    |
| in favor or against  | Neither                |      | 3.6               | 5% <sub>a</sub>  | 1.0             | ‰ <sub>a</sub>  | 7.4         | ₩a                  | 0.0            | 0%                   | 3.6             | %a                      | 4.2            | %a                 | 9.6            | 6% <sub>a</sub>    |
| in favor or against<br>"menthol" be prohibited,  | ed, Don't know         |      | 0.                | 0%               | 3.4             | % <sub>a</sub>  | 3.4         | ₩a                  | 4.4            | % <sub>a</sub>       | 0.3             | % <sub>a</sub>          | 2.3            | % <sub>a</sub>     | 0.             | 0%                 |
| too?   | Total                  |      | 100               | .0%              | 100             | .0%             | 100         | .0%                 | 100            | .0%                  | 100.            | 0%                      | 100            | .0%                | 100            | .0%                |
|  | Unweighted Sample      | Size | 5                 | 55               | 8               | 4               | 1           | 35                  | 2              | 8                    | 5               | В                       | 10             | )9                 | 4              | 2                  |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 3 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Favor   | 81.8%                       | 85.0%               | 87.5%                       |
| Against   | 5.8%                        | 7.7%                | 11.1%                       |

# 3.4 PROTECTING YOUTH FROM TOBACCO IN MEDIA – DETAILED FINDINGS

"Media used in schools should not include tobacco use or imagery unless depicting historical facts."

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

Table 18

|                             |            | Unweighted | Weighted   |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
|                             |            | Frequency  | Percentage |
| "Media used in schools      | Agree      | 400        | 84.7%      |
| should NOT include          | Disagree   | 42         | 13.8%      |
| tobacco use or imagery      | Neither    | 13         | 1.5%       |
| unless depicting historical | Don't know | 0          | 0.0%       |
| facts."                     | Totals     | 455        | 100.0%     |

## <u>Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:</u> (Not measured in recent-past Broome County studies.)

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

| o determine statistically                           | significant relationships | hips, refer to<br>Mai<br>880.2<br>19.0<br>0.8<br>0.0<br>100.<br>ze 20 | to exp           | olanati         | ons o           | n pag           | jes 27         | 7-28.)          |                      |                 |                 |                      |                     |                    |                 |                    |
|---|---------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
|   |                           |   | Ger              | nder            |                 |                 |                |                 | Age G                | Groups          | 6               |                      |                     | C                  | Cigare          | tte Use            |
|   |                           | М   | ale              | Fem             | ale             | 18-             | 34             | 35-             | 54                   | 55              | -64             | 6                    | 5+                  | Smo                | ker             | Non-smok           |
| "Media used in schools                              | Agree                     | 80  | .2% <sub>a</sub> | 89.0            | )% <sub>b</sub> | 76.8            | ‰ <sub>a</sub> | 84.5            | 5% <sub>a</sub>      | 90.             | 1% <sub>a</sub> | 88.                  | 0% <sub>a</sub>     | 81.0               | )% <sub>a</sub> | 85.6% <sub>a</sub> |
| should NOT include                                  | Disagree                  | 19  | .0% <sub>a</sub> | 8.9             | % <sub>b</sub>  | 23.2            | % <sub>a</sub> | 13.7            | 13.7% <sub>a,b</sub> |                 | 7% <sub>b</sub> | ∕₀ <sub>b</sub> 9.2% |                     | 19.0% <sub>a</sub> |                 | 12.6% <sub>a</sub> |
| tobacco use or imagery                              | Neither                   | 0.  | 8% <sub>a</sub>  | 2.1             | %a              | 0.0%            |                | 1.8             | 3% <sub>a</sub> 1.1  |                 | 1% <sub>a</sub> | 2.7                  | 7% <sub>a</sub> 0.0 |                    | %               | 1.8% <sub>a</sub>  |
| unless depicting historical                         | Don't know                | 0.  | 0%               | % 0.0%          |                 | 0.0             | % 0.0'         |                 | )% 0.0               |                 | 0%              | 0.0                  | )%                  | 0.0%               |                 | 0.0%               |
| facts."   | Total                     | 10  | <b>D.0%</b>      | 100.            | .0%             | 100.            | 0%             | 100             | .0%                  | 100.0%          |                 | 100                  | .0%                 | 100.               | .0%             | 100.0%             |
|   | Unweighted Sample Size    | 2   | 200              | 25              | 5               | 29              | 9              | 11              | 0                    | 2               | 22              | 9                    | 4                   | 5                  | 5               | 400                |
|   |                           |   |                  | Ed              | ucatio          | n Leve          | el             |                 |                      |                 | Annual          | House                | ehold Ir            | ncome              |                 |                    |
|   |                           |   | No Co            | ollege          | Sor<br>Colle    | me<br>ege       | 4+ \<br>Deg    | ∕ear<br>gree    | <\$25                | 5,000           | \$25,0<br>\$50, | 000-<br>000          | \$50,<br>\$100      | 000-<br>,000       | \$100,          | 000+               |
| "Media used in school                               | Agree                     |   | 85.              | 0% <sub>a</sub> | 85.1            | % <sub>a</sub>  | 83.            | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 92.0                 | 0% <sub>a</sub> | 77.8            | % <sub>a</sub>       | 86.1                | 1% <sub>a</sub>    | 86.2            | 2% <sub>a</sub>    |
| should NOT include                                  | Disagree                  |   | 14.:             | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 13.8            | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 13.            | 4% <sub>a</sub> | 6.5                  | % <sub>a</sub>  | 21.3            | % <sub>b</sub>       | 13.5                | % <sub>a,b</sub>   | 10.8            | % <sub>a,b</sub>   |
| tobacco use or imagery<br>unless depicting historie | y Neither                 |   | 0.8              | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 1.19            | % <sub>a</sub>  | 2.8            | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 1.5                  | % <sub>a</sub>  | 0.9             | % <sub>a</sub>       | 0.4                 | %a                 | 3.0             | % <sub>a</sub>     |
|   | rical Don't know          |   | 0.               | 0%              | 0.0             | %               | 0.0            | 0%              | 0.0%                 |                 | 0.0%            |                      | 0.0                 | )%                 | 0.0             | )%                 |
| facts."   |                           |   |                  |                 |                 |                 |                |                 |                      |                 |                 |                      |                     |                    |                 |                    |

100.0%

137

100.0%

212

100.0%

44

100.0%

88

1**00.0%** 

176

100.0%

76

Total

<u>Regional Average Results for Comparison:</u> (For greater detail, including county-specific results and tests of significance, refer to both pages 29-30 and Appendix I.)

100.0%

106

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 2 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Agree   | 84.7%                       | 85.8%               | 86.9%                       |
| Disagree  | 9.4%                        | <b>11.6%</b>        | 13.8%                       |

Unweighted Sample Size

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:

(Not measured in recent-past Broome County studies.)

# 3.5 SMOKE-FREE HOUSING – DETAILED FINDINGS (among those who live in MUD's)

Which statement best describes the rules that your landlord has set regarding smoking tobacco inside the residential units in your building? *(among those who live in multi-unit dwellings)* 

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

Table 19

|                          |   | Unweighted | Weighted   |
|--------------------------|---|------------|------------|
|                          |   | Frequency  | Percentage |
|                          | Allowed in all<br>residential units     | 15         | 29.6%      |
| Rules inside your rental | Allowed in some<br>residential units    | 3          | 10.1%      |
| residential unit.        | Not allowed in any<br>residential units | 22         | 51.7%      |
|                          | Don't know/Not sure                     | 4          | 8.7%       |
|                          | Totals                                  | 44         | 100.0%     |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses:         | 2006   | 2009  | 2011  | 2013  | 2015  | 2017         | 2019         |
|--------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|--------------|
| Allowed in all     | 67.69/ | 69.8% | 48.8% | 31.4% | 35.2% | <b>19.1%</b> | 29.6%        |
| Allowed in some    | 07.0%  | 4.7%  | 4.5%  | 5.5%  | 17.1% | 6.4%         | <b>10.1%</b> |
| Not allowed in any | 30.8%  | 18.5% | 31.8% | 51.7% | 36.0% | 67.1%        | 51.7%        |
| Don't know         | 1.6%   | 6.9%  | 14.9% | 11.4% | 11.7% | 7.5%         | 8.7%         |

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

(To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.)

|       |   |   |         | Gen             | der                    |                        |                    |                         |                    | Age                   | Groups                 | 5                      |                      |                 | Cigar              |                | ette Use          |                |
|-------|---|---|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|
|       |   |   | M       | ale             | Ferr                   | nale                   | 18-                | 34                      | 35-                | 54                    | 55                     | -64                    | 65                   | +               | Smo                | ker            | Non-smo           | oker           |
|       |   | Allowed in all residential units        | 19.     | 8%a             | 36.0                   | )% <sub>a</sub>        | 47.9               | ‰ <sub>a</sub>          | 18.2               | ‰a                    | 37.                    | 4% <sub>a</sub>        | 26.8                 | %a              | 19.2               | % <sub>a</sub> | 32.6%             | <sup>b</sup> a |
| Jules |   | Allowed in some residential units       | 23.     | 0% <sub>a</sub> | 1.6                    | % <sub>b</sub>         | 0.0                | %                       | 22.2               | ‰ <sub>a</sub>        | 4.0                    | <b>)%</b> <sub>b</sub> | 0.0                  | %               | <b>20</b> .1       | % <sub>a</sub> | 7.2%              | 3              |
| esid  | ential unit.  | Not allowed in any<br>residential units | y 52.0  |                 | )% <sub>a</sub> 51.5%  |                        | 52.1% <sub>a</sub> |                         | 48.5% <sub>a</sub> |                       | 41.                    | 7% <sub>a</sub>        | 73.2                 | .% <sub>a</sub> | 40.7               | % <sub>a</sub> | 54.9%             | a              |
|       |   | Don't know/Not sure                     | 5.2     | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 10.9                   | <b>9</b> %a            | %a 0.0%            |                         | 11.1               | %a                    | 16.                    | <b>8%</b> a            | 0.0                  | %               | 20.1               | %a             | 5.3% <sub>t</sub> | b              |
|       | Total<br>Unweighted Sample Size   |   | 100     | 100.0%          |                        | .0%                    | 100.0%             |                         | 100.               | 0%                    | 100                    | ).0%                   | 100.0%               |                 | 100.0%             |                | 100.0%            | %              |
|       |   | Unweighted Sample Size                  | 1       | 5               | 2                      | 9                      | 4                  | L.                      | 11                 | 1                     | 2                      | 22                     | 7                    |                 | 9                  |                | 35                |                |
|       |   |   |         |                 | Ed                     | lucatio                | on Leve            | əl                      |                    |                       |                        | Annua                  | House                | hold l          | ncome              |                |                   |                |
|       |   |   |         | No College      |                        | So<br>Col              | ome<br>lege        | 4+ )<br>De              | Year<br>gree       | <\$2                  | 5,000                  | \$25,<br>\$50          | 000-<br>000          | \$50<br>\$100   | ,000-<br>),000     | \$100          | ,000+             |                |
|       |   | Allowed in all residen<br>units         | tial    | ial 38.7        |                        | 38.7% <sub>a</sub> 11. |                    | 4‰ 33.7‰ <sub>a,b</sub> |                    | 23.6% <sub>a</sub> 45 |                        | 45.:                   | .2% <sub>a</sub> 29  |                 | 2% <sub>a</sub>    | 0.             | 0%                |                |
|       | Bulas insida your ran   | Allowed in some resid                   | lential | 8.9             | 8.9% <sub>a</sub> 15.2 |                        | 2%a 5.3            |                         | .2% <sub>a</sub> 0 |                       | 0.0% 26.9              |                        | 9% <sub>a</sub> 3.4  |                 | .1% <sub>b</sub> ( |                | 0%                |                |
|       | Rules inside your rental residential unit. Not allowed in any residential units |   |         | 52.4            | 4%a                    | 44.                    | 7%a                | 61.                     | 1% <sub>a</sub>    | 70                    | 70.7% <sub>a</sub> 14. |                        | .5% <sub>b</sub> 58. |                 | 6% <sub>a</sub>    | 10             | 0.0%              |                |
|       |   | Don't know/Not sure                     |         | 0.0             | )%                     | 28.                    | 7% <sub>a</sub>    | 0.                      | 0%                 | 5.'                   | 7% <sub>a</sub>        | 13.4                   | 4% <sub>a</sub>      | <b>9.</b> 1     | 1% <sub>a</sub>    | 0.             | 0%                |                |
|       |   | Total                                   |         | 100             | .0%                    | 100                    | 0.0%               | 100                     | 100.0%             |                       | 100.0% 10              |                        | 0.0% 10              |                 | 100.0% 10          |                | 100.0%            |                |
|       |   | Unweighted Sample S                     | Size    | 1               | 6                      | 1                      | 5                  |                         | 13                 | 11                    |                        | 1                      | 11                   |                 | 16                 |                | 3                 |                |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 24 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Allowed in all units   | 3.0%                        | 25.6%               | 57.7%                       |
| Allowed in some units  | 2.3%                        | 12.8%               | 30.5%                       |
| Not allowed in any units   | 11.0%                       | 49.2%               | 76.4%                       |



Table 20

Favor a policy that would prohibit smoking inside all residential units in your building? (among those who live in multi-unit dwellings)

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                            |            | Unweighted | Weighted   |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
|                            |            | Frequency  | Percentage |
|                            | Favor      | 23         | 55.7%      |
| Policy that would prohibit | Against    | 15         | 31.0%      |
| smoking inside all         | Neither    | 6          | 13.3%      |
| building?                  | Don't know | 0          | 0.0%       |
|                            | Totals     | 44         | 100.0%     |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.) (WARNING: in 2006-2017 this was posed with similar but slightly different wording, and posed to all participants, not solely to MUD-dwellers)

| Responses: | 2006  | 2009  | 2011  | 2013  | 2015  | 2017  | 2019  |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Favor      | 39.9% | 52.4% | 70.6% | 51.3% | 44.7% | 49.9% | 55.7% |
| Against    | 48.5% | 41.4% | 27.6% | 37.2% | 48.9% | 34.6% | 31.0% |
| Neither    | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 6.5%  | 14.7% | 13.3% |
| Don't know | 11.6% | 6.2%  | 1.8%  | 11.4% | 0.0%  | 0.9%  | 0.0%  |

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

(To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.)

| -                                      | • •                    |      |                             |                 |                      |                                      | -               |                      |                    |                   |                      |                    |                   |                    |                 |                    |
|--|------------------------|------|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
|  |                        |      | Ger                         | nder            |                      |                                      |                 |                      | Age (              | Groups            | 6                    |                    |                   | (                  | Cigare          | tte Use            |
|  |                        | M    | ale                         | Ferr            | nale                 | 18-                                  | 34              | 35-                  | 54                 | 55                | -64                  | 65                 | 5+                | Smo                | ker             | Non-smol           |
|  | Favor                  | 42   | .9% <sub>a</sub>            | 64.1            | <b>I%</b> ь          | 74.0                                 | )% <sub>a</sub> | 53.5                 | 5% <sub>a</sub>    | 45.               | 5% <sub>a</sub>      | 56.8               | 8% <sub>a</sub>   | 10.6               | 5% <sub>a</sub> | 69.0% <sub>b</sub> |
| cy that would prohibit                 | Against                | 38   | .0% <sub>a</sub>            | 26.4            | 1% <sub>a</sub>      | 26.0                                 | % <sub>a</sub>  | % <sub>a</sub> 29.8  | 8% <sub>a</sub>    | 39.               | .6%a                 | 26.8               | 8% <sub>a</sub>   | 50.2% <sub>a</sub> |                 | 25.3% <sub>b</sub> |
| king inside all                        | Neither                | 19   | .0% <sub>a</sub>            | 0%a 9.5%a       |                      | 0.0%                                 |                 | 16.7                 | % <sub>a</sub>     | 14.               | 9% <sub>a</sub>      | 16.4               | 4% <sub>a</sub>   | 39.2               | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 5.7% <sub>b</sub>  |
| ding?                                  | Don't know             | 0.   | 0%                          | % 0.0%          |                      | 0.0                                  | %               | 0.0                  | %                  | 0.                | 0%                   | 0.0                | )%                | 0.0                | %               | 0.0%               |
| Ŭ                                      | Total                  |      | 100.0%                      |                 | .0%                  | 100.                                 | .0%             | 100.                 | .0%                | 100               | ).0%                 | 100                | .0%               | 100.               | .0%             | 100.0%             |
|  | Unweighted Sample Size |      | 15                          | 2               | 29                   |                                      | 4 1             |                      | 1                  |                   | 22                   | 7                  | 7                 | 9                  | )               | 35                 |
|  |                        |      | Education<br>No College Col |                 | ion Level            |                                      |                 |                      |                    | Annual House      |                      | ehold Ir           | ncome             |                    |                 |                    |
|  |                        |      |                             |                 | ollege Colle         |                                      | 4+ `<br>Deg     | Year<br>gree         | <\$2               | 5,000             | \$25,0<br>\$50,      | 000-<br>000        | \$50,<br>\$100    | 000-<br>,000       | \$100,          | 000+               |
|  | Favor                  |      | 68.                         | 0% <sub>a</sub> | 30.                  | 0% <sub>b</sub> 63.4% <sub>a,b</sub> |                 | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub>     | 71.3% <sub>a</sub> |                   | 3% <sub>a</sub> 39.3 |                    | 46.7              | % <sub>a</sub>     | 88.7            | 7% <sub>a</sub>    |
| Policy that would prof                 | nibit Against          |      | 16.                         | 9% <sub>a</sub> | ∕₀ <sub>a</sub> 56.9 |                                      | 28.0            | 28.0% <sub>a,b</sub> |                    | 6.5% <sub>a</sub> |                      | % <sub>b</sub>     | <sub>b</sub> 40.7 |                    | 0.0             | %                  |
| smoking inside all                     | Neither                |      | 15.                         | 1% <sub>a</sub> | 13.1                 | 1% <sub>a</sub>                      | 8.6             | 5% <sub>a</sub>      | 22.                | 2% <sub>a</sub>   | 11.0                 | 0% <sub>a</sub> 1; |                   | 5% <sub>a</sub>    | 11.3            | 8% <sub>a</sub>    |
| residential units in your<br>building? | Don't know             |      | 0.                          | 0%              | 0.0                  | 0%                                   | 0.              | 0%                   | 0.                 | 0%                | 0.0                  | %                  | 0.0               | %                  | 0.0             | %                  |
|  | Total                  |      | 100                         | .0%             | 100                  | .0%                                  | 100             | .0%                  | 100                | .0%               | 100.                 | 0%                 | 100               | .0%                | 100             | .0%                |
|  | Unweighted Sample      | Size | 1                           | 6               | 1                    | 5                                    | 1               | 3                    | 1                  | 1                 | 11                   | 11                 |                   | 16 3               |                 | 3                  |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 10 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Favor  | 55.7%                       | 66.5%               | 81.9%                       |
| Against  | 13.5%                       | 25.8%               | 37.5%                       |



# 3.6 TOBACCO AND E-CIGARETTE USE – DETAILED FINDINGS

#### Table 21

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

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                           |                     | Unweighted | Weighted   |
|---------------------------|---------------------|------------|------------|
|                           |                     | Frequency  | Percentage |
|                           | Yes                 | 204        | 46.8%      |
| Smoked 100+ cigarettes in | No                  | 252        | 53.2%      |
| your entire life?         | Don't know/Not sure | 0          | 0.0%       |
|                           | Totals              | 456        | 100.0%     |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses: | 2006  | 2009  | 2011  | 2013  | 2015  | 2017  | 2019  |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes        | 42.8% | 47.5% | 45.0% | 44.6% | 49.5% | 47.6% | 46.8% |
| No         | 57.2% | 52.5% | 55.0% | 55.4% | 50.5% | 52.4% | 53.2% |
| Don't know | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  |

#### <u>Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):</u> (To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.)

|                           |                        |                     |     | Ger                     | nder            |                 |                           |        |                        | Age (               | Groups                 | 5                      |                      |              | (                     | Cigare | tte Use         |                |
|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------|-----------------|----------------|
|                           |                        |                     | М   | ale                     | Fen             | nale            | 18-                       | 34     | 35-                    | 54                  | 55                     | -64                    | 65+                  |              | Smo                   | ker    | Non-sm          | noker          |
|                           | Yes                    |                     | 56. | .3%a                    | 37.8            | 3% <sub>b</sub> | 49.3                      | 8%a    | 41.0                   | )%a                 | 57.                    | 1%a                    | 43.9                 | 9%a          | 100.                  | .0%    | 34.2            | % <sub>a</sub> |
| Smoked 100+ cigarettes in | No                     |                     | 43. | 43.7% <sub>a</sub> 62.2 |                 | 2% <sub>b</sub> | <b>50.7%</b> <sub>a</sub> |        | 59.0% <sub>a</sub> 42. |                     | 9% <sub>a</sub>        | 56.1                   | 1% <sub>a</sub>      | 0.0          | %                     | 65.8   | % <sub>a</sub>  |                |
| your entire life?         | Don't                  | know/Not sure       | 0.  | 0%                      | 0.0             | )%              | 0.0                       | 0% 0.0 |                        | %                   | 0.                     | 0%                     | 0.0                  | )%           | 0.0                   | %      | 0.0%            | %              |
|                           | Total                  |                     | 100 | <b>).0%</b>             | .0% 100.0       |                 | 100.0%                    |        | 1 <b>00.0%</b>         |                     | 100                    | ).0%                   | 100.0%               |              | 100.0%                |        | 100.0           | 0%             |
|                           | Unweighted Sample Size |                     |     | 200                     | 25              | 56              | 2                         | 9      | 11                     | 0                   | 223                    |                        | 94                   |              | 5                     | 6      | 400             | 0              |
|                           |                        |                     |     |                         |                 | lucatio         | cation Level Annual       |        |                        |                     | House                  | hold Ir                | ncome                |              |                       |        |                 |                |
|                           |                        |                     |     | No College Col          |                 | me<br>lege      | e 4+ Year<br>ge Degree    |        | <\$25,000              |                     | \$25,0<br>\$50,        | 000-<br>000            | \$50,<br>\$100       | 000-<br>,000 | \$100                 | ,000+  |                 |                |
|                           |                        | Yes                 |     | 45.                     | 6% <sub>a</sub> | 60.             | 3% <sub>b</sub>           | 32.    | 2% <sub>a</sub>        | % <sub>a</sub> 50.4 |                        | 4% <sub>a,b</sub> 55.7 |                      | 47.0         | .0% <sub>a,b</sub> 3′ | 31.    | 6% <sub>b</sub> |                |
| Smoked 100+ cigaret       | tes in                 | No                  |     | 54.4% <sub>a</sub>      |                 | 39.             | 7% <sub>b</sub>           | 67.    | 8% <sub>a</sub> 49.6   |                     | 6% <sub>a,b</sub> 44.3 |                        | 3% <sub>a</sub> 53.0 |              | 0% <sub>a,b</sub> 68  |        | 4% <sub>b</sub> |                |
| your entire life?         |                        | Don't know/Not sure |     | 0.                      | 0%              | 0.0             | 0%                        | 0.     | 0%                     | 0.0                 | 0%                     | 0.0                    | %                    | 0.0          | %                     | 0.     | 0%              |                |
|                           | Total                  |                     |     | 100                     | <b>.0%</b>      | 100             | <b>).0%</b>               | 100    | .0%                    | 100                 | .0%                    | 100.                   | 0%                   | 100          | .0%                   | 100    | <b>).0%</b>     |                |
|                           |                        | Unweighted Sample S | ize | 1                       | 06              | 1:              | 38                        | 2      | 12                     | 4                   | 4                      | 89                     |                      | 176          |                       | 7      | 76              |                |

#### **Regional Average Results for Comparison:**





#### Table 22 Do you now smoke cigarettes every day, some days, or not at all?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                           |                     | Unweighted | Weighted   |
|---------------------------|---------------------|------------|------------|
|                           |                     | Frequency  | Percentage |
|                           | Smoke Every Day     | 38         | 12.2%      |
| Compart singuatta analian | Smoke Some Days     | 18         | 7.0%       |
| frequency                 | Do Not Smoke At All | 400        | 80.8%      |
| nequency                  | Don't Know/Not Sure | 0          | 0.0%       |
|                           | Totals              | 456        | 100.0%     |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses: | 2006  | 2009  | 2011  | 2013  | 2015  | 2017         | 2019  |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|
| Every day  | 22.2% | 21.4% | 11.7% | 16.3% | 17.0% | <b>16.2%</b> | 12.2% |
| Some days  | 2.7%  | 3.6%  | 4.7%  | 6.3%  | 5.5%  | 5.0%         | 7.0%  |
| Not at all | 75.1% | 75.0% | 83.6% | 77.4% | 77.4% | 78.8%        | 80.8% |
| Don't know | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%         | 0.0%  |

#### <u>Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):</u> (To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.)

|                                     |       |                     |        | Ger                | nder             |                 | -               | ,              | Age             | Groups              | ;                |                  |                     | 0                   | Cigare           | tte Use          |                 |
|-------------------------------------|-------|---------------------|--------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
|                                     |       |                     | м      | ale                | Fem              | ale             | 18-:            | 34             | 35-             | 54                  | 55               | -64              | 65                  | 5+                  | Smo              | ker              | Non-smok        |
|                                     | Smok  | e Every Day         | 16.    | . <b>8</b> %a      | 7.9              | % <sub>b</sub>  | 19.2            | %a             | 12.5            | % <sub>a,b</sub>    | 12.6             | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub> | 5.0                 | % <sub>b</sub>      | 63.5             | ‰a               | 0.0%            |
|                                     | Smok  | e Some Days         | 9.     | 8% <sub>a</sub>    | 4.3              | % <sub>b</sub>  | 14.0            | % <sub>a</sub> | 4.5             | % <sub>b</sub>      | 5.6              | % <sub>a,b</sub> | 4.79                | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub>    | 36.5             | ‰ <sub>a</sub>   | 0.0%            |
| urrent cigarette smoking            | Do N  | ot Smoke At All     | 73.    | 73.4% <sub>a</sub> |                  | 3% <sub>b</sub> | 66.8            | % <sub>a</sub> | 83.0            | )% <sub>b</sub>     | 81.9             | ‰ <sub>a,b</sub> | 90.2                | 2% <sub>b</sub>     | 0.0              | %                | 100.0%          |
|                                     | Don't | Know/Not Sure       | 0.     | 0%                 | 0.0              | %               | 0.0             | %              | 0.0             | %                   | 0.               | 0%               | 0.0                 | )%                  | 0.0%             | 0.0%             |                 |
| Tota                                |       |                     | 100.0% |                    | 100.0%           |                 | 100.            | 0.0% 100.0     |                 | .0%                 | % 100.0%         |                  | 100.0%              |                     | 100.0%           |                  | 100.0%          |
| Unweighted Sample Size              |       |                     | 2      | 200 256            |                  | 6               | 29              | Э              | 11              | 0                   | 2                | 23               | 9                   | 4                   | 5                | 6                | 400             |
|                                     |       |                     |        | Educatio           |                  |                 | n Leve          | el             |                 |                     |                  | Annual           | House               | hold li             | ncome            |                  |                 |
|                                     |       |                     |        | No Co              | ollege           | So<br>Coll      | me<br>lege      | 4+ )<br>Deg    | Year<br>gree    | <\$2                | 5,000            | \$25,0<br>\$50,  | 000-<br>000         | \$50,<br>\$100      | 000-<br>0,000    | \$100            | ,000+           |
|                                     |       | Smoke Every Day     |        | 12.                | 2% <sub>a</sub>  | 20.             | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 2.7            | 7% <sub>b</sub> | 17.                 | 3% <sub>a</sub>  | 15.2             | 2% <sub>a</sub>     | 11.4                | % <sub>a,b</sub> | 1.4              | ₩ <sub>b</sub>  |
| 0                                   |       | Smoke Some Days     |        | 5.6                | % <sub>a,b</sub> | 12.             | 6% <sub>a</sub> | 2.1            | l% <sub>b</sub> | 6.8% <sub>a,b</sub> | % <sub>a,b</sub> | 16.2%            | !% <sub>a</sub> 3.7 | 7% <sub>b</sub> 0.0 | 0.6              | % <sub>b,c</sub> |                 |
| Current cigarette smok<br>frequency | oking | Do Not Smoke At All |        | 82.                | 2% <sub>a</sub>  | 67.             | 2% <sub>b</sub> | 95.            | 2% <sub>c</sub> | 75.9                | % <sub>a,b</sub> | 68.6             | 5% <sub>a</sub>     | 84.9                | % <sub>b,c</sub> | 98.              | 1% <sub>c</sub> |
|                                     |       | Don't Know/Not Sure |        | 0.                 | 0%               | 0.0             | 0%              | 0.             | 0%              | 0.                  | 0%               | 0.0              | %                   | 0.0                 | 0%               | 0.0              | 0%              |
|                                     |       | Total               |        | 100                | .0%              | 100             | .0%             | 100            | ).0%            | 100                 | .0%              | 100              | .0%                 | 100                 | .0%              | 100              | .0%             |
|                                     |       | Unweighted Sample S | ize    | 1                  | 06               | 1:              | 38              | 2              | 12              | 4                   | 4                | 8                | 9                   | 17                  | 76               | 7                | '6              |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:



#### Table 23 Cigarette Smoking Status – Current, Former, Never Smokers?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                           |                | Unweighted | Weighted   |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------|------------|
|                           |                | Frequency  | Percentage |
|                           | Current smoker | 56         | 19.2%      |
| Cigorotto Smoking Status  | Former smoker  | 148        | 27.6%      |
| Sigarette Shioking Status | Never a smoker | 252        | 53.2%      |
|                           | Totals         | 456        | 100.0%     |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses: | 2006  | 2009  | 2011  | 2013  | 2015         | 2017         | 2019  |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|--------------|-------|
| Current    | 24.9% | 25.0% | 16.4% | 22.6% | 22.6%        | 21.2%        | 19.2% |
| Former     | 17.9% | 22.5% | 28.6% | 22.0% | 27.0%        | 26.3%        | 27.6% |
| Never      | 57.2% | 52.5% | 55.0% | 55.4% | <b>50.5%</b> | <b>52.4%</b> | 53.2% |

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

(To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 27-28.)

|                          |        |                     | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |                           |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |        |                 |                |
|--------------------------|--------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------|-----------------|----------------|
|                          |        |                     |                                       | Gen                       | der             |                 |                 |                 |                 | Age (            | Groups            |                    |                 |                  | С                | igaret | te Use          |                |
|                          |        |                     | Ma                                    | ale                       | Fem             | ale             | 18-             | 34              | 35-             | 54               | 55                | -64                | 65              | i+               | Smol             | ker    | Non-sm          | oker           |
|                          | Curre  | ent smoker          | 26.                                   | 6% <sub>a</sub>           | 12.2            | ‰ <sub>b</sub>  | 33.2            | % <sub>a</sub>  | 17.0            | ‰ <sub>b</sub>   | 18.1              | % <sub>a,b</sub>   | 9.8             | % <sub>b</sub>   | 100.             | 0%     | 0.0%            | 0              |
| Cigarotto Smoking Status | Form   | er smoker           | 29.                                   | <b>29.7%</b> <sub>a</sub> |                 | 3% <sub>a</sub> | 16.0            | % <sub>a</sub>  | 24.0            | % <sub>a,b</sub> | 38.               | 9% <sub>b</sub>    | 34.1            | % <sub>b,c</sub> | 0.0              | %      | 34.2%           | o <sub>a</sub> |
|                          | Neve   | er a smoker         | 43.                                   | 43.7% <sub>a</sub>        |                 | % <sub>b</sub>  | 50.7            | '% <sub>a</sub> | 59.0            | % <sub>a</sub>   | 42.               | 9% <sub>a</sub>    | 56.1            | 1% <sub>a</sub>  | 0.0              | %      | 65.8%           | 6 <sub>a</sub> |
| То                       |        |                     | 100.0%                                |                           | 100.            | 0%              | 100.            | 0%              | 100.            | 0%               | 100               | .0%                | 100.            | .0%              | 100.             | 0%     | 100.0           | %              |
|                          | Unwe   | eighted Sample Size | 2                                     | 200 256                   |                 | 2               | 9               | 11              | 110 223         |                  | 23                | 94                 |                 | 56               | 6                | 400    |                 |                |
|                          |        |                     | Education                             |                           | on Leve         | el              |                 |                 |                 | Annual           | House             | hold li            | ncome           |                  |                  |        |                 |                |
|                          |        |                     |                                       | No Co                     | ollege          | So<br>Coll      | me<br>lege      | 4+ )<br>Deg     | Year<br>gree    | <\$2             | 5, <b>000</b>     | \$25,0<br>\$50,    | 000-<br>000     | \$50,<br>\$100   | 000-<br>,000     | \$100, | 000+            |                |
|                          |        | Current smoker      |                                       | 17.                       | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 32.             | 8% <sub>b</sub> | 4.8             | 3% <sub>c</sub> | 24.1             | l% <sub>a,b</sub> | 31.4               | % <sub>a</sub>  | 15.1             | % <sub>b,c</sub> | 1.9    | % <sub>c</sub>  |                |
| Cigarette Smoking S      | Statue | Former smoker       |                                       | 27.                       | 9% <sub>a</sub> | 27.             | 5% <sub>a</sub> | 27.             | 4% <sub>a</sub> | 26.              | 3% <sub>a</sub>   | 24.3% <sub>a</sub> |                 | 31.8             | 3% <sub>a</sub>  | 29.7   | % <sub>a</sub>  |                |
| Cigarette Smoking Stat   | Jiaius | Never a smoker      |                                       | 54.4                      | 4% <sub>a</sub> | 39.             | 7% <sub>b</sub> | 67.             | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 49.6             | 5% <sub>a,b</sub> | 44.3               | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 53.0             | % <sub>a,b</sub> | 68.4   | 1% <sub>b</sub> |                |
|                          |        | Total               |                                       | 100                       | .0%             | 100             | .0%             | 100.0%          |                 | 100.0%           |                   | 100                | .0%             | 100              | .0%              | 100.   | .0%             |                |
|                          |        | Unweighted Sample S | lize                                  | 1                         | 06              | 1:              | 38              | 2               | 12              | 4                | 14                | 8                  | 9               | 17               | 76               | 7      | 6               |                |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes all 34 of 34 studied counties that used<br>this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Current cigarette smoker  | 9.1%                        | 16.1%               | 22.9%                       |
| Former cigarette smoker   | 13.4%                       | 26.1%               | 37.3%                       |
| Never a cigarette smoker  | 43.4%                       | 57.9%               | 75.6%                       |



Do you now use e-cigarettes or other electronic vaping products every day, some days, rarely, or not at all?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

Table 24

|                     |                     | Unweighted | Weighted       |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------|----------------|
|                     |                     | Frequency  | Percentage     |
|                     | Every Day           | 15         | 5.5%           |
|                     | Some Days           | 13         | 4.3%           |
| Current E-cigarette | Rarely              | 7          | 2.1%           |
| Frequency of Use    | Not at all          | 414        | <b>87.9%</b>   |
|                     | Don't Know/Not Sure | 1          | 0.3%           |
|                     | Totals              | 450        | 1 <b>00.0%</b> |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses:          | 2013  | 2015  | 2017  | 2019  |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Every day           | 0.0%  | 2.5%  | 2.9%  | 5.5%  |
| Some days           | 0.1%  | 2.6%  | 3.9%  | 4.3%  |
| Rarely              | 3.7%  | 2.6%  | 4.5%  | 2.1%  |
| Not at all          | 96.0% | 91.9% | 87.6% | 87.9% |
| Don't know/Not sure | 0.2%  | 0.3%  | 1.1%  | 0.3%  |

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

| To determine statistically significant relationships, refer to explanations on pages 21-20. |                        |                    |                    |                    |                      |                      |                     |                    |                    |  |  |
|---|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|--|
|   |                        | Ger                | der                |                    | Age                  | Groups               |                     | Cigarette Use      |                    |  |  |
|   |                        | Male               | Female             | 18-34              | 35-54                | 55-64                | 65+                 | Smoker             | Non-smoker         |  |  |
|   | Every Day              | 10.5% <sub>a</sub> | 0.7% <sub>b</sub>  | 12.8% <sub>a</sub> | 4.9% <sub>a,b</sub>  | 1.6% <sub>b</sub>    | 2.4% <sub>b,c</sub> | 10.9% <sub>a</sub> | 4.2% <sub>b</sub>  |  |  |
|   | Some Days              | 5.1% <sub>a</sub>  | 3.5% <sub>a</sub>  | 6.1% <sub>a</sub>  | 4.5% <sub>a</sub>    | 6.2% <sub>a</sub>    | 0.8% <sub>a</sub>   | 11.5% <sub>a</sub> | 2.5% <sub>b</sub>  |  |  |
| Current E-cigarette   | Rarely                 | 2.1% <sub>a</sub>  | 2.1% <sub>a</sub>  | 3.9% <sub>a</sub>  | 1.6% <sub>a</sub>    | 2.5% <sub>a</sub>    | 0.7% <sub>a</sub>   | 5.2% <sub>a</sub>  | 1.3% <sub>b</sub>  |  |  |
| Frequency of Use  | Not at all             | 82.4% <sub>a</sub> | 93.2% <sub>b</sub> | 77.3% <sub>a</sub> | 89.0% <sub>a,b</sub> | 89.7% <sub>a,b</sub> | 95.0% <sub>b</sub>  | 72.4% <sub>a</sub> | 91.6% <sub>b</sub> |  |  |
|   | Don't Know/Not Sure    | 0.0%               | 0.5% <sub>a</sub>  | 0.0%               | 0.0%                 | 0.0%                 | 1.1% <sub>a</sub>   | 0.0%               | 0.3% <sub>a</sub>  |  |  |
|   | Total                  | 100.0%             | 100.0%             | 1 <b>00.0%</b>     | 100.0%               | 100.0%               | 1 <b>00.0</b> %     | 100.0%             | 100.0%             |  |  |
|   | Unweighted Sample Size | 198                | 252                | 28                 | 108                  | 220                  | 94                  | 55                 | 395                |  |  |

|                     |                        | Ed                   | ucation Leve             | əl                 | Annual Household Income |                       |                        |                    |  |  |
|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
|                     |                        | No College           | Some<br>College          | 4+ Year<br>Degree  | <\$25,000               | \$25,000-<br>\$50,000 | \$50,000-<br>\$100,000 | \$100,000+         |  |  |
|                     | Every Day              | 5.4% <sub>a</sub>    | 6.5% <sub>a</sub>        | 4.3% <sub>a</sub>  | 6.8% <sub>a</sub>       | 10.3% <sub>a</sub>    | 4.3% <sub>a</sub>      | 2.3% <sub>a</sub>  |  |  |
|                     | Some Days              | 2.4% <sub>a</sub>    | <b>7.9%</b> a            | 2.3% <sub>a</sub>  | 0.0%                    | 9.9% <sub>a</sub>     | 5.0% <sub>a</sub>      | 0.5% <sub>a</sub>  |  |  |
| Current E-cigarette | Rarely                 | 1.7% <sub>a</sub>    | <b>4.0%</b> <sub>a</sub> | 0.2% <sub>a</sub>  | 1.5% <sub>a</sub>       | 0.4% <sub>a</sub>     | 1.9% <sub>a</sub>      | 0.0%               |  |  |
| Frequency of Use    | Not at all             | 89.7% <sub>a,b</sub> | 81.6% <sub>a</sub>       | 93.2% <sub>b</sub> | 91.7% <sub>a,b</sub>    | <b>79.4%</b> a        | 88.0% <sub>a,b</sub>   | 97.2% <sub>b</sub> |  |  |
|                     | Don't Know/Not Sure    | 0.7% <sub>a</sub>    | 0.0%                     | 0.0%               | 0.0%                    | 0.0%                  | 0.8% <sub>a</sub>      | 0.0%               |  |  |
|                     | Total                  | 1 <b>00.0%</b>       | 1 <b>00.0</b> %          | 100.0%             | 100.0%                  | 100.0%                | 100.0%                 | 100.0%             |  |  |
|                     | Unweighted Sample Size | 105                  | 136                      | 209                | 44                      | 89                    | 175                    | 76                 |  |  |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes all 34 of 34 studied counties that used<br>this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Use every day   | 0.6%                        | 2.6%                | 6.2%                        |
| Use some days   | 0.2%                        | 3.1%                | 6.7%                        |
| Use rarely  | 0.0%                        | 3.3%                | 6.9%                        |
| Use at least rarely   | 4.5%                        | 9.0%                | 15.9%                       |
| Do not use at all   | 84.1%                       | 90.7%               | 95.5%                       |



#### Table 25 Why would you say that you use e-cigarettes? (among only current e-cigarette users)

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

|                            |                      | Unweighted | Weighted     |
|----------------------------|----------------------|------------|--------------|
|                            |                      | Frequency  | Percentage   |
|                            | Tobacco cessation    | 20         | 71.2%        |
| Why would you say that you | Non-cessation reason | 12         | <b>28.0%</b> |
| use e-cigarettes?          | Not sure             | 1          | 0.8%         |
|                            | Totals               | 33         | 100.0%       |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### <u>Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:</u>

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses:           | 2015  | 2017  | 2019  |
|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Tobacco cessation    | 80.4% | 60.7% | 71.2% |
| Non-cessation reason | 19.6% | 39.3% | 28.0% |
| Not sure             | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.8%  |

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data): statistically significant relationships (To deter

| To actermine statistically | , sigini | icant relationships, | Terer | 10 CAP               | Janati          | 0113 0          | in pag          | 103 ZI         | -20.)                             |                 |                 |                 |                |                 |                 |                 |         |      |
|----------------------------|----------|----------------------|-------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|------|
|                            |          |                      |       | Ger                  | der             |                 |                 |                |                                   | Age (           | Groups          | 5               |                |                 | (               | Cigare          | tte Use |      |
|                            |          |                      | М     | ale                  | Ferr            | ale             | 18-             | 34             | 35-                               | 54              | 55              | -64             | 65             | 5+              | Smo             | ker             | Non-sm  | oker |
|                            | Tobac    | co cessation         | 86.   | 5%a                  | 30.4            | ₩b              | 73.3            | %a             | 69.2                              | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 62.             | <b>9%</b> a     | 82.2           | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 72.7            | %a              | 69.9%   | Da   |
| Why would you say that you | Non-c    | essation reason      | 13.   | 13.5% <sub>a</sub> 6 |                 | 7% <sub>b</sub> | 26.7            | % <sub>a</sub> | % <sub>a</sub> 30.8% <sub>a</sub> |                 | 32.             | <b>2%</b> a     | 17.8           | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 27.3            | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 28.6%   | Pa   |
| use e-cigarettes?          | Not su   | ire                  | 0.    | 0.0% 2               |                 | % <sub>a</sub>  | 0.0             | %              | 0.0                               | )%              | 4.9             | 9% <sub>a</sub> | 0.0            | 0%              | 0.0             | %               | 1.4%    | a    |
|                            | Total    |                      | 100   | ).0%                 | 100             | .0%             | 100.0% 100      |                | .0%                               | 100.0%          |                 | 100             | .0% 100        |                 | .0%             | 100.09          | %       |      |
|                            | Unwei    | ghted Sample Size    | 1     | 17 16                |                 | 7               | ,               | 8              | 8                                 |                 | 14              | 4               | 4              | 1               | 1               | 22              |         |      |
|                            |          |                      |       |                      | Ed              | ucatio          | n Leve          | əl             |                                   |                 |                 | Annual          | House          | hold Ir         | ncome           |                 |         |      |
|                            |          |                      |       | No Co                | ollege          | So<br>Col       | me<br>lege      | 4+ )<br>Deg    | rear<br>gree                      | <\$2            | 5, <b>000</b>   | \$25,0<br>\$50, | 000-<br>000    | \$50,<br>\$100  | 000-<br>,000    | \$100           | ,000+   |      |
|                            |          | Tobacco cessation    |       | 69.                  | 8% <sub>a</sub> | 70.             | 7% <sub>a</sub> | 75.            | 4% <sub>a</sub>                   | 86.             | 9% <sub>a</sub> | 72.5            | ‰ <sub>a</sub> | 58.4            | 1% <sub>a</sub> | 100             | .0%     |      |
| Why would you say th       | at you   | Non-cessation reason | )     | 30.                  | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 27.             | 9% <sub>a</sub> | 24.            | 6% <sub>a</sub>                   | 13.             | 1% <sub>a</sub> | 25.6            | ‰ <sub>a</sub> | 41.6            | 5% <sub>a</sub> | 0.0             | )%      |      |
| use e-cigarettes?          |          | Not sure             |       | 0.                   | 0%              | 1.5             | 5%a             | 0.             | 0%                                | 0.              | 0%              | 1.8             | %a             | 0.0             | )%              | 0.0             | )%      |      |
|                            |          | Total                |       | 100                  | .0%             | 100             | .0%             | 100            | . <b>0%</b>                       | 100             | ).0%            | 100.            | 0%             | 100             | .0%             | 100             | .0%     |      |
|                            |          | Unweighted Sample S  | Size  |                      | 8               | 1               | 4               | 1              | 1                                 | :               | 3               | 9               |                | 1               | 5               | ;               | 3       |      |

<u>Regional Average Results for Comparison:</u> (For greater detail, including county-specific results and tests of significance, refer to both pages 29-30 and Appendix I.)

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 13 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Tobacco cessation  | 24.6%                       | 49.4%               | 100.0%                      |
| Non-cessation reason   | 0.0%                        | 47.1%               | 70.3%                       |

# Do you think that breathing the aerosol from someone else's e-cigarettes or other electronic vapor products is \_\_\_\_\_harmful to one's health?

#### December 2019 Results – Broome County:

Table 26

|                                 |                    | Unweighted | Weighted   |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|
|                                 |                    | Frequency  | Percentage |
| Ver                             | ry harmful         | 181        | 37.3%      |
| Do you think that breathing Sol | mewhat harmful     | 138        | 33.3%      |
| the aerosol from someone Not    | ot that harmful    | 36         | 10.3%      |
| electronic vapor products       | ot at all harmful  | 26         | 6.6%       |
| is to one's health: Do          | on't know/Not sure | 68         | 12.5%      |
| Toi                             | tals               | 449        | 100.0%     |

#### Trend Analysis – Graphically:



#### Trend Analysis – Detailed Statistics:

(To determine statistically significant trends, refer to explanations on pages 30-31.)

| Responses:          | 2015  | 2017  | 2019  |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Very harmful        | 15.7% | 24.2% | 37.3% |
| Somewhat harmful    | 31.5% | 32.1% | 33.3% |
| Not that harmful    | 16.2% | 14.7% | 10.3% |
| Not at all harmful  | 10.1% | 6.5%  | 6.6%  |
| Don't know/Not sure | 26.6% | 22.5% | 12.5% |

#### Cross-tabulations – Broome County (using only December 2019 data):

| (To determine statistically  | y significant relationships | , reter | to expla        | nations                  | on pag       | jes 27          | -28.)      |                 |       |                    |              |                      |                    |        |                   |
|--|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|-------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------|-------------------|
|  |                             |         | Gende           | r                        |              |                 |            | Age G           | roups |                    |              |                      | Cigar              | ette U | se                |
|  |                             | Ma      | ale             | Female                   | 18           | -34             | 35-        | 54              | 55    | -64                | 65-          | +                    | Smoker             | Non-   | smoker            |
| Do you think that breathing<br>the aerosol from someone<br>else's e-cigarettes or other<br>electronic vanor products | Very harmful                | 30.     | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 44.0% <sub>b</sub>       | 27.          | 7% <sub>a</sub> | 31.2       | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 32.   | 9%a                | 56.9         | % <sub>b</sub>       | 14.9% <sub>a</sub> | 42     | 2.6% <sub>b</sub> |
|  | Somewhat harmful            | 33.1    | 1% <sub>a</sub> | 33.4% <sub>a</sub>       | 47.3         | 2% <sub>a</sub> | 29.5       | 5% <sub>b</sub> | 25.   | 9% <sub>b</sub>    | 30.6%        | 6 <sub>a,b</sub>     | 41.0% <sub>a</sub> | 31     | .4% <sub>a</sub>  |
|  | Not that harmful            | 13.1    | 1% <sub>a</sub> | 7.7% <sub>a</sub>        | 11.9         | 9% <sub>a</sub> | 11.7       | 7% <sub>a</sub> | 13.   | 1% <sub>a</sub>    | 5.1%         | 6 <sub>a</sub>       | 17.9% <sub>a</sub> | 8      | .5% <sub>b</sub>  |
|  | Not at all harmful          | 8.6     | 6%a             | <b>4.8%</b> <sub>a</sub> | 9.1          | % <sub>a</sub>  | 8.1        | % <sub>a</sub>  | 6.2   | ‰a                 | <b>2.9</b> % | 6 <sub>a</sub>       | 10.9% <sub>a</sub> | 5      | .6% <sub>a</sub>  |
| is to one's health:  | Don't know/Not sure         | 15.1    | 1%a             | 10.1% <sub>a</sub>       | 4.0          | %a              | 19.5       | 5% <sub>b</sub> | 21.   | 9% <sub>b</sub>    | 4.6%         | 6a                   | 15.3% <sub>a</sub> | 11     | <b>.9%</b> a      |
|  | Total                       | 100     | .0%             | 1 <b>00.0%</b>           | 100          | .0%             | 100        | .0%             | 100   | .0%                | 100.0        | 0%                   | 1 <b>00.0</b> %    | 10     | 0.0%              |
|  | Unweighted Sample Size      | 19      | 98              | 251                      | 2            | 8               | 10         | 8               | 2     | 19                 | 94           | L                    | 56                 | :      | 393               |
|  |                             |         |                 | Educati                  | on Leve      | əl              |            |                 | ŀ     | nnual H            | ouseho       | old Inco             | me                 |        |                   |
|  |                             |         | No Colle        | ege S<br>Co              | ome<br>Ilege | 4+ Y<br>Degi    | ear<br>ree | <\$25,          | 000   | \$25,00<br>\$50,00 | 0-<br>00     | \$50,000<br>\$100,00 | )-<br>0 \$100      | ,000+  |                   |
|  | Verv harmful                |         | 43.4%           | . 33                     | .7%          | 33.4            | %          | 33.0            | %     | 32.1%              | ,<br>Do      | 36.9%                | 37.                | 2%_    |                   |

|                             | Very harmful        | 43.4% <sub>a</sub> | 33.7% <sub>a</sub> | 33.4% <sub>a</sub> | 33.0% <sub>a</sub> | <b>32.1%</b> <sub>a</sub> | 36.9% <sub>a</sub> | 37.2% <sub>a</sub>   |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Do you think that breathing | Somewhat harmful    | 30.9% <sub>a</sub> | 35.8% <sub>a</sub> | 33.3% <sub>a</sub> | 50.1% <sub>a</sub> | 32.3% <sub>a,b</sub>      | 31.7% <sub>b</sub> | 30.3% <sub>a,b</sub> |
| the aerosol from someone    | Not that harmful    | 10.7% <sub>a</sub> | 13.2% <sub>a</sub> | 6.4% <sub>a</sub>  | 1.7% <sub>a</sub>  | 11.1% <sub>a,b</sub>      | 15.9% <sub>b</sub> | 4.7% <sub>a,b</sub>  |
| electronic vapor products   | Not at all harmful  | 5.0% <sub>a</sub>  | 6.8% <sub>a</sub>  | 8.7% <sub>a</sub>  | 3.6% <sub>a</sub>  | 10.7% <sub>a</sub>        | 5.3% <sub>a</sub>  | 6.0% <sub>a</sub>    |
| is to one's health:         | Don't know/Not sure | 10.0% <sub>a</sub> | 10.5% <sub>a</sub> | 18.2% <sub>a</sub> | 11.6% <sub>a</sub> | 13.9% <sub>a</sub>        | 10.2% <sub>a</sub> | 21.8% <sub>a</sub>   |
|                             | Total               | 100.0%             | 100.0%             | 100.0%             | 100.0%             | 100.0%                    | 100.0%             | 100.0%               |

#### Regional Average Results for Comparison:

| Among 34 New York State County-<br>level Adult Survey Studies between<br>2018 and 2019 (includes only the 13 of 34 studied counties that<br>used this question in their version of the survey) | Minimum<br>in Any<br>County | Regional<br>Average | Maximum<br>in Any<br>County |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Very harmful   | 17.4%                       | 28.7%               | 40.3%                       |
| Somewhat harmful   | 28.7%                       | 34.5%               | 41.0%                       |
| Not that harmful   | 7.8%                        | 11.2%               | 18.9%                       |
| Not at all harmful   | 3.5%                        | 8.0%                | 11.6%                       |
|  |                             |                     |                             |



# Section 4 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 and Tioga* during December 2019. 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 2021. 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 2019. It is strongly recommended that continued emphasis be placed on the selection of survey questions that relate directly to the current community partnership work plan that will be in place in 2021.

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

# Appendix I NYS January 2018 – December 2019 **County-Specific** Comparative Results

#### Appendix I January 2018 - December 2019 County-level Comparison of

#### **Tobacco Community Assessment Adult Survey Results**

NOTE: RED highlighted percentages indicate that the result for that response (column) for that county is statistically significantly higher than the regional average percentage for that response (p<0.05) NOTE: GREEN highlighted percentages indicate that the result for that response (column) for that county is statistically

significantly lower than the regional average percentage for that response (p<0.05)

#### **Table of Tables:**

#### **Home Tobacco Policy**

Table A.1 – Which statement best describes the rules about smoking in your home? Table A.2 – Which statement best describes the rules about vaping in your home?

#### **Outdoor Tobacco Policies**

Table A.3 - Opinion about policy that would prohibit smoking: on the grounds of public buildings and workplaces?

- Table A.4 Opinion about policy that would prohibit smoking: in outdoor public places such as a park, outdoor recreation area, or playground?
- Table A.5 Opinion about policy that would prohibit smoking: at a public outdoor community event such as a fair, festival, concert, or sporting event?

#### Tobacco Point of Sale - Potential Policies

Table A.6 - Opinion about policy that would: prohibit the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies?

Table A.7 - Opinion about policy that would: prohibit the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools?

Table A.8 – Opinion about policy that would: limit the number of stores that could sell tobacco in your community?

- Table A.9 Opinion about policy that would: prohibit discounts for tobacco products at stores such as coupons, rebates, multi-pack discounts, or other special offers?
- Table A.10 Opinion about policy that would: prohibit the sale of fruit, alcohol, or candy flavored tobacco products, including e-cigarette liquids?
- Table A.11 Opinion about policy that would: prohibit the sale of flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products?
- Table A.12 If favor to "flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products", are you in favor or against "menthol" being prohibited, too?

#### Tobacco Marketing – Protecting Youth from Tobacco Imagery on Screen

Table A.13 - "Media used in schools should not include tobacco use or imagery unless depicting historical facts."

#### Smoke-Free Housing (among those who live in MUD's)

Table A.14 – Rules about smoking inside residential units in your building?

Table A.15 - In favor or against a policy that would prohibit smoking inside all residential units in your building?

#### **Tobacco and E-cigarette Use**

- Table A.16 Smoked at Least 100 Cigarettes in entire life?
- Table A.17 Current Cigarette Use Every Day, Some Days, or Not at All?
- Table A.18 Cigarette Smoking Status Current, Former, Never Smokers?
- Table A.19 Cigarette Smoking Status Current Every Day, Current Some Days, Former, Never Smokers?
- Table A.20 Currently use e-cigarettes or other electronic vaping products?
- Table A.21 Use e-cigarettes for tobacco cessation? (among only current e-cigarette users)

Table A.22 - Do you think that breathing the aerosol from someone else's e-cigarettes or other electronic vapor products is \_\_\_\_\_harmful to one's health?

|                     |                           | Which statement best describes the rules about smoking in your home? |   |                         |          |            |        |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|----------|------------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| Table A.1           |                           | Not allowed<br>anywhere inside                                       | Allowed in some<br>places or at some<br>times | Allowed anywhere inside | No rules | Don't know | Total: |  |  |  |  |
| County of Residence | Tioga (Jan. 2018)         | 88.6%  | 4.4%  | 5.3%                    | 1.6%     | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
| (sampling date)     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 87.0%  | 6.4%  | 4.4%                    | 2.1%     | 0.1%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)          | 86.8%  | 4.8%  | 6.0%                    | 2.5%     | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Broome (Jan. 2018)        | 84.3%  | 6.8%  | 5.9%                    | 2.7%     | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 82.1%  | 8.2%  | 5.0%                    | 4.4%     | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 81.8%  | 9.1%  | 5.9%                    | 3.2%     | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 72.8%  | 14.3%   | 8.9%                    | 3.5%     | 0.5%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 83.3%  | 7.7%  | 5.9%                    | 2.9%     | 0.2%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |

|                     |                           | Which statement best describes the rules about vaping in your home? |   |                            |          |            |        |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|----------------------------|----------|------------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| Table A.2           |                           | Not allowed anywhere inside   | Allowed in some<br>places or at some<br>times | Allowed anywhere<br>inside | No rules | Don't know | Total: |  |  |  |  |
| County of Residence | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 86.1%   | 4.1%  | 3.7%                       | 4.8%     | 1.3%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
| (sampling date)     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 80.3%   | 6.4%  | 6.4%                       | 5.0%     | 1.9%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 83.2%   | 5.2%  | 5.1%                       | 4.9%     | 1.6%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |  |

| Table A 2           |                           | Policy 1 | that would prohibit | smoking on the g | rounds of all work | places? |
|---------------------|---------------------------|----------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------|
| Table A.S           |                           | Favor    | Against             | Neither          | Don't know         | Total:  |
| County of Residence | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 73.0%    | 22.9%               | 3.9%             | 0.2%               | 100.0%  |
| (sampling date)     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 63.6%    | 23.0%               | 12.0%            | 1.4%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Ontario (Jan. 2019)       | 62.7%    | 27.1%               | 9.8%             | 0.3%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2018)        | 62.6%    | 31.2%               | 5.5%             | 0.8%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Seneca (Jan. 2018)        | 60.5%    | 29.9%               | 9.2%             | 0.3%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 59.5%    | 26.9%               | 11.4%            | 2.3%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Yates (Jan. 2019)         | 58.7%    | 36.6%               | 4.4%             | 0.3%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 58.5%    | 34.3%               | 4.9%             | 2.4%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)          | 56.6%    | 37.4%               | 5.9%             | 0.1%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 56.3%    | 38.3%               | 5.1%             | 0.3%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Steuben (Jan. 2019)       | 56.1%    | 37.2%               | 6.5%             | 0.3%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 55.5%    | 41.3%               | 3.1%             | 0.1%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Seneca (Dec. 2019)        | 55.3%    | 34.6%               | 8.6%             | 1.5%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Wayne (Jan. 2018)         | 53.6%    | 38.7%               | 6.9%             | 0.8%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Chenango (Jan. 2018)      | 52.3%    | 39.7%               | 6.8%             | 1.3%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Chemung (Jan. 2019)       | 52.0%    | 43.4%               | 4.5%             | 0.1%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)        | 50.1%    | 36.8%               | 12.4%            | 0.7%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Madison (June 2018)       | 49.6%    | 41.3%               | 8.6%             | 0.4%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Wayne (Dec. 2019)         | 49.5%    | 37.1%               | 12.3%            | 1.1%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Schuyler (Jan. 2019)      | 49.4%    | 44.5%               | 5.8%             | 0.2%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 47.5%    | 42.8%               | 7.6%             | 2.1%               | 100.0%  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 56.3%    | 35.5%               | 7.4%             | 0.8%               | 100.0%  |

| Table A.4                                  |                           | Policy that wo | Policy that would prohibit smoking in outdoor public places such as a park, outdoor recreation area, or playground? |         |            |        |  |  |  |
|--|---------------------------|----------------|---|---------|------------|--------|--|--|--|
|  |                           | Favor          | Against   | Neither | Don't know | Total: |  |  |  |
| County of Residence T<br>(sampling date) S | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 66.9%          | 23.8%   | 8.5%    | 0.8%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|  | Seneca (Dec. 2019)        | 63.7%          | 29.0%   | 5.8%    | 1.5%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|  | Wayne (Dec. 2019)         | 52.5%          | 36.8%   | 9.9%    | 0.7%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|  | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 52.1%          | 39.7%   | 7.3%    | 0.9%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |
| Broome (Dec.                               | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 51.9%          | 31.5%   | 14.8%   | 1.8%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|  | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 57.5%          | 32.1%   | 9.3%    | 1.2%       | 100.0% |  |  |  |

| Table A.5           |                           | Policy that would prohibit smoking at a public outdoor community event such as a fair, festival, concert, or sporting event? |         |         |            |        |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|---------|---------|------------|--------|--|
|                     |                           | Favor  | Against | Neither | Don't know | Total: |  |
| County of Residence | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 67.1%  | 21.4%   | 10.8%   | 0.7%       | 100.0% |  |
| (sampling date)     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 58.4%  | 32.8%   | 8.5%    | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 53.9%  | 34.1%   | 10.7%   | 1.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 59.8%  | 29.4%   | 10.0%   | 0.8%       | 100.0% |  |

| Table A 6           |                           | Policy that would prohibit the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies? |         |         |            |        |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|---------|---------|------------|--------|--|
|                     |                           | Favor  | Against | Neither | Don't know | Total: |  |
| County of Residence | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 74.8%  | 20.7%   | 4.1%    | 0.4%       | 100.0% |  |
| (sampling date)     | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 73.8%  | 16.5%   | 9.5%    | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2018)   | 72.8%  | 18.4%   | 8.7%    | 0.1%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2019)      | 70.3%  | 23.8%   | 5.5%    | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Rockland (Jan. 2018)      | 69.3%  | 19.3%   | 10.9%   | 0.5%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Orange (Jan. 2019)        | 69.3%  | 21.1%   | 8.6%    | 0.9%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2018)      | 69.1%  | 22.0%   | 7.3%    | 1.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Yates (Jan. 2019)         | 67.7%  | 28.9%   | 3.2%    | 0.1%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Seneca (Dec. 2019)        | 66.9%  | 25.6%   | 7.1%    | 0.4%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Ulster (Jan. 2018)        | 66.4%  | 21.7%   | 11.4%   | 0.5%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2019)   | 65.4%  | 29.7%   | 3.9%    | 0.9%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)          | 63.0%  | 24.6%   | 12.1%   | 0.2%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Ontario (Jan. 2019)       | 62.8%  | 22.8%   | 13.8%   | 0.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 62.5%  | 25.7%   | 11.5%   | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Nassau (June 2018)        | 62.0%  | 28.7%   | 9.1%    | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 60.2%  | 27.3%   | 11.8%   | 0.7%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 60.1%  | 25.7%   | 11.8%   | 2.5%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Schuyler (Jan. 2019)      | 59.3%  | 32.3%   | 7.5%    | 0.8%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Seneca (Jan. 2018)        | 59.1%  | 28.2%   | 11.1%   | 1.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Tioga (Jan. 2018)         | 58.9%  | 23.4%   | 16.8%   | 1.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 58.6%  | 33.5%   | 7.3%    | 0.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Wayne (Jan. 2018)         | 58.1%  | 34.7%   | 6.3%    | 0.8%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Jan. 2018)        | 57.3%  | 25.9%   | 15.8%   | 1.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Chenango (Jan. 2018)      | 55.5%  | 26.8%   | 13.4%   | 4.4%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Wayne (Dec. 2019)         | 54.8%  | 26.2%   | 15.6%   | 3.4%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 54.7%  | 31.0%   | 13.6%   | 0.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Suffolk (June 2018)       | 54.2%  | 34.1%   | 10.8%   | 0.9%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)        | 53.0%  | 28.7%   | 17.5%   | 0.8%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Madison (June 2018)       | 51.6%  | 33.6%   | 14.1%   | 0.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Steuben (Jan. 2019)       | 50.7%  | 33.5%   | 14.5%   | 1.4%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Chemung (Jan. 2019)       | 50.2%  | 37.2%   | 11.9%   | 0.7%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Jefferson (June 2019)     | 46.4%  | 40.1%   | 11.7%   | 1.8%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 61.2%  | 27.2%   | 10.6%   | 1.0%       | 100.0% |  |

| Table A.7           |                           | Policy that would prohibit the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools? |         |         |            |        |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|---------|---------|------------|--------|--|
|                     |                           | Favor  | Against | Neither | Don't know | Total: |  |
| County of Residence | Orange (Jan. 2019)        | 79.1%  | 15.8%   | 4.3%    | 0.7%       | 100.0% |  |
| (sampling date)     | Dutchess (Jan. 2018)      | 79.1%  | 15.2%   | 4.9%    | 0.9%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 76.6%  | 19.5%   | 3.7%    | 0.2%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2018)   | 75.8%  | 18.0%   | 6.2%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 75.3%  | 18.9%   | 5.1%    | 0.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2019)        | 73.5%  | 19.1%   | 5.7%    | 1.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Rockland (Jan. 2018)      | 72.0%  | 17.5%   | 10.1%   | 0.4%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Jan. 2018)        | 71.5%  | 19.0%   | 9.1%    | 0.4%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Ulster (Jan. 2018)        | 71.3%  | 21.2%   | 7.5%    | 0.1%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Nassau (June 2018)        | 68.9%  | 26.9%   | 3.6%    | 0.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2019)   | 68.4%  | 26.7%   | 3.7%    | 1.2%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Suffolk (June 2018)       | 67.8%  | 20.4%   | 11.5%   | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 67.7%  | 22.7%   | 9.1%    | 0.5%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Seneca (Jan. 2018)        | 67.0%  | 21.1%   | 10.8%   | 1.1%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Ontario (Jan. 2019)       | 66.9%  | 23.2%   | 8.5%    | 1.4%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Tioga (Jan. 2018)         | 66.9%  | 25.3%   | 7.4%    | 0.4%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)          | 66.7%  | 25.0%   | 8.3%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2018)        | 66.7%  | 24.0%   | 7.4%    | 1.9%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Yates (Jan. 2019)         | 63.9%  | 33.4%   | 2.7%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2019)      | 62.8%  | 35.2%   | 2.1%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Chenango (Jan. 2018)      | 62.7%  | 25.8%   | 11.1%   | 0.4%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Chemung (Jan. 2019)       | 62.4%  | 32.6%   | 5.0%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Wayne (Jan. 2018)         | 61.8%  | 27.9%   | 8.7%    | 1.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 60.4%  | 32.6%   | 6.8%    | 0.1%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)        | 58.4%  | 32.5%   | 8.2%    | 0.9%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 58.0%  | 30.5%   | 9.6%    | 2.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 56.8%  | 35.5%   | 7.6%    | 0.1%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Steuben (Jan. 2019)       | 56.5%  | 31.7%   | 11.3%   | 0.5%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Madison (June 2018)       | 56.4%  | 33.1%   | 9.7%    | 0.7%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Schuyler (Jan. 2019)      | 56.3%  | 38.9%   | 4.8%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Jefferson (June 2019)     | 55.8%  | 35.2%   | 8.6%    | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 54.8%  | 34.8%   | 9.7%    | 0.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 65.9%  | 26.2%   | 7.3%    | 0.6%       | 100.0% |  |

| Table A 8           |                           | Policy that would limit the number of stores that could sell tobacco in your community? |         |         |            |        |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---------|---------|------------|--------|--|
|                     |                           | Favor   | Against | Neither | Don't know | Total: |  |
| County of Residence | Seneca (Dec. 2019)        | 64.1%   | 30.6%   | 4.8%    | 0.4%       | 100.0% |  |
| (sampling date)     | Westchester (Jan. 2019)   | 63.4%   | 32.5%   | 3.1%    | 1.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 62.4%   | 30.1%   | 7.2%    | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Rockland (Jan. 2018)      | 62.3%   | 26.8%   | 10.7%   | 0.2%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2018)   | 61.7%   | 28.9%   | 5.3%    | 4.1%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 60.5%   | 35.7%   | 3.6%    | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Ontario (Jan. 2019)       | 60.2%   | 29.1%   | 9.9%    | 0.8%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Yates (Jan. 2019)         | 60.2%   | 32.4%   | 5.4%    | 2.1%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2018)      | 59.0%   | 35.9%   | 4.8%    | 0.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Orange (Jan. 2019)        | 58.9%   | 33.9%   | 6.4%    | 0.9%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2019)      | 58.5%   | 36.7%   | 4.8%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2019)        | 57.8%   | 27.5%   | 9.0%    | 5.7%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 57.0%   | 34.2%   | 7.7%    | 1.1%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Suffolk (June 2018)       | 56.8%   | 35.8%   | 6.7%    | 0.7%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Seneca (Jan. 2018)        | 55.6%   | 32.6%   | 10.7%   | 1.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)        | 53.4%   | 36.0%   | 9.7%    | 0.9%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Ulster (Jan. 2018)        | 53.1%   | 36.5%   | 8.9%    | 1.5%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)          | 52.7%   | 40.0%   | 6.7%    | 0.5%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Nassau (June 2018)        | 52.6%   | 39.6%   | 7.0%    | 0.8%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Tioga (Jan. 2018)         | 52.5%   | 37.0%   | 9.9%    | 0.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 52.3%   | 40.2%   | 6.5%    | 1.1%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Schuyler (Jan. 2019)      | 51.6%   | 38.2%   | 9.0%    | 1.2%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Wayne (Jan. 2018)         | 50.5%   | 41.6%   | 6.6%    | 1.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Wayne (Dec. 2019)         | 48.9%   | 37.4%   | 12.6%   | 1.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 48.7%   | 37.0%   | 13.4%   | 0.8%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Steuben (Jan. 2019)       | 48.4%   | 39.4%   | 11.7%   | 0.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2018)        | 48.2%   | 42.4%   | 7.8%    | 1.6%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Chemung (Jan. 2019)       | 47.9%   | 46.4%   | 4.8%    | 1.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Jan. 2018)        | 47.5%   | 40.1%   | 10.9%   | 1.5%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Chenango (Jan. 2018)      | 46.8%   | 40.7%   | 10.2%   | 2.4%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 44.9%   | 41.6%   | 11.2%   | 2.2%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 42.8%   | 50.3%   | 5.8%    | 1.2%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Jefferson (June 2019)     | 42.5%   | 44.7%   | 10.5%   | 2.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Madison (June 2018)       | 42.0%   | 45.4%   | 11.8%   | 0.8%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 53.7%   | 37.0%   | 8.1%    | 1.2%       | 100.0% |  |

| Table A.9           |                           | Policy that wou | ld prohibit discou<br>rebates, multi-pa | nts for tobacco pro<br>ck discounts or oth | oducts at stores s<br>ner special offers? | uch as coupons, |
|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|-----------------|
|                     |                           | Favor           | Against                                 | Neither                                    | Don't know                                | Total:          |
| County of Residence | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 70.8%           | 24.0%                                   | 5.1%                                       | 0.1%                                      | 100.0%          |
| (sampling date)     | Westchester (Jan. 2019)   | 65.0%           | 30.9%                                   | 2.7%                                       | 1.4%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Orange (Jan. 2019)        | 64.0%           | 30.1%                                   | 5.0%                                       | 0.8%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2018)   | 62.6%           | 26.7%                                   | 8.1%                                       | 2.6%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Rockland (Jan. 2018)      | 61.4%           | 32.5%                                   | 5.5%                                       | 0.6%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 61.0%           | 36.6%                                   | 2.3%                                       | 0.1%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2019)        | 60.8%           | 31.7%                                   | 5.8%                                       | 1.7%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2019)      | 60.2%           | 35.5%                                   | 4.1%                                       | 0.1%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Ontario (Jan. 2019)       | 60.2%           | 29.2%                                   | 10.1%                                      | 0.5%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Yates (Jan. 2019)         | 59.2%           | 32.7%                                   | 8.1%                                       | 0.0%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2018)      | 58.8%           | 34.6%                                   | 5.1%                                       | 1.4%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Seneca (Dec. 2019)        | 57.5%           | 36.0%                                   | 5.4%                                       | 1.2%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 55.1%           | 35.5%                                   | 9.0%                                       | 0.3%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Ulster (Jan. 2018)        | 54.8%           | 36.2%                                   | 8.2%                                       | 0.8%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)        | 54.8%           | 31.9%                                   | 13.2%                                      | 0.2%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Steuben (Jan. 2019)       | 53.0%           | 39.4%                                   | 7.1%                                       | 0.5%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 51.3%           | 40.5%                                   | 7.0%                                       | 1.1%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Schuyler (Jan. 2019)      | 49.9%           | 46.5%                                   | 3.5%                                       | 0.2%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 49.2%           | 40.1%                                   | 9.6%                                       | 1.1%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 48.6%           | 41.5%                                   | 8.6%                                       | 1.3%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Wayne (Dec. 2019)         | 48.4%           | 38.8%                                   | 10.7%                                      | 2.1%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 45.9%           | 44.2%                                   | 9.0%                                       | 0.9%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Jefferson (June 2019)     | 44.7%           | 46.2%                                   | 8.8%                                       | 0.3%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | Chemung (Jan. 2019)       | 41.6%           | 49.5%                                   | 5.8%                                       | 3.1%                                      | 100.0%          |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 55.8%           | 36.3%                                   | 7.0%                                       | 0.9%                                      | 100.0%          |

| Table A.10          |                           | Policy that would prohibit the sale of fruit, alcohol, or candy flavored tobacco products,<br>including e-cigarette liquids? |         |         |            |        |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|---------|---------|------------|--------|--|
|                     |                           | Favor  | Against | Neither | Don't know | Total: |  |
| County of Residence | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 63.9%  | 26.2%   | 8.8%    | 1.2%       | 100.0% |  |
| (sampling date)     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)        | 60.4%  | 22.7%   | 15.1%   | 1.9%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Jefferson (June 2019)     | 59.9%  | 32.7%   | 6.6%    | 0.8%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 52.9%  | 37.7%   | 8.2%    | 1.2%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Tioga (Jan. 2018)         | 40.8%  | 28.4%   | 17.8%   | 13.0%      | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Wayne (Jan. 2018)         | 37.2%  | 36.2%   | 16.5%   | 10.1%      | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Jan. 2018)        | 33.9%  | 38.6%   | 19.1%   | 8.4%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Seneca (Jan. 2018)        | 27.1%  | 38.7%   | 26.1%   | 8.1%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 47.0%  | 32.6%   | 14.8%   | 5.6%       | 100.0% |  |

| Table A.11                             |                           | Prohibit the sale of flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products? |         |         |            |        |  |
|--|---------------------------|---|---------|---------|------------|--------|--|
|  |                           | Favor   | Against | Neither | Don't know | Total: |  |
| County of Residence<br>(sampling date) | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 64.8%   | 26.3%   | 7.6%    | 1.3%       | 100.0% |  |
|  | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 63.3%   | 27.9%   | 7.4%    | 1.4%       | 100.0% |  |
|  | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 51.7%   | 36.5%   | 10.3%   | 1.5%       | 100.0% |  |
|  | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 59.9%   | 30.2%   | 8.4%    | 1.4%       | 100.0% |  |

| Table A.12                             |                           | If "yes, you favor prohibiting the sale of flavored tobacco and e-cigarette products", are<br>you in favor or against "menthol" being prohibited, too? |         |         |            |        |  |
|--|---------------------------|--|---------|---------|------------|--------|--|
|  |                           | Favor  | Against | Neither | Don't know | Total: |  |
| County of Residence<br>(sampling date) | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 87.5%  | 6.2%    | 4.0%    | 2.2%       | 100.0% |  |
|  | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 85.5%  | 5.8%    | 4.7%    | 4.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|  | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 81.8%  | 11.1%   | 5.2%    | 1.9%       | 100.0% |  |
|  | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 85.0%  | 7.7%    | 4.6%    | 2.7%       | 100.0% |  |

| Table A.13          |                           | "Media used in schools should not include tobacco use or imagery unless depicting<br>historical facts." |         |         |            |        |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---------|---------|------------|--------|--|
|                     |                           | Favor   | Against | Neither | Don't know | Total: |  |
| County of Residence | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 86.9%   | 9.4%    | 3.7%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
| (sampling date)     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 84.7%   | 13.8%   | 1.5%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 85.8%   | 11.6%   | 2.6%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |

|                     |                           |                                  | Rules insid                       | le your rental resid                       | lential unit.          |        |
|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|--------|
| Table A.14          |                           | Allowed in all residential units | Allowed in some residential units | Not allowed in<br>any residential<br>units | Don't know/Not<br>sure | Total: |
| County of Residence | Tioga (Jan. 2018)         | 3.0%                             | 10.6%                             | 76.4%                                      | 10.0%                  | 100.0% |
| (sampling date)     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 20.7%                            | 6.7%                              | 70.9%                                      | 1.7%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Chenango (Jan. 2018)      | 18.2%                            | 10.4%                             | 67.9%                                      | 3.5%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Broome (Jan. 2018)        | 19.1%                            | 6.4%                              | 67.1%                                      | 7.5%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)          | 20.8%                            | 6.7%                              | 61.7%                                      | 10.8%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Ontario (Jan. 2019)       | 9.9%                             | 12.8%                             | 59.1%                                      | 18.2%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Orange (Jan. 2019)        | 19.0%                            | 11.4%                             | 58.0%                                      | 11.6%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Madison (June 2018)       | 25.5%                            | 8.4%                              | 55.9%                                      | 10.2%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)        | 23.8%                            | 10.5%                             | 53.9%                                      | 11.8%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Seneca (Dec. 2019)        | 28.5%                            | 2.3%                              | 52.6%                                      | 16.6%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Jefferson (June 2019)     | 23.2%                            | 12.5%                             | 52.2%                                      | 12.0%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 23.2%                            | 11.4%                             | 52.1%                                      | 13.3%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 29.6%                            | 10.1%                             | 51.7%                                      | 8.7%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Seneca (Jan. 2018)        | 29.4%                            | 14.9%                             | 46.6%                                      | 9.1%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 19.2%                            | 24.9%                             | 44.4%                                      | 11.5%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 23.8%                            | 13.4%                             | 42.9%                                      | 19.9%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2019)        | 32.0%                            | 9.7%                              | 42.5%                                      | 15.8%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Wayne (Jan. 2018)         | 21.0%                            | 18.7%                             | 40.9%                                      | 19.4%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2019)   | 42.9%                            | 9.1%                              | 40.3%                                      | 7.7%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 23.2%                            | 14.1%                             | 37.0%                                      | 25.8%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2019)      | 25.4%                            | 30.5%                             | 33.9%                                      | 10.2%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 34.4%                            | 18.6%                             | 30.9%                                      | 16.1%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Wayne (Dec. 2019)         | 42.0%                            | 7.7%                              | 30.0%                                      | 20.4%                  | 100.0% |
|                     | Yates (Jan. 2019)         | 57.7%                            | 26.7%                             | 11.0%                                      | 4.6%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 25.6%                            | 12.8%                             | 49.2%                                      | 12.4%                  | 100.0% |

| Table A 1           | 5                         | Policy that would prohibit smoking inside all residential units in your building? (among<br>only MUD-dwellers) |         |         |            |        |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|---------|---------|------------|--------|--|
|                     | <b>.</b>                  | Favor  | Against | Neither | Don't know | Total: |  |
| County of Residence | Orange (Jan. 2019)        | 81.9%  | 13.5%   | 4.2%    | 0.5%       | 100.0% |  |
| (sampling date)     | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 75.5%  | 22.8%   | 0.8%    | 0.9%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 74.3%  | 18.1%   | 6.5%    | 1.1%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)        | 68.6%  | 25.6%   | 5.8%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 65.3%  | 28.5%   | 6.2%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 64.5%  | 21.1%   | 13.7%   | 0.7%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2019)      | 62.5%  | 35.0%   | 2.5%    | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 60.7%  | 24.5%   | 14.8%   | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2019)   | 56.4%  | 37.5%   | 4.3%    | 1.8%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 55.7%  | 31.0%   | 13.3%   | 0.0%       | 100.0% |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 66.5%  | 25.8%   | 7.2%    | 0.5%       | 100.0% |  |

| Table A.16          |                           | Smoked 100+ cigarettes in your entire life? |       |                |        |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|-------|----------------|--------|
|                     |                           | Yes   | No    | Don't know/Not | Total: |
| County of Residence | Ulster (Jan. 2018)        | 56.6%                                       | 43.4% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
| (sampling date)     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 54.3%                                       | 45.7% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Jefferson (June 2019)     | 54.0%                                       | 46.0% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Wavne (Dec. 2019)         | 52.7%                                       | 47.3% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 49.3%                                       | 50.7% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Madison (June 2018)       | 48.7%                                       | 51.3% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Chemung (Jan. 2019)       | 48.4%                                       | 51.6% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Broome (Jan. 2018)        | 47.6%                                       | 52.4% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 46.8%                                       | 53.2% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Seneca (Dec. 2019)        | 46.0%                                       | 54.0% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Wavne (Jan. 2018)         | 45.9%                                       | 54.1% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Tioga (Jan. 2018)         | 45.7%                                       | 54.3% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 45.0%                                       | 55.0% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 44.0%                                       | 56.0% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Steuben (Jan. 2019)       | 43.2%                                       | 56.8% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Suffolk (June 2018)       | 42.7%                                       | 57.3% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Seneca (Jan. 2018)        | 42.7%                                       | 57.3% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 42.1%                                       | 57.9% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2018)      | 41.3%                                       | 58.7% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)        | 41.3%                                       | 58.7% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2019)        | 40.6%                                       | 59.4% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Schuyler (Jan. 2019)      | 39.9%                                       | 60.1% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Ontario (Jan. 2019)       | 39.4%                                       | 60.6% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Chenango (Jan. 2018)      | 38.1%                                       | 61.9% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2019)      | 37.6%                                       | 62.4% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Yates (Jan. 2019)         | 37.4%                                       | 62.6% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)          | 37.1%                                       | 62.9% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Rockland (Jan. 2018)      | 34.4%                                       | 65.6% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2018)   | 33.7%                                       | 66.3% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2018)        | 33.5%                                       | 66.5% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Nassau (June 2018)        | 33.4%                                       | 66.6% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 33.1%                                       | 66.9% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2019)   | 30.3%                                       | 69.7% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Orange (Jan. 2019)        | 24.4%                                       | 75.6% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 42.1%                                       | 57.9% | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     |                           | Current cigarette smoking frequency |            |                 |                |        |
|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|----------------|--------|
| Table A.17          |                           | Smoke Every Dav                     | Smoke Some | Do Not Smoke At | Don't Know/Not | Total: |
| County of Residence | lefferson ( lune 2019)    | 40.0%                               | Days       | All             | Sure           | 100.0% |
| (sampling date)     | Broome (Jan. 2018)        | 16.8%                               | 5.1%       | 77.1%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Modicon (June 2019)       | 16.2%                               | 5.0%       | 78.8%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Nadison (June 2016)       | 16.1%                               | 5.3%       | 78.6%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Steubert (Jan. 2019)      | 15.4%                               | 4.0%       | 80.6%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Olster (Jan. 2018)        | 15.1%                               | 4.6%       | 80.2%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Chemung (Jan. 2019)       | 14.6%                               | 5.8%       | 79.6%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)        | 14.2%                               | 4.1%       | 81.6%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Tioga (Jan. 2018)         | 13.9%                               | 4.5%       | 81.5%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Seneca (Jan. 2018)        | 13.9%                               | 4.7%       | 81.4%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Chenango (Jan. 2018)      | 13.7%                               | .9%        | 85.4%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 13.5%                               | 1.6%       | 84.9%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 12.2%                               | 7.0%       | 80.8%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Schuyler (Jan. 2019)      | 12.2%                               | 4.9%       | 82.9%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 11.9%                               | 4.7%       | 83.5%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2019)        | 11.2%                               | 1.6%       | 87.2%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2019)      | 11.0%                               | 1.1%       | 87.8%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Wayne (Dec. 2019)         | 11.0%                               | 5.7%       | 83.3%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)          | 10.9%                               | 2.9%       | 86.2%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Wayne (Jan. 2018)         | 10.3%                               | 10.9%      | 78.8%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 10.2%                               | 3.0%       | 86.7%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2018)      | 10.1%                               | 5.7%       | 84.2%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Orange (Jan. 2019)        | 10.0%                               | 1.0%       | 89.0%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Ontario (Jan. 2019)       | 10.0%                               | 6.5%       | 83.5%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Seneca (Dec. 2019)        | 9.6%                                | 6.4%       | 83.9%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 9.5%                                | 7.5%       | 83.0%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 9.0%                                | 7.8%       | 83.3%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2018)        | 7.9%                                | 7.7%       | 84.5%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Yates (Jan. 2019)         | 7.3%                                | 6.6%       | 86.0%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Suffolk (June 2018)       | 7.3%                                | 7.2%       | 85.5%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 6.9%                                | 4.7%       | 88.3%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2019)   | 6.4%                                | 8.5%       | 85.1%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Rockland (Jan. 2018)      | 6.2%                                | 4.1%       | 89.6%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Nassau (June 2018)        | 5.6%                                | 5.1%       | 89.3%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2018)   | 4.5%                                | 4.6%       | 90.9%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 11.0%                               | 5.1%       | 83.9%           | 0.0%           | 100.0% |

| Table A 19          | Cigarette Smoking Status  |                |               |                |        |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|--------|--|
| Table A.To          |                           | Current smoker | Former smoker | Never a smoker | Total: |  |
| County of Residence | Jefferson (June 2019)     | 22.9%          | 31.1%         | 46.0%          | 100.0% |  |
| (sampling date)     | Madison (June 2018)       | 21.4%          | 27.2%         | 51.3%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Jan. 2018)        | 21.2%          | 26.3%         | 52.4%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Wayne (Jan. 2018)         | 21.2%          | 24.7%         | 54.1%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Chemung (Jan. 2019)       | 20.4%          | 28.0%         | 51.6%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Ulster (Jan. 2018)        | 19.8%          | 36.9%         | 43.4%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Steuben (Jan. 2019)       | 19.4%          | 23.7%         | 56.8%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 19.2%          | 27.6%         | 53.2%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Seneca (Jan. 2018)        | 18.6%          | 24.1%         | 57.3%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Tioga (Jan. 2018)         | 18.5%          | 27.2%         | 54.3%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)        | 18.4%          | 22.9%         | 58.7%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Schuyler (Jan. 2019)      | 17.1%          | 22.8%         | 60.1%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 17.0%          | 37.3%         | 45.7%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Wayne (Dec. 2019)         | 16.7%          | 36.0%         | 47.3%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 16.7%          | 28.2%         | 55.0%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 16.5%          | 27.5%         | 56.0%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Ontario (Jan. 2019)       | 16.5%          | 22.8%         | 60.6%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Seneca (Dec. 2019)        | 16.1%          | 29.9%         | 54.0%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2018)      | 15.8%          | 25.5%         | 58.7%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2018)        | 15.5%          | 18.0%         | 66.5%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 15.1%          | 34.2%         | 50.7%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2019)   | 14.9%          | 16.3%         | 68.9%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Chenango (Jan. 2018)      | 14.6%          | 23.5%         | 61.9%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Suffolk (June 2018)       | 14.5%          | 28.2%         | 57.3%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Yates (Jan. 2019)         | 14.0%          | 23.4%         | 62.6%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)          | 13.8%          | 23.3%         | 62.9%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 13.3%          | 28.8%         | 57.9%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2019)        | 12.8%          | 27.9%         | 59.4%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2019)      | 12.2%          | 26.0%         | 61.8%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 11.7%          | 21.4%         | 66.9%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Orange (Jan. 2019)        | 11.0%          | 13.4%         | 75.6%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Nassau (June 2018)        | 10.7%          | 22.7%         | 66.6%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Rockland (Jan. 2018)      | 10.4%          | 24.1%         | 65.6%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2018)   | 9.1%           | 24.6%         | 66.3%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 16.1%          | 26.1%         | 57.9%          | 100.0% |  |

|                     |                           | Cigarette Smoking Status |                      |               |                |        |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------|--------|--|
| Table A.19          |                           | Current Every<br>Day     | Current Some<br>Days | Former Smoker | Never a Smoker | Total: |  |
| County of Residence | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 9.5%                     | 7.5%                 | 37.3%         | 45.7%          | 100.0% |  |
| (sampling date)     | Ulster (Jan. 2018)        | 15.1%                    | 4.6%                 | 36.9%         | 43.4%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Wayne (Dec. 2019)         | 11.0%                    | 5.7%                 | 36.0%         | 47.3%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 13.5%                    | 1.6%                 | 34.2%         | 50.7%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Jefferson (June 2019)     | 16.8%                    | 6.1%                 | 31.1%         | 46.0%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Seneca (Dec. 2019)        | 9.6%                     | 6.4%                 | 29.9%         | 54.0%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 10.2%                    | 3.0%                 | 28.8%         | 57.9%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Suffolk (June 2018)       | 7.3%                     | 7.2%                 | 28.2%         | 57.3%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 9.0%                     | 7.8%                 | 28.2%         | 55.0%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Chemung (Jan. 2019)       | 14.6%                    | 5.8%                 | 28.0%         | 51.6%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2019)        | 11.2%                    | 1.6%                 | 27.9%         | 59.4%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 12.2%                    | 7.0%                 | 27.6%         | 53.2%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 11.9%                    | 4.7%                 | 27.5%         | 56.0%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Madison (June 2018)       | 16.1%                    | 5.3%                 | 27.2%         | 51.3%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Tioga (Jan. 2018)         | 13.9%                    | 4.5%                 | 27.2%         | 54.3%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Jan. 2018)        | 16.2%                    | 5.0%                 | 26.3%         | 52.4%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2019)      | 11.0%                    | 1.1%                 | 26.0%         | 61.8%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2018)      | 10.1%                    | 5.7%                 | 25.5%         | 58.7%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Wayne (Jan. 2018)         | 10.3%                    | 10.9%                | 24.7%         | 54.1%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2018)   | 4.5%                     | 4.6%                 | 24.6%         | 66.3%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Seneca (Jan. 2018)        | 13.9%                    | 4.7%                 | 24.1%         | 57.3%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Rockland (Jan. 2018)      | 6.2%                     | 4.1%                 | 24.1%         | 65.6%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Steuben (Jan. 2019)       | 15.4%                    | 4.0%                 | 23.7%         | 56.8%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Chenango (Jan. 2018)      | 13.7%                    | .9%                  | 23.5%         | 61.9%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Yates (Jan. 2019)         | 7.3%                     | 6.6%                 | 23.4%         | 62.6%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)          | 10.9%                    | 2.9%                 | 23.3%         | 62.9%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)        | 14.2%                    | 4.1%                 | 22.9%         | 58.7%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Ontario (Jan. 2019)       | 10.0%                    | 6.5%                 | 22.8%         | 60.6%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Schuyler (Jan. 2019)      | 12.2%                    | 4.9%                 | 22.8%         | 60.1%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Nassau (June 2018)        | 5.6%                     | 5.1%                 | 22.7%         | 66.6%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 6.9%                     | 4.7%                 | 21.4%         | 66.9%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2018)        | 7.9%                     | 7.7%                 | 18.0%         | 66.5%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2019)   | 6.4%                     | 8.5%                 | 16.3%         | 68.9%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Orange (Jan. 2019)        | 10.0%                    | 1.0%                 | 13.4%         | 75.6%          | 100.0% |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 11.0%                    | 5.1%                 | 26.1%         | 57.9%          | 100.0% |  |

|                     | 2                         | Current E-cigarette or Other Electronic Vaping Product Frequency of Use |           |        |            |                        |        |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|-----------|--------|------------|------------------------|--------|
| Table A.20          | J                         | Every Day   | Some Days | Rarely | Not at all | Don't Know/Not<br>Sure | Total: |
| County of Residence | Seneca (Jan. 2018)        | 3.1%  | 6.2%      | 6.5%   | 84.1%      | 0.0%                   | 100.0% |
| (sampling date)     | Ontario (Jan. 2019)       | 6.1%  | 1.3%      | 6.7%   | 85.3%      | 0.6%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Wayne (Jan. 2018)         | 5.4%  | 5.5%      | 3.2%   | 85.4%      | 0.5%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2019)   | 2.9%  | 6.7%      | 4.2%   | 86.2%      | 0.1%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Suffolk (June 2018)       | 3.5%  | 6.4%      | 2.7%   | 87.0%      | 0.4%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Broome (Jan. 2018)        | 2.9%  | 3.9%      | 4.5%   | 87.7%      | 1.1%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 5.5%  | 4.3%      | 2.1%   | 87.9%      | 0.3%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Jefferson (June 2019)     | 3.1%  | 3.1%      | 4.9%   | 88.2%      | 0.7%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Yates (Jan. 2019)         | 1.7%  | 2.5%      | 6.9%   | 88.9%      | 0.0%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)          | 2.4%  | 2.4%      | 6.1%   | 89.0%      | 0.2%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Ulster (Jan. 2018)        | 3.4%  | 5.2%      | 2.4%   | 89.0%      | 0.0%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Oneida (Jan. 2019)        | 4.1%  | 0.8%      | 5.4%   | 89.5%      | 0.2%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2019)        | 2.9%  | 4.6%      | 2.8%   | 89.6%      | 0.0%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2018)        | 1.3%  | 3.0%      | 4.7%   | 90.6%      | 0.3%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Orange (Jan. 2019)        | 3.0%  | 1.2%      | 4.1%   | 90.7%      | 1.0%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 1.2%  | 4.5%      | 2.4%   | 91.1%      | 0.8%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 1.2%  | 2.2%      | 5.3%   | 91.2%      | 0.1%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2018)   | 0.7%  | 5.5%      | 2.6%   | 91.2%      | 0.0%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Chemung (Jan. 2019)       | 1.0%  | 5.6%      | 1.8%   | 91.6%      | 0.0%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 0.6%  | 6.5%      | 1.2%   | 91.6%      | 0.1%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 3.6%  | 4.0%      | 0.3%   | 91.9%      | 0.2%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Steuben (Jan. 2019)       | 1.5%  | 3.5%      | 2.8%   | 92.2%      | 0.0%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 4.3%  | 1.6%      | 1.4%   | 92.6%      | 0.0%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Wayne (Dec. 2019)         | 4.2%  | 1.0%      | 1.7%   | 93.0%      | 0.1%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Rockland (Jan. 2018)      | 1.2%  | 3.7%      | 1.8%   | 93.0%      | 0.2%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2019)      | 1.8%  | 2.5%      | 2.5%   | 93.1%      | 0.1%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Schuyler (Jan. 2019)      | 6.2%  | 0.7%      | 0.0%   | 93.2%      | 0.0%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Nassau (June 2018)        | 1.5%  | 3.3%      | 1.6%   | 93.2%      | 0.4%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Tioga (Jan. 2018)         | 1.1%  | 0.2%      | 5.1%   | 93.3%      | 0.3%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Chenango (Jan. 2018)      | 2.4%  | 0.7%      | 3.3%   | 93.6%      | 0.0%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2018)      | 1.5%  | 0.7%      | 3.0%   | 94.6%      | 0.1%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Madison (June 2018)       | 0.6%  | 1.2%      | 3.6%   | 94.7%      | 0.0%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Herkimer (Dec. 2019)      | 1.6%  | 0.4%      | 2.7%   | 95.3%      | 0.0%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | Seneca (Dec. 2019)        | 2.4%  | 1.3%      | 0.7%   | 95.5%      | 0.0%                   | 100.0% |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 2.6%  | 3.1%      | 3.3%   | 90.7%      | 0.2%                   | 100.0% |

| T-LL- A OA          |                           | Why                  | Why would you say that you use e-cigarettes? |          |        |  |  |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--|----------|--------|--|--|--|
| Table A.21          |                           | Tobacco<br>cessation | Non-cessation<br>reason                      | Not sure | Total: |  |  |  |
| County of Residence | Schuyler (Jan. 2019)      | 100.0%               | 0.0%   | 0.0%     | 100.0% |  |  |  |
| (sampling date)     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 71.2%                | 28.0%  | 0.8%     | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|                     | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 68.2%                | 30.2%  | 1.7%     | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|                     | Nassau (June 2018)        | 56.7%                | 37.2%  | 6.0%     | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|                     | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 54.9%                | 45.1%  | 0.0%     | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|                     | Chemung (Jan. 2019)       | 48.9%                | 51.1%  | 0.0%     | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|                     | Suffolk (June 2018)       | 46.1%                | 50.1%  | 3.8%     | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 42.0%                | 51.7%  | 6.2%     | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|                     | Livingston (Dec. 2019)    | 39.5%                | 60.1%  | 0.4%     | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 35.8%                | 63.8%  | 0.5%     | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|                     | Steuben (Jan. 2019)       | 29.7%                | 70.3%  | 0.0%     | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|                     | Monroe (Jan. 2019)        | 25.2%                | 68.4%  | 6.4%     | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)          | 24.6%                | 55.8%  | 19.6%    | 100.0% |  |  |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 49.4%                | 47.1%  | 3.5%     | 100.0% |  |  |  |

| Table A.22          |                           | Do you think that breathing the aerosol from someone else's e-cigarettes or other electronic vapor<br>products isto one's health? |                     |                  |                    |                        |        |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|--|
|                     |                           | Very harmful  | Somewhat<br>harmful | Not that harmful | Not at all harmful | Don't know/Not<br>sure | Total: |  |
| County of Residence | Tioga (Dec. 2019)         | 40.3%   | 31.0%               | 9.4%             | 3.5%               | 15.8%                  | 100.0% |  |
| (sampling date)     | Broome (Dec. 2019)        | 37.3%   | 33.3%               | 10.3%            | 6.6%               | 12.5%                  | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Orange (Jan. 2019)        | 34.0%   | 38.9%               | 7.8%             | 6.2%               | 13.0%                  | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Nassau (Jan. 2019)        | 31.5%   | 35.1%               | 7.9%             | 9.8%               | 15.8%                  | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Nassau (June 2018)        | 30.1%   | 34.3%               | 9.1%             | 9.1%               | 17.3%                  | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Suffolk (Jan. 2019)       | 30.0%   | 33.9%               | 11.7%            | 11.6%              | 12.9%                  | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Dutchess (Jan. 2019)      | 27.6%   | 41.0%               | 7.9%             | 9.9%               | 13.6%                  | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Suffolk (June 2018)       | 26.3%   | 35.9%               | 11.7%            | 5.5%               | 20.6%                  | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Westchester (Jan. 2019)   | 26.1%   | 40.7%               | 10.5%            | 9.1%               | 13.5%                  | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Niagara (June 2019)       | 24.3%   | 32.2%               | 14.8%            | 10.1%              | 18.7%                  | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Broome (Jan. 2018)        | 24.2%   | 32.1%               | 14.7%            | 6.5%               | 22.5%                  | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Erie (June 2018)          | 24.0%   | 30.9%               | 18.9%            | 9.7%               | 16.5%                  | 100.0% |  |
|                     | Tioga (Jan. 2018)         | 17.4%   | 28.7%               | 11.4%            | 6.5%               | 36.0%                  | 100.0% |  |
|                     | ALL COUNTIES<br>COMBINED: | 28.7%   | 34.5%               | 11.2%            | 8.0%               | 17.6%                  | 100.0% |  |

# Appendix II The 2019 **Broome County** Survey Instrument

Introductory Script

Hello, this is \_\_\_\_\_\_ calling on behalf of the New York State Department of Health. We are not selling anything, we are conducting a very short survey in Broome and Tioga Counties about health-related issues. The survey should only take about 2-3 minutes; would you be willing to help us out today/tonight?

If YES- "Great, thanks." If NO-try to arrange a CALL BACK time.

<u>NOTE:</u> 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."

#### **BE PREPARED TO EXPLAIN:**

-the local tobacco coalition completes this survey of opinions and behaviors about every two years,

-they use the survey data to evaluate their programs,

-they use the survey data to plan future activities,

-they use the survey data to improve what they do,

So ... they could really use your help.

"Would you like me to start with the first question, and you can stop the survey anytime you'd like?"

| * What county do you live in | 1?         |         |
|------------------------------|------------|---------|
| O Broome                     | Livingston | 🔵 Tioga |
| Herkimer                     | 🔘 Seneca   | O Wayne |
| Other (please specify)       |            |         |
|                              |            |         |
|                              |            |         |

# BROOME/TIOGA - Advancing Tobacco Free Communities Community Survey 2019

Secondhand Smoke Exposure

Our first question(s) relate(s) to secondhand smoke exposure, and rules about smoking and vaping.

Q1: For tobacco products that are burned, such as cigarettes, cigars, pipes or hookah, which statement best describes the rules about smoking in your home? Would you say...

- Smoking is not allowed anywhere inside your home
- Smoking is allowed in some places or at some times
- Smoking is allowed anywhere inside the home
- There are no rules about smoking inside the home
- On't know

Q2: For electronic cigarette products such as JUULs, vapes, e-hookahs, etc. which statement best describes the rules about their use in your home? Would you say...

- Not allowed anywhere inside your home
- Allowed in some places or at some times
- Allowed anywhere inside the home
- There are no rules about vaping inside the home
- 🔵 Don't know

# BROOME/TIOGA - Advancing Tobacco Free Communities Community Survey 2019

# **Outdoor Tobacco Policy**

#### Our next question(s) relate to outdoor tobacco policy.

| What is your opinion about policies that         | _? |
|--|----|
| Are you in favor or against this type of policy? |    |

|  | Favor      | Against    | Neither<br>Favor or<br>Against | Don't<br>Know/Not<br>Sure |
|--|------------|------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Q6: Prohibit smoking on the grounds of all workplaces?   | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$                     | $\bigcirc$                |
| Q8: Prohibit smoking in outdoor public places such as a park, outdoor recreation area, or playground?          | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$                     | $\bigcirc$                |
| Q9: Prohibit smoking at a public outdoor community event such as a fair, festival, concert, or sporting event? | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$                     | $\bigcirc$                |

# BROOME/TIOGA - Advancing Tobacco Free Communities Community Survey 2019

# **Tobacco Point of Sale**

#### Next, we are interested in your opinions about locations where tobacco is sold.

# What is your opinion about policies that \_\_\_\_\_ Are you in favor or against this type of policy?

|   | Favor      | Against    | Neither<br>Favor or<br>Against | Don't<br>Know/Not<br>Sure |
|---|------------|------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Q12: Prohibit the sale of all tobacco products in pharmacies?   | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$                     | $\bigcirc$                |
| Q13: Prohibit the sale of tobacco products in stores that are located near schools?   | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$                     | $\bigcirc$                |
| Q14: Limit the number of stores that could sell tobacco in your community?  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$                     | $\bigcirc$                |
| Q16: Prohibit discounts for tobacco products at stores<br>such as coupons, rebates, multi-pack discounts, or<br>other special offers? | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$                     | $\bigcirc$                |
| Q19: Prohibit the sale of fruit, alcohol, or candy flavored tobacco products, including e-cigarette liquids?                          | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$                     | $\bigcirc$                |
| Q20: Prohibit the sale of flavored tobacco and e-<br>cigarette products?  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$                     | $\bigcirc$                |
| Q21: If <u>favor to Q20</u> , are you in favor or against<br>"menthol" being be prohibited, too?                                      | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$                     | $\bigcirc$                |

?

# BROOME/TIOGA - Advancing Tobacco Free Communities Community Survey 2019

Protecting Youth from Tobacco On Screen

# Our next question deals with tobacco portrayed on screen in the media and movies.

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

|   | Agree      | Disagree   | Don't Know/Not<br>Sure |
|---|------------|------------|------------------------|
| Q25: "Media used in schools should NOT include<br>tobacco use or imagery unless depicting historical<br>facts." | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$             |

# BROOME/TIOGA - Advancing Tobacco Free Communities Community Survey 2019

# Smoke-Free Housing

# Next, we have some questions about smoking in multiple-unit dwellings or apartments.

Q29: Do you live in an apartment, condominium, townhouse, or other multi-unit dwelling?

() Yes (MUD) () No (not a MUD) () Don't Know/Not Sure

Q31: 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 allowed in some residential units
- Smoking is not allowed in any residential units
- Don't know/Not sure

Q32: Are you in favor or against a policy that would prohibit smoking inside all residential units in your building?

○ Favor ○ Against ○ Neither favor or against ○ Don't know/Not sure

#### BROOME/TIOGA - Advancing Tobacco Free Communities Community Survey 2019

# TOBACCO USE

#### Our last section of questions deals with Tobacco Use.

Q35: Have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your entire life?

○ Yes ○ No ○ Don't Know/Not Sure

\* Q36: Do you now smoke cigarettes everyday, some days, or not at all?

○ Every day ○ Some days ○ Not at all

Q37: Do you now use e-cigarettes or other electronic "vaping" products every day, some days, rarely, or not at all?

🔿 Every day 🔵 Some days 🔵 Rarely 🔵 Not at all 🔵 Don't Know/Not Sure

Q38: If YES: Why would you say that you use e-cigarettes?

🔿 To stop using tobacco products (cessation) 🔿 Other reason than cessation 🔿 Don't Know/Not Sure

Q40: Do you think that breathing the aerosol from someone else's e-cigarettes or other electronic vaping products is very harmful to one's health; somewhat harmful to one's health, not that harmful to one's health, or not at all harmful to one' health?

○ Very ○ Somewhat ○ Not that ○ Not at all ○ Don't Know/Not Sure

As we finish, 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.

# **BE PREPARED TO EXPLAIN:**

**Reason we are asking these questions:** 

"To determine whether the randomly selected sample we collected is an accurate reflection of the demographic characteristics of the entire population of \_\_\_\_\_\_County. We can compare our sample demographics to the US Census reports. We want to ensure that we do not over nor under represent certain groups."

\* AGE: If you don't mind me asking, what is your age (read intervals...)?

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

\* EDUCATION: Which of the following best describes your highest educational attainment? (read first four choices)

- High school graduate, or less
- Some college coursework, but less than a Bachelors Degree
- Bachelors Degree

Graduate or professional degree

On't Know/Refused (do not read)

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

| O None   | <u> </u> | 4  |
|----------|----------|----|
| <u> </u> | 3        | 5+ |

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

| O Male                 | ○ Female | O Transgender |
|------------------------|----------|---------------|
| Other (please specify) |          |               |
|                        |          |               |

INCOME: 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 accurately represents the whole population that lives in \_\_\_\_\_ County)

 Less than \$25,000
 \$100,000 to \$124,999

 \$25,000 to \$49,999
 \$125,000 to \$149,999

 \$50,000 to \$74,999
 \$150,000 or more

 \$75,000 to \$99,999
 Don't know/Refused (don't read)

# \* GEOGRAPHY: What is your postal Zip code?

| 13732                  | 13777 | 13845   |
|------------------------|-------|---------|
| 13734                  | 13787 | 13848   |
| 13736                  | 13790 | 13850   |
| 13737                  | 13794 | 13851   |
| 13743                  | 13795 | 13862   |
| 13744                  | 13797 | 13864   |
| 13745                  | 13802 | 13865   |
| 13746                  | 13811 | 0 13901 |
| 13748                  | 13812 | 13902   |
| 13749                  | 13813 | 0 13903 |
| 13754                  | 13826 | 13904   |
| 13760                  | 13827 | 13905   |
| 13761                  | 13833 | 14859   |
| 13762                  | 13835 | 14883   |
| 13763                  | 13840 | 14892   |
| Other (please specify) |       |         |
|                        |       |         |

\* MODALITY: Are you speaking on a cell phone or a landline?

O Cell

Landline

\* PHONE OWNERSHIP: Finally, 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.

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 you hang up.

\* Phone Number of Participant:

\* INTERVIEWER NAME:

COMMENTS: (either about this call, or from the participant)

\$