

COMMUNITY TOBACCO SURVEY OF ADULT RESIDENTS OF ST. LAWRENCE COUNTY (NEW YORK)

**Opinions, Behaviors, and Perceptions Related to
Exposure to Secondhand Smoke, Spreading the
Message About the Dangers of Tobacco, Tobacco
Advertising, Tobacco Sales, Tobacco Use, and
Tobacco Cessation**

December 2010



Conducted for
St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership
Canton, New York

Prepared by
Joel LaLone Consulting
Watertown, New York

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	Page 1
Methodology.....	Page 1
Table 1 – Response Rates for the December 2010 St. Lawrence County Community Tobacco Survey.....	Page 2
Demographics of the Sample – Who was interviewed?.....	Page 2
Table 2 – Demographics of the Sample Compared to US Census Estimates for St. Lawrence County.....	Page 3
Summary of Findings	Page 5
Presentation of Results	Page 11
Technical Comments for Interpretation of the Presented Results	Page 12
Margin of Error – Using this Data to Estimate for Entire St. Lawrence County Adult Populations.....	Page 12
Table 3 – Approximate Margin of Error for Varying Sample Sizes and Varying Sample Percentages.....	Page 14
Tests for Statistical Significance – Using this Data to Test for Trends, Differences, and Relationships.....	Page 15
Table 4 – Sample Sizes and Approximate Margins of Error Within Demographic Subgroups.....	Page 17
Spreading the Message About the Dangers of Tobacco Findings	Page 19
Table 5 – Have you heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership?.....	Page 19
Table 6 – Source where heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership?.....	Page 20
Table 7 – Seen recent media campaign about tobacco advertising in stores?.....	Page 21
Table 8 – Heard of the NYS Smokers’ Quitline?.....	Page 22
Table 9 – Have you been asked if you smoke by a health professional in past 12 months?.....	Page 23
Tobacco Advertising Findings	Page 24
Table 10 – Exposure to Tobacco Advertising in Past 30 days – Posters or Windows at Shops Where Tobacco Sold.....	Page 24
Table 11 – Tobacco Advertising Noticed at Convenience Stores, Supermarkets, Gas Stations.....	Page 25
Table 12 – “Retailers removing tobacco advertising would decrease youth smoking.”.....	Page 26
Table 13 – Opinion about eliminating the display of tobacco products – at convenience stores and gas stations?.....	Page 27
Table 14 – Opinion about eliminating the display of tobacco products – at grocery stores?.....	Page 28
Table 15 – Opinion about eliminating the display of tobacco products – at pharmacies?.....	Page 29
Table 16 – Should store owners voluntarily decrease the number of tobacco ads?.....	Page 30
Tobacco Sales Findings	Page 31
Table 17 – Convenience stores and gas stations should or should not sell tobacco products?.....	Page 31
Table 18 – Grocery stores should or should not sell tobacco products?.....	Page 32
Table 19 – Pharmacies should or should not sell tobacco products?.....	Page 33
Table 20 – Should tobacco retailers be required to keep tobacco out of view?.....	Page 34
Secondhand Smoke Exposure Findings – Your Home and/or Personal Vehicle	Page 35
Table 21 – Breathing secondhand smoke considered dangerous?.....	Page 35
Table 22 – Rules About Smoking in your Home.....	Page 36
Table 23 – Rules About Smoking in the Personal Vehicle.....	Page 37
Table 24 – Support for a law in NYS prohibiting smoking inside a car when a person under the age of 18 is present.....	Page 38
Secondhand Smoke Exposure Findings – At the Workplace	Page 39
Table 25 – Employment Status.....	Page 39
Table 26 – Is there a policy that prohibits smoking at your workplace?.....	Page 40
Table 27 – Opinions About a Smoke-free Policy at the workplace – support vs. oppose.....	Page 41
Table 28 – Employer offered any stop-smoking programs?.....	Page 42
Secondhand Smoke Exposure Findings – Public Outdoor Locations.....	Page 43
Table 29 – SUMMARY- Attitudes About Restricting or Eliminating Smoking at Public Outdoor Locations.....	Page 43
Table 30 – Support for a Smoke-free Policy at Outdoor Recreation Area (park, pool, or beach).....	Page 44
Table 31 – Support for a Smoke-free Policy at Public Building Entryways	Page 45
Table 32 – Support for a Smoke-free Policy at Sporting Events	Page 46
Tobacco Use Findings	Page 47
Table 33 – Smoked at Least 100 Cigarettes in Entire Life?.....	Page 47
Table 34 – Some Every Day, Some Days, or Not at All.....	Page 48
Table 35 – Cigarette Use Status – Current, Former, Never Smokers?.....	Page 49
Table 36 – Summary: Non-cigarette Tobacco Use – Smokeless Tobacco, e-cigarettes.....	Page 50
Table 37 – Non-cigarette Tobacco Use – Use at least one non-cigarette type of product.....	Page 51
Table 38 – Overall Tobacco Use.....	Page 52

[Table of Contents \(continued\)](#)

Further Attitudes, Behaviors, Interests, and Familiarity among Former Smokers Findings.....	Page 53
Table 39 – How long ago did you quit smoking?.....	Page 53
Table 40 – Did the price of tobacco have an impact on your quitting smoking?.....	Page 54
Further Attitudes, Behaviors, Interests, and Familiarity among Current Smokers Findings.....	Page 55
Table 41 – Average number of cigarettes per day smoked?.....	Page 55
Table 42 – Have you been advised to quit by a health professional in past 12 months?.....	Page 56
Table 43 – Quit for at least one day in past 12 months trying to quit?.....	Page 57
Table 44 – Number of quit attempts in past three years?.....	Page 58
Table 45 – Purchase cigarettes online in past 12 months?.....	Page 59
Table 46 – Purchase cigarettes at an Indian enterprise or reservation in past 12 months?.....	Page 60
Table 47 – Has the price of tobacco had an impact on your tobacco use?.....	Page 61
Table 48 – Have any recent laws or restrictions had an impact on the amount you smoke?.....	Page 62
Table 49 – Do you want to quit smoking now?.....	Page 63
Table 50 – If you had health insurance that paid for quit-smoking medication would you be more likely to quit?.....	Page 64
Concluding Comments	Page 65
Appendix – The Survey Instrument	Page 65

[Contact Information](#)

St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership
Mr. Benjamin Todd, Coordinator
St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership
St. Lawrence County Public Health Department
80 State Highway 310
Suite 2
Canton, New York 13617
Phone: 315-386-2325
Fax: 315-386-2744
btodd@co.st-lawrence.ny.us
lmaki@co.st-lawrence.ny.us

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

NYS Smokers' Quitline
1-866-NY-QUITS 1-866-697-8487

Introduction

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

The objectives of the New York Tobacco Control Program and its community partnerships include:

1. eliminating exposure to secondhand smoke;
2. changing the community's attitudes and policies regarding tobacco use, thereby decreasing the social acceptability of tobacco;
3. promoting cessation of tobacco use;
4. preventing the initiation of tobacco use among youths and adults;
5. building and maintaining effective tobacco control infrastructure; and
6. contributing to the science of tobacco control.

To accomplish this mission in St. Lawrence County, the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership has a need for current and accurate information regarding tobacco-related behaviors and attitudes among St. Lawrence County residents. This information will enable the community partnership to better:

- **plan and define** goals, objectives, programs, services, initiatives, and promotions to be provided in the future by the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership, and
- **measure and evaluate the effectiveness of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership** in meeting its goals and objectives by using this data for comparison to past studies, and future similar studies completed in St. Lawrence County in subsequent years, as well as to comparable regional data.

To measure the necessary attitudes and behaviors regarding tobacco issues in St. Lawrence County, the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership contracted with *Joel LaLone Consulting*, from Watertown, New York, to complete a community study. The study involved completion of a random telephone survey of a sample of 400 adult residents of St. Lawrence County. The survey included the following nine primary sections of questions/information regarding attitudes and behaviors related to tobacco:

1. Spreading the Message About the Dangers of Tobacco
2. Tobacco Advertising
3. Tobacco Sales
4. Secondhand Smoke Exposure – Your Home and/or Personal Vehicle
5. Secondhand Smoke Exposure – Public Outdoor Locations
6. Secondhand Smoke Exposure – At the Workplace
7. Tobacco Use
8. Further Attitudes, Behaviors, Interests, and Familiarity among Former Smokers
9. Further Attitudes, Behaviors, Interests, and Familiarity among Current Smokers

This report is a summary and explanation of the findings of the St. Lawrence County community tobacco study completed for the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership in December 2010. When possible, comparisons of the current results are made to the results of previous community tobacco surveys completed in St. Lawrence County in 2006 and 2008. Additionally, the current St. Lawrence County results are compared to current regional average results. The regional average results are derived using the findings from seventeen Central, Northern, and Western New York counties (including St. Lawrence County) that completed community tobacco studies during June-December 2010 that are similar to the current St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership study. Finally, the current results are cross-tabulated by the possible explanatory factors of Gender, Age, Education Level, Income Level, and Current Cigarette Smoking Status.

Methodology

The survey instrument used in this study was developed through the collective efforts of the evaluation specialists at the New York State Department of Health Tobacco Control Program, together with the local tobacco coalition coordinator at the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership. The instrument, the introductory script used by interviewers on the telephone, and the required methodology to collect the data (complete interviews) were each approved by the Institutional Review Board of the New York State Department of Health in November 2010. The survey included approximately 50 items (questions) regarding the nine sets of

tobacco issues outlined in the preceding introduction (including demographic questions). Copies of the script and survey instrument are attached as an appendix.

The study included completing interviews of 400 adult residents of St. Lawrence County. All interviews were completed via telephone. To be eligible to complete the survey, the resident was required to be at least 18 years of age. Two thousand five hundred (2,500) personal residence telephone numbers were randomly selected from St. Lawrence County (predominately landlines, occasionally interviews were completed on cellular phones). The telephone numbers were obtained from an unscrubbed list, ensuring that individuals whose households are included in the “telemarketing do-not-call list” would be represented in this study. After selecting the 2,500 random telephone numbers, the list was randomly sorted a second time. All telephone calls were made between 3:30 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. from a call center in Watertown, New York, on the evenings of December 27th, 2010 through January 6th, 2011. The staff of *Joel LaLone Consulting*, who completed the interviews, has extensive experience and training in human subject research methodology and effective interviewing techniques. Mr. LaLone supervised the telephone interviewing at all times. From the 2,500 personal residence telephone numbers initially randomly generated for St. Lawrence County, it was only necessary to attempt to contact 1,823 households before completing the 400 interviews. When each of the 1,823 telephone number was attempted, one of four results occurred: Completion of an interview; a Decline to be interviewed; No Answer/Busy; or an Invalid Number. As required within the research protocol provided by the New York State Department of Health, voluntary informed consent was obtained from each resident before the interview was completed. This protocol included informing each resident that it was his or her right to decline to answer any and all individual questions within the interview. To be categorized as a completed interview, at least one-half (50%) of the questions in the survey 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 survey was approximately ten minutes. Declines to be interviewed (refusals) were not called back with an attempt to convince the resident to reconsider the interview. If no contact was made at a telephone number (No Answer/Busy), callbacks were made to the number. Telephone numbers that were not successfully contacted and, as a result, were ultimately categorized as No Answer/Busy, were attempted a minimum of four times (three callbacks). No messages were left on answering machines at homes where no person answered the telephone. No rewards or gifts were offered to contacted adults to encourage their participation. The response rate results for the study are summarized below.

Table 1 – Response Rates for the December 2010 St. Lawrence County Community Tobacco Survey					
Result:	Complete Interview	Decline to be Interviewed	Not Valid Telephone Number	No Answer/ Busy	TOTALS
Frequency	400	274	157	992	1823
% of Numbers Attempted	21.9%	15.0%	8.6%	54.4%	100%
% of Valid Numbers	24.0%	16.4%		59.5%	100%
% of Contacted Residents	59.3%	40.7%			100%

Within the fields of social science and public health research, when using telephone interview methodology, a response rate of over 59% among the successful contacts, where a person is actually talking on the phone, is considered quite successful.

Demographics of the Sample – Who was interviewed?

This section of the report includes a description of the results for the demographic variables included in the survey sample. The demographic characteristics of the sampled adult residents can be used to attain the following three separate objectives. Initially, this information adds to the knowledge and awareness about the true characteristics of the population of adult residents in the sampled county (i.e. What is the current typical household size, educational profile, and income level in St. Lawrence 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 target specific subgroups of the county population for programming and interventions. Finally, the demographic information also serves an important purpose when compared to established facts about St. Lawrence County – to analyze the representativeness of the sample that was randomly selected in this study. The results for the demographic questions in the survey are summarized in the following table. The estimated demographic characteristics of the entire adult population residing in St. Lawrence County that were reported by the US Census Bureau in 2009 (most current detailed U.S. Census results available for St. Lawrence County) are also summarized for each demographic variable and provided for comparison.

Table 2 – Demographics of the Sample Compared to U.S. Census Estimates for St. Lawrence County		
	St. Lawrence County (December 2010 Sample)	St. Lawrence County (U.S. Census 2009)
Gender (US Census %'s are among those age 18 or older) (sample weighted for Gender, Age, Education Level)		
Male	51%	51%
Female	49%	49%
Age Group (US Census %'s are among those age 18 or older) (sample weighted for Gender, Age, Education Level)		
18-24	14%	18%
25-34	21%	16%
35-44	12%	17%
45-54	17%	18%
55-64	19%	14%
65+	17%	17%
Education Level (sample weighted for Gender, Age, Education Level)		
HS Graduate or less	55%	55%
Some College	27%	27%
College Graduate (4+years)	18%	18%
Annual Household Income (sample weighted for Gender, Age, Education Level)		
Less than \$25,000	26%	27%
\$25,000-\$50,000	37%	27%
More than \$50,000	37%	46%
Children in the Household (sample weighted for Gender, Age, Education Level)		
None	65%	68% "no children"
One child	13%	32% "at least one child"
Two children	12%	
Three children	7%	
Four or more children	3%	
Employment Status (Census reports for those over age of 15) (sample weighted for Gender, Age, Education Level)		
Employed for wages	49%	52% employed
Self-employed	4%	
Out of work more than 1 year	3%	4% unemployed 44% "not in labor force"
Out of work less than 1 year	10%	
Homemaker	3%	
Student	3%	
Retired	22%	
Unable to work	6%	
Not sure	0%	
Health Insurance Coverage (sample weighted for Gender, Age, Education Level)		
Yes, have coverage	89%	No comparable statistics available
No, do not have HI, or not sure.	11%	

In general, the responses to the demographic questions included in the survey appear to accurately parallel that which is true for the entire adult population of St. Lawrence County. The postal zip code for each participant was recorded, and the geographic distribution of this sample represents St. Lawrence County accurately. The primary exceptions when comparing the raw (unweighted) demographics of this sample to U.S. Census estimates for the county are that women are overrepresented in the sample (women are more likely than men to answer the telephone and/or agree to a survey, whereas the distribution of men and women in the St. Lawrence County population is essentially equal), older residents are also overrepresented (again, older residents are more likely to participate than younger adult residents to participate in a telephone survey), and those adult residents with lower formal education levels are underrepresented (less likely to participate in a survey). These types of sampling error are inherent in telephone methodology: females, older persons, and those with higher formal education levels are typically overrepresented – regardless of the subject of the survey. To compensate for this overrepresentation of females, older residents, and the highly-educated in the sample collected in this study, post-stratification weightings by gender, age, and education level have been applied in any further analysis of the tobacco issues included in this report. All subsequent statistics that will be reported in this document are weighted by gender, age, and education level. The gender, age, and education level targets that were used for these weighting algorithms were derived from the 2009 US Census updates for the St. Lawrence County adult population.

Given the extreme diligence placed on scientific sampling design and protocol, and the high response rates, after application of post-stratification weightings by gender, age, and education level, it is felt that this sample of St. Lawrence County adults does accurately represent the population of all St. Lawrence 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 St. Lawrence County. In survey research, the exact margin of error when estimating for an entire population is question-specific, depending upon the sample size for each question and sample statistics that result for each question. Sample sizes tend to vary for each question on the survey, since some questions are only appropriate for certain subgroups (i.e. only smokers were asked if they had purchased cigarettes from a website or on the Internet during the past 12 months) and/or as a result of persons refusing to answer questions. In general, the results of this survey for any questions that were answered by the entire sample of 400 interviewed St. Lawrence 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 ± 5.7 percentage points. For questions that were only posed to certain specific subgroups in St. Lawrence County, such as 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 St. Lawrence County (i.e. generalization of some specific characteristics of *sampled smokers* in St. Lawrence County to *all cigarette smokers in St. Lawrence County*) with a 95% confidence level to within a margin of error that will be larger than ± 5.7 percentage points. Further technical details regarding the margin of error for this survey will be provided later in the “Presentation of Results” section of this report. All data compilation and statistical analyses within this study have been completed using *Minitab, Release 15* and *SPSS, Release 16*.

Summary of Findings

The following is a detailed summary of the findings of this community tobacco study completed in December 2010 regarding the attitudes and behaviors related to tobacco among adult residents of St. Lawrence County (New York). Throughout this Summary of Findings, the “regional average rate” is defined as the average rate among seventeen Central, Northern, and Western New York counties that completed county-specific community tobacco surveys during June-December 2010, including Chenango, Cortland, Herkimer, Jefferson, Lewis, Madison, Monroe, Oneida, Onondaga, Ontario, Orleans, Oswego, Seneca, St. Lawrence, Tompkins, Wayne, and Yates Counties.

Spreading the Message About the Dangers of Tobacco Findings:

1. The majority of St. Lawrence County adult residents (56.1%) have **heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership**. The familiarity rate with the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership is significantly above the current regional average, with a regional average tobacco community partnership familiarity rate among the seventeen recently-studied counties of 31.9%. The familiarity rate found in St. Lawrence County is the highest found among the seventeen studied counties. Familiarity with the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership currently is not significantly different from the 2006 and 2008 familiarity rates found in the county (rates were 54.0% in 2006, and 46.2% in 2008). (Table 5)
2. The **sources where residents most commonly have heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership** are in newspapers (approximately 23% cite this source) and on television (approximately 20% cite this source). The most significant change in source of hearing about the local tobacco community partnership that has occurred in St. Lawrence County is a decrease in citing the radio as the source – in 2006 radio was cited by 34.7% of the respondents, while in 2010 this rate has decreased to 18.3%. Sources cited in St. Lawrence County in 2010 are distributed in a way that is not significantly different from the current regional average rates of citation. (Table 6)
3. Almost one-half of St. Lawrence County residents (45.5%) recall **noticing the recent media campaign about tobacco advertising in stores that was sponsored by the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership**, a rate that is significantly above the current regional average rate of 35.8%. (Table 7)
4. Approximately three-fourths of St. Lawrence County adult residents (76.4%) have ever **heard of the New York State Smokers’ Quitline**; this level of familiarity is not significantly different from the current average rate found among residents of neighboring counties (75.4%). The rate in St. Lawrence County increased significantly between 2006 and 2008 from 51.3% to 68.9%, and increased again between 2008 and 2010 from 68.9% to 76.4%. (Table 8)
5. The majority of St. Lawrence County adults (67.8%) have been **asked whether or not they smoke by health professionals** in the past twelve months. This rate of inquiry is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 68.5%, and has not changed significantly in St. Lawrence County throughout the interval of 2006-2010. (Table 9)

Tobacco Advertising Findings:

6. St. Lawrence County adults commonly notice **tobacco advertising on posters outside or windows facing outside stores where tobacco is sold**, 38.0% report this exposure on at least some days in the past 30 days with 15.6% indicating “every day.” There has been no significant change in this recalled exposure among St. Lawrence County adults between 2008-2010, and the current 38.0% exposure rate in the county is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 42.2%. The demographic subgroup most commonly reporting recollection of tobacco advertising is the younger adults – 52.9% of participants who are age 18-34 report that they recall seeing tobacco advertising on posters outside or windows facing outside stores where tobacco is sold at least some days in the past 30 days. (Table 10)
7. Residents of St. Lawrence County were asked whether they **recall seeing tobacco advertisements when they visit a convenience store, supermarket, or gas station** – 74.1% reported recalling tobacco ads at these locations at least some of the time (not significantly different from the current regional average of 75.8%). This rate of reporting exposed “all the time” has decreased significantly in St. Lawrence County since 2008 – in 2008 50.1% of the participants responded with “all the time”, while in 2010 this rate decreased to 28.8%. Younger adults are the group who most commonly report this tobacco advertising exposure – 90.4% of

participants who are age 18-34 report that they recall seeing tobacco advertising when they visit a convenience store, supermarket, or gas station. (Table 11)

8. St. Lawrence County adults tend to **agree that if tobacco retailers removed tobacco ads it would decrease the number of youths who begin smoking** – approximately 56% agree with this statement (28.3% “Strongly Agree”, 27.9% “Agree”). This result in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average of 57.0% “agreeing”). Although agreement is more common among non-smokers than among current smokers, even among *current smokers* in the county over 49% agree that if tobacco retailers removed tobacco ads it would decrease the number of youths who begin smoking (while only 45.9% of *current smokers* “disagree”). (Table 12)
9. St. Lawrence County adults **voiced very strong support for eliminating the visibility of tobacco products at stores that sell tobacco**. Specifically, these opinions were gathered regarding convenience stores and gas stations, grocery stores, and pharmacies. The results for these three types of locations are summarized in the following table.

Tobacco Display Location	% “Favor” the Elimination of the Display of Tobacco Products (Strongly Favor + Somewhat Favor)	
	St. Lawrence County (2010)	Regional Average (2010)
Pharmacies	63.5%	65.9%
Grocery Stores	62.6%	63.2%
Convenience Stores and Gas Stations	59.4%	59.5%

For all three types of locations the majority favors eliminating the display of tobacco products, and for all three types of locations the levels of support in St. Lawrence County are not significantly different from the current regional averages. Support for the elimination of tobacco displays is even evident among *current cigarette smokers* with 57.3% in favor of eliminating the displays at pharmacies, 55.1% in favor of eliminating the displays at grocery stores, and 47.2% in favor of eliminating the displays at convenience stores and gas stations. (Tables 13-15)

10. Residents of St. Lawrence County showed **very strong support for store owners voluntarily decreasing the number of tobacco ads inside and outside their stores** – 78.8% of St. Lawrence County residents responded with “Yes”, while only 11.2% responded with “No” when asked if they would like to see store owners voluntarily invoke this change. The rate in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 77.3% responding “Yes.” Even among *current smokers* in St. Lawrence County, 54.3% respond that they would like to see store owners voluntarily decrease the number of tobacco ads inside and outside their stores. (Table 16)

Tobacco Sales Findings:

11. By a large margin, St. Lawrence County adults **believe that pharmacies should not sell tobacco** (52.4% indicated “Should not,” while only 40.8% indicated “Should”). In the 2010 study, opinions were collected regarding whether or not convenience stores and gas stations, grocery stores, and pharmacies should or should not sell tobacco products. The results for these three types of locations are summarized below.

Tobacco Sales Location	% Responding “Should not” sell Tobacco Products	
	St. Lawrence County (2010)	Regional Average (2010)
Pharmacies	52.4%	57.4%
Grocery Stores	38.0%	43.0%
Convenience Stores and Gas Stations	26.3%	28.4%

Levels of support for not selling tobacco products at all three types of sales locations that were studied in St. Lawrence County are not significantly different from the current regional averages. Belief that pharmacies should not sell tobacco is even somewhat evident among *current cigarette smokers* with 32.9% of *current smokers* responding “Should not”. (Tables 17-19)

12. Strong **support for tobacco retailers being required to keep tobacco products out of the view from customers in stores is present** among St. Lawrence County adults – 67.9% support this potential requirement for tobacco retailers, while only 28.7% oppose. This opinion is illustrated in every demographic subgroup investigated (excluding the group of current smokers) – in every subgroup other than the current smoker subgroup the percentage who replies “Yes, I support this requirement to keep tobacco products out of

view.” surpasses 59%. Notably, even among *current smokers* in the county there is some level of support for this potential requirement – 47.6% of *current smokers* believe that retailers should be required to keep tobacco products out of view, while 48.3% of the current smokers do not support this notion. (Table 20)

Secondhand Smoke Exposure Findings – Your Home and/or Personal Vehicle:

13. An overwhelming majority of the St. Lawrence County respondents consider **exposure to secondhand smoke to be harmful** (92.2%), of which 70.2% indicated they believe it is *very harmful*. This rate is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 93.0% agreeing that exposure to secondhand smoke is somewhat or very harmful, and has not changed significantly from the results found in St. Lawrence County in 2006 or 2008. Notably, the large majority of *current smokers* in the St. Lawrence County (76.1%) do consider exposure to secondhand smoke to be at least somewhat harmful, with only 4.7% of the *current smokers* indicating “Not at all harmful”. (Table 21)
14. St. Lawrence County adult residents are very likely to indicate that they **do not allow smoking in their home** – 77.5% report that this is their in-home policy, a rate that is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 79.3%. This rate has not changed significantly from the rates found in either 2006 or 2008 in the county. Current smokers are least likely *to not allow* smoking in their homes; however, over 40% of *current smokers* (40.3%) **do not** allow smoking in their homes. (Table 22)
15. St. Lawrence County adult residents are likely to indicate that they **do not allow smoking in their personal vehicle** – 75.0% report that this is their in-vehicle policy, a rate that is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 74.8%. This rate has not changed significantly from the rates found in either 2006 or 2008 in the county. Current smokers are least likely *to not allow* smoking in their personal vehicles; however, over 32% of *current smokers* (32.4%) **do not** allow smoking in their personal vehicles. (Table 23)
16. Very strong **support for a law that would prohibit smoking inside a car in New York State when a person under the age of 18 is present** has been identified among St. Lawrence County adults – 74.5% of the adults would agree with this type of law (among which, 51.0% strongly agree), while only 22.8% “disagree”. Level of agreement in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 70.1%. This opinion is strongly illustrated in every demographic subgroup investigated – a majority within each subgroup would agree with this law if passed in New York State. In fact, even among *current smokers* in the county more would agree with this law than disagree – 66.9% of *current smokers* would agree with the law, while only 28.7% of *current smokers* would disagree. (Table 24)

Secondhand Smoke Exposure Findings – At the Workplace:

17. Approximately 53% of the adult residents (52.5%) in the St. Lawrence County are currently employed, not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 57.6%, and not significantly changed from employment rates found in earlier St. Lawrence County tobacco studies. Among these employed residents, over 50% report that **there is a policy that prohibits smoking on the entire grounds of their workplace** (51.5% of the employed residents report this policy in place at their workplace). This rate of working in an entirely smoke-free workplace has not changed significantly from the 56.1% found in the county in 2008, and is not significantly different from the current regional average of 46.6% of employed individuals working at entirely smoke-free workplaces. Less than one-half (43.5%) of employed *current smokers* work at an entirely smoke-free workplace. (Tables 25-26)
18. St. Lawrence County employed adults **favor a policy that prohibits smoking on the entire grounds of their workplace** – 57.7% favor while only 38.3% oppose. This level of support among currently employed individuals in St. Lawrence County for a smoke-free workplace is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 58.4% favoring a smoking-prohibition-on-the-entire-grounds-of-the-workplace policy. Level of support is particularly high among the more highly-educated employed adult residents – 85.7% of those who have at least a 4-year college degree are in favor. Notably, 32.5% of the *employed current smokers* in St. Lawrence County favor a smoking prohibition policy at their workplace. (Table 27)
19. Approximately one-third of St. Lawrence County employed adults indicate that their employer has **offered a stop-smoking program or some other help to employees who want to quit smoking in the past year** – 31.7% indicate that their employers have offered these types of tobacco cessation programs, while 62.9% indicate that their employer has not. This availability of employer-sponsored stop-smoking programs among currently employed St. Lawrence County individuals has not changed significantly between 2008 and 2010 (34.8% had this opportunity offered by their employer in 2008), and is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 29.3% of employed individuals having these services offered to them. (Table 28)

Secondhand Smoke Exposure Findings – Public Outdoor Locations:

20. There is a very high level of **support among St. Lawrence County residents for reducing secondhand smoke exposure at public outdoor locations**, with at least 83% of the residents supporting either restricting or completely eliminating cigarette smoking at each of the three types of outdoor locations studied (public outdoor recreation areas like parks, pools, and beaches; public building entryways; and at sporting events). More strikingly, at public building entryways 59.4% of the interviewed adults in St. Lawrence County support *complete elimination of smoking*, and at sporting events 57.0% of the interviewed adults in St. Lawrence County support *complete elimination of smoking*. Support for restriction or elimination of smoking at public outdoor recreation areas like parks, pools, and beaches in St. Lawrence County is above the current regional average level of support, and level of support for restricting or eliminating smoking at public outdoor locations in the county have not changed significantly between 2006-2010. Results for the three types of public outdoor locations are summarized in the following table. (Tables 29-32)

Type of Outdoor Location	Among all surveyed residents, % who support either restricting or entirely eliminating smoking									
	St. Lawrence County 2006			St. Lawrence County 2008			St. Lawrence County 2010			2010 Regional Average
	Rest.	Elim.	R+E	Rest.	Elim.	R+E	Rest.	Elim.	R+E	Restrict+Eliminate
Sporting Events	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	29.1%	57.0%	86.1%	84.1%
Public Outdoor Recreation Area	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	44.1%	40.2%	84.3%	79.1%
Public Building Entryways	30.4%	54.2%	84.6%	28.5%	59.1%	87.6%	23.7%	59.4%	83.1%	84.8%

21. Even **among current cigarette smokers, there is a large degree of support for the notion of at least restricting cigarette smoking to certain areas at public outdoor locations**. At each of the three studied public outdoor locations, at least 65% of *St. Lawrence County current cigarette smokers* believe that smoking should be restricted or not allowed at all. Note the high levels of support among *current cigarette smokers* in St. Lawrence County for reducing secondhand smoke exposure at public building entryways – 45.7% of the *smokers* support complete elimination of smoking at public building entryways. Results for current cigarette smokers are summarized in the following table. (Tables 30-32)

Type of Outdoor Location	Among surveyed <i>Current Cigarette Smokers</i> , % who support either restricting or entirely eliminating smoking		
	St. Lawrence County 2010		
	Restrict	Eliminate	Restrict + Eliminate
Public Outdoor Recreation Area	36.3%	39.6%	75.9%
Public Building Entryways	22.6%	45.7%	68.3%
Sporting Event	26.1%	39.4%	65.5%

Tobacco Use Findings:

22. The **current cigarette smoking rate found in St. Lawrence County is:** a total estimate of **24.4% current smokers**, with 19.1% smoking every day and 5.3% smoking on only some days. This cigarette smoking rate has not changed significantly from the rates found in St. Lawrence County in 2006 or 2008. The current 24.4% smoking rate in St. Lawrence County is significantly higher than the current regional average rate of 17.5% current cigarette smokers found among the seventeen Northern, Central, and Western New York counties studied in June-December 2010. The New York State Department of Health published the results for the Expanded Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) in December 2009. This overall health study includes an estimate of adult current cigarette smoking prevalence. The methodology utilized in the BRFSS is very similar to that used in this current December 2010 St. Lawrence County adult tobacco community assessment (both studies used a random telephone survey, sample sizes were n=657 vs. n=400, weighting algorithms were similar while not identical, the BRFSS interviews spanned July 2008-June 2009; for more details regarding this BRFSS study, visit: <http://www.health.state.ny.us/statistics/brfss/expanded/2009/county/>). The adult smoking prevalence rate reported for St. Lawrence County in the 2009 Expanded BRFSS was 24.7%. The 24.4% smoking rate found in St. Lawrence County in this December 2010 St. Lawrence County adult tobacco community assessment is not significantly different from the finding in the Expanded BRFSS. (Tables 34-35)
23. Significant **correlations with cigarette smoking – potential explanatory factors that are related with the likelihood that a St. Lawrence County adult resident will be a current cigarette smoker** – that were

discovered include that males (31.8% are smokers), residents between the ages of 18-34 (38.8% are smokers), residents with no college coursework in their educational background (29.5% are smokers), residents with some college coursework in their educational background but less than a 4-year college degree (27.3% are smokers), and those from “low-to-mid” income households (44.5% of those from households with annual income of \$25,000-\$50,000 are smokers) are most likely to be current cigarette smokers. (Table 35)

24. More than one-half of the adults in St. Lawrence County (54.2%) have **smoked at least 100 cigarettes in their lifetime**, a rate that has not changed significantly from the rates found in the county in earlier studies (47.1% in 2006, and 53.4% in 2008), and a rate that is significantly higher than the current regional average rate of 46.5%. This 54.2% who have smoked at least 100 cigarettes in their lifetime is not equally distributed between “former” and “current” smokers – 29.9% of the adult population in St. Lawrence County are former smokers, and 24.4% are current smokers. (Tables 33 and 35)
25. Use of **other tobacco products (those other than cigarettes)** among St. Lawrence County residents has not changed significantly throughout 2006-2010, with use of smokeless tobacco remaining relatively stable (2.5% reported use in 2006, 3.8% reported use in 2008, and the current rate of use is 4.2%). Currently less than 1% of the adult residents in the county (0.5%) indicate that they use e-cigarettes. Neither of these current non-cigarette tobacco product use rates is significantly different from current regional averages. Currently, 4.7% of St. Lawrence County adults use *at least one form* of non-cigarette tobacco product (rate was 4.5% in 2006, and 8.5% in 2008, neither significantly different from the current rate). The 4.7% rate of non-cigarette tobacco use in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the regional average rate of 6.0%. Use of non-cigarette types of tobacco products is related to gender – 8.9% of males use non-cigarette tobacco while only 0.3% of females do so, related to age – 8.2% of those age 18-34 use non-cigarette tobacco while 0.0% of those age 65+ do so, and strongly related to cigarette smoking – 15.8% of current cigarette smokers also use at least one type of other tobacco product, while only 1.1% of non-cigarette-smokers report to use non-cigarette tobacco products. (Tables 36-37)
26. The current **overall tobacco-use rate** among St. Lawrence County residents is 25.2% (use at least one type of tobacco product), which is not significantly different from the results in either of the two preceding community tobacco assessments completed in the county (tobacco use rate has been 28.3% in 2006, and 27.3% in 2008). The current 25.2% overall tobacco use rate among St. Lawrence County residents is not significantly different from the current regional average of 20.6% using at least one type of tobacco product. Males (33.3% of males use tobacco), younger adults (38.8% of those age 18-34 use tobacco), those with lower education levels (29.5% of those with less than a 4-year college education use tobacco), and those from households with “low-to-mid” annual incomes (45.2% of those from households with annual income of \$25,000-\$50,000 use tobacco) are most likely to be users of tobacco products in St. Lawrence County. (Table 38)

Further Attitudes, Behaviors, Interests, and Familiarity among Former Smokers

27. Approximately one-fourth of all adults in St. Lawrence County (29.9%) are former smokers. **About one-in-five former smokers (21.9% of the former smokers) have quit within the past two years.** (Table 35 and Table 39)
28. Among the recently-quit former smokers (quit in past two years), **approximately one-half indicated that the price of tobacco either caused, or contributed to but did not cause, their recent cigarette cessation** – 14.3% of these former smokers indicated that the price of tobacco caused them to quit smoking, while 32.5% of these former smokers indicated that the price of tobacco contributed to but did not cause them to quit smoking. This combined rate of 46.8% of recent-quitters reporting that the price of tobacco had a positive impact upon their quitting has not changed in the county between 2008 and 2010, and is not significantly different from the current regional average rate. (Table 40)

Further Attitudes, Behaviors, Interests, and Familiarity among Current Smokers

29. Current cigarette **smokers in St. Lawrence County typically smoke about three-fourths of a pack of cigarettes per day.** The current St. Lawrence County average among smokers is 13.61 cigarettes per day. This rate is not significantly different from the current regional average among smokers of 12.84 cigarettes per day, and has not changed significantly from the smoking frequency recorded in earlier St. Lawrence County community tobacco assessments. (Table 41)
30. Among current cigarette smokers in St. Lawrence County, the majority has been **advised to quit by health professionals** in the past twelve months (67.7%), a rate that has not changed significantly from the past rates

found in St. Lawrence County, and is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 63.3%. (Table 42)

31. Almost one-half (44.1%) of the current smokers in St. Lawrence County **have attempted to quit smoking in the past year** (not a significant change from 47.8% found in 2006, or 51.9% found in 2008, in St. Lawrence County, and not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 53.3%). About one-in-four current smokers (23.1%) have attempted to quit smoking *more than five times* in the past three years. (Tables 43-44)
32. St. Lawrence County cigarette smokers continue to commonly **purchase their cigarettes at Indian reservations or through an Indian enterprise**. The majority of current smokers in the county (61.8%) report to purchase their cigarettes at Indian reservations or through an Indian enterprise, not significantly different from the current regional average of 51.5%, and not a significant trend in the county between 2008-2010. St. Lawrence County cigarette smokers **less commonly purchase their cigarettes on the Internet**, with a current 2010 rate of 3.3% indicating that they purchase cigarettes online “at least some” (not a significant trend, and not significantly different from the current regional average of 6.4%). (Tables 45-46)
33. The **price of tobacco is cited by 37.7% of current St. Lawrence County smokers** as having caused them to **reduce the number of cigarettes they smoke**, with 27.0% indicating that the price of tobacco is causing them to **plan to quit smoking**. More 40% of current smokers (41.5%) report *at least one* of these two positive impacts (reducing smoking and/or planning to quit). The current result in the county (41.5%) is not significantly different from current regional average of 53.3% reporting some positive effect, and not significantly changed from the result in St. Lawrence County in 2008. (Table 47)
34. Among current smokers in St. Lawrence County, approximately one-third (29.8% of smokers) indicate that **recent laws or restrictions on outdoor smoking influenced them to smoke fewer cigarettes** (a rate that is not significantly different from the current regional average of 29.0% indicating an influence). (Table 48)
35. Approximately 43% of St. Lawrence County **current smokers indicate that they want to quit smoking now** (42.8%). The interest-in-quitting rate in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 47.4%, and has not changed significantly from the 2006 and 2008 St. Lawrence County rates found (60.3% in 2006, and 48.5% in 2008). (Table 49)
36. More than one-half (53.3%) of St. Lawrence County **current smokers indicate if their insurance company paid for quit-tobacco medications, such as the nicotine patch, they would be more likely to try to quit smoking**. This more-likely-to-try-to-quit rate in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average rate of 55.7%. (Table 50)

Presentation of Results

The structure of the interviews for this study was organized into nine sections. Information concerning attitudes and behavior regarding tobacco was collected in the following nine groups of questions:

1. Spreading the Message About the Dangers of Tobacco
2. Tobacco Advertising
3. Tobacco Sales
4. Secondhand Smoke Exposure – Your Home and/or Personal Vehicle
5. Secondhand Smoke Exposure – Public Outdoor Locations
6. Secondhand Smoke Exposure – At the Workplace
7. Tobacco Use
8. Further Attitudes, Behaviors, Interests, and Familiarity among Former Smokers
9. Further Attitudes, Behaviors, Interests, and Familiarity among Current Smokers

The results for each survey question, in each of these nine sections of the survey, are presented in the following portion of the report with consistent structure. Typically, one page is devoted to the results for each survey question, using the following organization:

- (1) The **results of the current study** (December 2010), are presented in a table for each survey question that was included in this study – including sample percentages, sample frequencies or counts, and the sample size (all weighted by Gender, Age and Education Level).
- (2) When possible, directly below each of the “2010 Results” tables, **a trend analysis comparison** of the current study results to the results from the 2006 and 2008 St. Lawrence County tobacco studies is provided. These “comparison for a trend” tables are only possible when the same survey questions have been asked in 2006 and/or 2008, and in the current 2010 study. If the question phrasing and/or possible response distribution (choices, or answers) have been altered between earlier studies and the 2010 study, to an extent that it is likely that the actual variable or phenomena being measured has changed between years, then no trend table is presented. These trend analysis tables provide information for an analysis of changes over the past four years – an opportunity to attempt to identify St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership impact. Statistically significant changes or trends are highlighted throughout (in **blue print** above each trend table).
- (3) **Regional Comparative results are provided**, reporting the summarized outcomes for each survey question for a group of seventeen Central, Northern, and Western New York Counties that completed community tobacco assessments in June-December 2010. The summarized results include the minimum, maximum, and average result among the seventeen studied counties. The seventeen participating counties are: Chenango, Cortland, Herkimer, Jefferson, Lewis, Madison, Monroe, Oneida, Onondaga, Ontario, Orleans, Oswego, Seneca, St. Lawrence, Tompkins, Wayne, 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: “Use Every Day”, “Use Some Days”, “Do Not Use”, and “Don’t Know” would typically be collapsed to: “Use at least some” (ED+SD) versus “Do not indicate use” (DNU+DK) 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 St. Lawrence County. Statistically significant results, when any St. Lawrence County current result differs significantly from the current regional average, are highlighted throughout (again, in **blue print** above each regional comparison table).
- (4) Finally, the St. Lawrence County 2010 results for each of the survey questions have been **cross-tabulated by each of the demographic factors of Gender, Age, Education Level, and Household Income Level, as well as by Cigarette Smoking Status** (this report includes approximately 200 cross-tabulation tables of results). The results for these correlational investigations have been provided in tables along with the “current”, “trend”, and “regional comparison” tables for each survey item. Note that at times, for survey questions that were only posed to smaller subgroups, such as those for current cigarette smokers, the sample sizes are not sufficiently large to complete cross-tabulations – the resulting sample sizes within demographic subgroups would at times be well less than 50 (minimum cell size required by NYSDOH standards).

Technical Comments for Interpretation of the Presented Results

Margin of Error – Using this Data to Estimate for Entire St. Lawrence County Adult Populations

The results of this study should be presented to a very wide array of readers who, no doubt, have a very wide variety 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 study.

Recall that the margin of error for this survey has been stated as approximately ± 5.7 percentage points (on page 4). Therefore, when a percentage is observed in one of the following “St. Lawrence County 2010 Results” tables (recall, $n=400$ participants), the appropriate interpretation is that we are 95% confident that if *all* adult residents of St. Lawrence County were surveyed (rather than just the 400 that were actually surveyed), the percentage that would result for all residents would be within ± 5.7 percentage points of the *sample* percentage that has been calculated and reported in this study. For example, since 52.4% of the sample of St. Lawrence County adults in December 2010 reported that they believe that *tobacco products should not be sold in pharmacies* (please refer to Table 19 later in this report to verify this statistic), with this sample result, one can infer with 95% confidence (only a 5% chance that it will not be true) that if *all* St. Lawrence County adults were asked, somewhere between 46.7% and 58.1% of the population of approximately 85,000 adults over the age of 18 in St. Lawrence County would indicate that they believe that *tobacco products should not be sold in pharmacies* (using a margin of error of $\pm 5.7\%$). This resulting interval (46.7%-58.1%) is known as a 95% Confidence Interval. The consumer of this report should use this pattern, or approach, when attempting to generalize any of the 2010 St. Lawrence County overall survey findings to the entire adult population of the county.

The preceding example used a margin of error of $\pm 5.7\%$. However, the margin of error when using the sample results in this study to construct a confidence interval to estimate a population percentage will not always be $\pm 5.7\%$. There is not one universal value of a margin of error that can be precisely calculated and used for the results for every question included in this survey, or for that matter, any multiple-question survey. Calculation methods used in this study for generating the margin of error depend upon the following four factors:

1. The **sample size** is the number of adults who validly answered the survey question. The sample size will not always be $n=400$ since individuals have a right to omit any question. Additionally, some survey questions were only posed after screening questions, such as questions asked only to current smokers. In general, the smaller the sample size then the larger the margin of error, and conversely, the larger the sample size then the smaller the margin of error.
2. The **sample proportion or percentage** is the calculated percentage of the sample who responded with the answer or category of interest (i.e. responded “Agree”). This percentage can vary from 0%-100%, and, of course, will change from question to question throughout the survey. In general, the further that a sample percentage varies from 50% in either direction (approaching either 0% or 100%), the smaller the margin of error, and conversely, the closer that the actual sample percentage is to 50% then the larger the resulting margin of error.
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** is a factor that compensates for the impact that having a sample whose gender, age, and formal education level distributions do *not* parallel the gender, age, and formal education level distributions of the entire adult population of St. Lawrence County will have upon the size of the margin of error. In general, the further that the sample deviates from the actual gender, age, and formal education level distributions of the entire county population, the larger the resulting margin of error.

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

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

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

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

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

Deff = the design effect

And

$$Deff = \frac{n \cdot \sum w_i^2}{(\sum w_i)^2}$$

With w_i =the poststratification weight associated with i^{th} of the 400 sampled individuals

For this St. Lawrence County study, the design effect (Deff) equals 2.12.

Since the sample size varies (in fact, is conceivably different for each question on the survey) and the sample percentage varies (also, conceivably different for each question on the survey) the following table (Table 3) has been provided for the reader to determine the correct margin of error to use whenever constructing a confidence interval using the sample data presented in this study.

Table 3 – Approximate Margin of Error for Varying Sample Sizes and Sample Percentages

Varying Sample %'s (p=...):	Varying Sample Sizes (n=...):											
	30	50	75	100	125	150	175	200	250	300	350	400
2%	7.3%	5.7%	4.6%	4.0%	3.6%	3.3%	3.0%	2.8%	2.5%	2.3%	2.1%	2.0%
4%	10.2%	7.9%	6.5%	5.6%	5.0%	4.6%	4.2%	4.0%	3.5%	3.2%	3.0%	2.8%
6%	12.4%	9.6%	7.8%	6.8%	6.1%	5.5%	5.1%	4.8%	4.3%	3.9%	3.6%	3.4%
8%	14.1%	10.9%	8.9%	7.7%	6.9%	6.3%	5.9%	5.5%	4.9%	4.5%	4.1%	3.9%
10%	15.6%	12.1%	9.9%	8.6%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	6.1%	5.4%	4.9%	4.6%	4.3%
12%	16.9%	13.1%	10.7%	9.3%	8.3%	7.6%	7.0%	6.6%	5.9%	5.4%	5.0%	4.6%
14%	18.1%	14.0%	11.4%	9.9%	8.9%	8.1%	7.5%	7.0%	6.3%	5.7%	5.3%	5.0%
16%	19.1%	14.8%	12.1%	10.5%	9.4%	8.5%	7.9%	7.4%	6.6%	6.0%	5.6%	5.2%
18%	20.0%	15.5%	12.7%	11.0%	9.8%	9.0%	8.3%	7.8%	6.9%	6.3%	5.9%	5.5%
20%	20.8%	16.1%	13.2%	11.4%	10.2%	9.3%	8.6%	8.1%	7.2%	6.6%	6.1%	5.7%
22%	21.6%	16.7%	13.7%	11.8%	10.6%	9.7%	8.9%	8.4%	7.5%	6.8%	6.3%	5.9%
24%	22.3%	17.2%	14.1%	12.2%	10.9%	10.0%	9.2%	8.6%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	6.1%
26%	22.9%	17.7%	14.5%	12.5%	11.2%	10.2%	9.5%	8.9%	7.9%	7.2%	6.7%	6.3%
28%	23.4%	18.1%	14.8%	12.8%	11.5%	10.5%	9.7%	9.1%	8.1%	7.4%	6.8%	6.4%
30%	23.9%	18.5%	15.1%	13.1%	11.7%	10.7%	9.9%	9.2%	8.3%	7.6%	7.0%	6.5%
32%	24.3%	18.8%	15.4%	13.3%	11.9%	10.9%	10.1%	9.4%	8.4%	7.7%	7.1%	6.7%
34%	24.7%	19.1%	15.6%	13.5%	12.1%	11.0%	10.2%	9.6%	8.5%	7.8%	7.2%	6.8%
36%	25.0%	19.4%	15.8%	13.7%	12.3%	11.2%	10.4%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.3%	6.8%
38%	25.3%	19.6%	16.0%	13.9%	12.4%	11.3%	10.5%	9.8%	8.8%	8.0%	7.4%	6.9%
40%	25.5%	19.8%	16.1%	14.0%	12.5%	11.4%	10.6%	9.9%	8.8%	8.1%	7.5%	7.0%
42%	25.7%	19.9%	16.3%	14.1%	12.6%	11.5%	10.6%	10.0%	8.9%	8.1%	7.5%	7.0%
44%	25.9%	20.0%	16.4%	14.2%	12.7%	11.6%	10.7%	10.0%	9.0%	8.2%	7.6%	7.1%
46%	26.0%	20.1%	16.4%	14.2%	12.7%	11.6%	10.8%	10.1%	9.0%	8.2%	7.6%	7.1%
48%	26.0%	20.2%	16.5%	14.3%	12.8%	11.6%	10.8%	10.1%	9.0%	8.2%	7.6%	7.1%
50%	26.1%	20.2%	16.5%	14.3%	12.8%	11.7%	10.8%	10.1%	9.0%	8.2%	7.6%	7.1%
52%	26.0%	20.2%	16.5%	14.3%	12.8%	11.6%	10.8%	10.1%	9.0%	8.2%	7.6%	7.1%
54%	26.0%	20.1%	16.4%	14.2%	12.7%	11.6%	10.8%	10.1%	9.0%	8.2%	7.6%	7.1%
56%	25.9%	20.0%	16.4%	14.2%	12.7%	11.6%	10.7%	10.0%	9.0%	8.2%	7.6%	7.1%
58%	25.7%	19.9%	16.3%	14.1%	12.6%	11.5%	10.6%	10.0%	8.9%	8.1%	7.5%	7.0%
60%	25.5%	19.8%	16.1%	14.0%	12.5%	11.4%	10.6%	9.9%	8.8%	8.1%	7.5%	7.0%
62%	25.3%	19.6%	16.0%	13.9%	12.4%	11.3%	10.5%	9.8%	8.8%	8.0%	7.4%	6.9%
64%	25.0%	19.4%	15.8%	13.7%	12.3%	11.2%	10.4%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.3%	6.8%
66%	24.7%	19.1%	15.6%	13.5%	12.1%	11.0%	10.2%	9.6%	8.5%	7.8%	7.2%	6.8%
68%	24.3%	18.8%	15.4%	13.3%	11.9%	10.9%	10.1%	9.4%	8.4%	7.7%	7.1%	6.7%
70%	23.9%	18.5%	15.1%	13.1%	11.7%	10.7%	9.9%	9.2%	8.3%	7.6%	7.0%	6.5%
72%	23.4%	18.1%	14.8%	12.8%	11.5%	10.5%	9.7%	9.1%	8.1%	7.4%	6.8%	6.4%
74%	22.9%	17.7%	14.5%	12.5%	11.2%	10.2%	9.5%	8.9%	7.9%	7.2%	6.7%	6.3%
76%	22.3%	17.2%	14.1%	12.2%	10.9%	10.0%	9.2%	8.6%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	6.1%
78%	21.6%	16.7%	13.7%	11.8%	10.6%	9.7%	8.9%	8.4%	7.5%	6.8%	6.3%	5.9%
80%	20.8%	16.1%	13.2%	11.4%	10.2%	9.3%	8.6%	8.1%	7.2%	6.6%	6.1%	5.7%
82%	20.0%	15.5%	12.7%	11.0%	9.8%	9.0%	8.3%	7.8%	6.9%	6.3%	5.9%	5.5%
84%	19.1%	14.8%	12.1%	10.5%	9.4%	8.5%	7.9%	7.4%	6.6%	6.0%	5.6%	5.2%
86%	18.1%	14.0%	11.4%	9.9%	8.9%	8.1%	7.5%	7.0%	6.3%	5.7%	5.3%	5.0%
88%	16.9%	13.1%	10.7%	9.3%	8.3%	7.6%	7.0%	6.6%	5.9%	5.4%	5.0%	4.6%
90%	15.6%	12.1%	9.9%	8.6%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	6.1%	5.4%	4.9%	4.6%	4.3%
92%	14.1%	10.9%	8.9%	7.7%	6.9%	6.3%	5.9%	5.5%	4.9%	4.5%	4.1%	3.9%
94%	12.4%	9.6%	7.8%	6.8%	6.1%	5.5%	5.1%	4.8%	4.3%	3.9%	3.6%	3.4%
96%	10.2%	7.9%	6.5%	5.6%	5.0%	4.6%	4.2%	4.0%	3.5%	3.2%	3.0%	2.8%
98%	7.3%	5.7%	4.6%	4.0%	3.6%	3.3%	3.0%	2.8%	2.5%	2.3%	2.1%	2.0%
Average	20.8%	16.1%	13.2%	11.4%	10.2%	9.3%	8.6%	8.1%	7.2%	6.6%	6.1%	5.7%

Therefore, if $n=135$ persons *who are age 18-34* in St. Lawrence County validly answered a survey question (a question such as “Do you think that *pharmacies* should or should not sell tobacco products?”, later described in detail in Table 19), and $p=58.2\%$ of these younger adults responded with “Should Not,” then the interpretation would be that the margin of error for estimating that which would be expected to be true for the entire St. Lawrence County *18-34 years of age* adult population would be $\pm 12.6\%$ (used the margin of error from Table 3 for the sample proportion included in the table that was closest to our actual sample proportion – 58% in the table, and sample size closest to our actual sample size – $n=125$ in the table). Finally, one could then state with 95% confidence that among *all St. Lawrence County adults age 18-34*, somewhere in the interval $58.2\% \pm 12.6\%$, or in other words, between 45.6% and 70.8%, think that *pharmacies* should not sell tobacco products. Note that this margin of error of $\pm 12.6\%$ is larger than the earlier-cited margin of error of $\pm 5.7\%$, a result of having a sample of only 135 adults age 18-34 included in the sample.

Tests for Statistical Significance – Using this Data to Test for Significant Trends, Differences, and Relationships

The preceding pages of technical discussion of statistical techniques have focused on the statistical inference referred to as *estimation* – construction of confidence intervals using the margins of error described in Table 3. To take full advantage of the data collected in this study, other statistical techniques are of value. Tests for significant trends over time, tests to compare to regional averages, and tests for significantly correlated factors with tobacco-related results, will be presented as well. A test or correlation that results with a p-value of $p < 0.05$ will be considered statistically significant.

What is “statistical significance?”

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. Because the data for St. Lawrence County in this December 2010 community tobacco study is based on a *sample* of 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 trend, 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 St. Lawrence County residents appear to think that pharmacies *should not* sell tobacco products less commonly than those residents in neighboring counties (52.4% of St. Lawrence County adults think pharmacies “should not”, while the regional average rate is 57.4%, refer to Table 19), the researcher would want to know if this lower proportion would still be present if they interviewed *every* St. Lawrence County adult rather than just the sample of 400 adults who were actually interviewed. To answer this question, the researcher uses a test of statistical significance. The outcome of a statistical significance test will be that the result is either “not statistically significant” or the result is “statistically significant.”

The meaning of “not statistically significant” is that if the sample were repeated many more times (in this case, that would mean many more different groups of $n=400$ randomly selected adults from the approximately 85,000 adults in St. Lawrence County), then the results of these samples would *not* consistently show that the St. Lawrence County adults believe that pharmacies *should not* sell tobacco products less commonly than those residents in neighboring counties; some St. Lawrence County samples of 400 adults might be higher and some lower than the neighboring county average rate of 57.4%. In this case, the researcher could **not** report *with high levels of confidence* that the St. Lawrence County rate is statistically significantly different from the regional average. Rather, the difference found between the one actually-selected sample of size $n=400$ St. Lawrence County residents and the aggregate results of the neighboring counties would be interpreted as small enough that it could be due simply to the random chance of sampling when interviewing only 400 residents – *not statistically significant*.

Conversely, the meaning of “statistically significant” is that if the sample were repeated many more times, then the results of these samples would consistently show that St. Lawrence County adults are less likely to believe that pharmacies *should not* sell tobacco products than those adults in neighboring counties. Furthermore, if *every* adult in St. Lawrence County were interviewed, we are confident that this population not-selling-tobacco-at-pharmacies rate would be lower than the average rate in neighboring counties. One can never be 100% certain (or confident) that the result of a sample will indicate appropriately whether the population value (in this illustration that would be: the results for *all* St. Lawrence County residents) is, in fact, different from some hypothesized value (in this illustration that would be: the regional average rate) or not; however, using the standard confidence level of 95% means that the observed sample difference would also 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 it is so large that there is a probability of less than 5% that this difference occurred simply due to the random chance of sampling; instead, it

is considered a “real” difference. In this study, when completing significance tests, the 95% confidence level will be used. In statistical vocabulary and notation, this would be represented as a p-value of less than 5% ($p < 0.05$).

Note, this “belief that pharmacies *should not* sell tobacco products” survey question is described in detail in Table 19, and the 2010 St. Lawrence County rate of 52.4% believing that pharmacies *should not* sell tobacco products is not significantly lower than the current regional average rate of 57.4%, it is not a large enough difference to be considered statistically significant (this is what is indicated by the (“Should not” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average) comment above the Regional Comparison table).

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

Throughout this report, tests for “relationships between collected variables” have been completed. The theory when completing these tests is similar to that which was described in the illustration above, the comparison of the St. Lawrence County “believe that pharmacies *should not* sell tobacco products” rate to the current regional average. However, with investigations for *relationships between variables*, the focus becomes the identification of correlations *between* variables – is the result for some survey question different when looking at various subgroups (or, levels) of some other variable? Again, referring to the “pharmacies *should not* sell tobacco products” scenario, one could observe in Table 19 that the rate *among males is 44.4% believe that pharmacies should not* sell tobacco, and compare this to the rate *among females (which is 60.7%)*. 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 – found to be not a statistically significant difference ($p > 0.05$). Conversely, a very large difference between these within-subgroup proportions could be large enough to be quite *unlikely* to occur simply due to the random chance of sampling – found to be a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$).

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

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

Each correlational investigation in this report is presented in its own cross-tabulation table (i.e. an investigation for a relationship between “Gender” and “policy-about-smoking-in-one’s-personal-vehicle” is presented in its own table). As a result of approximately 40-50 outcome variables in this study, each cross-tabulated by all five of the potential explanatory variables of Gender, Age, Smoking Status, Education, and Income, there are over 200 cross-tabulation correlational investigation tables included in the following section of this report. This large number of cross-tabulation tables, combined with the variety of ways that the response distribution to many survey questions could be collapsed (very important limiting factor), suggests that an alternative, more versatile, approach to testing for significance in the cross-tabulation tables be utilized in place of the standard Chi Square Test. Therefore, rather than calculating and reporting the results for each of the ~200 cross-tabulation tables included in this report, the following method is recommended.

When the reader wishes to determine whether or not an observed difference in a cross-tabulation table is statistically significant or not (i.e. “Does the 44.4% of the 202 sampled *males* in St. Lawrence County believing that pharmacies *should not* sell tobacco products differ significantly from the 60.7% of the 193 sampled *females* who expressed this belief?”), the method that has been recommended by the New York State Department of Health in its presentation of the 2009 Expanded Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) results will be also recommended for this 2010 St. Lawrence County study. The NYSDOH 2009 Expanded BRFSS (on page 12 of 151 in that report) cites the following:

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

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

by the NYSDOH may be applied to determine whether or not the observed sample difference between demographic subgroups should be considered statistically significant.

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

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

For Males: n=202, p=44.4%, therefore from Table 3 the approximate margin of error is ±10.0%. The resulting confidence interval is: 44.4%±10.0%, or **(34.4%,54.4%)**

For Females: n=193, p=60.7%, therefore from Table 3 the approximate margin of error is ±9.9%. The resulting confidence interval is: 60.7%±9.9%, or **(50.8%,70.6%)**

Since these two confidence intervals do overlap, the difference between males and females is not considered statistically significant. In other words, attitude about whether pharmacies should not sell tobacco products is not significantly related to gender in St. Lawrence County.

The above-described process is the appropriate process to use whenever comparing subgroups within the data set that has been collected and analyzed within this study. The level of precision that is provided in the margins of error that are presented in Table 3 is the level of precision that is necessary to validly test for a statistically significant difference between subgroups (or, alternatively described – “test for a statistically significant relationship with some potential explanatory variable”). However, at times the results in this report will (and should be) presented to an audience that has less technical/statistical background than the typical members of a tobacco control community partnership. In this instance, it could be beneficial to explain the margins of error that are appropriate to use for smaller subgroups of the entire sample that has been collected in more general (or, *approximate*) terms. Therefore, the following Table 4 is provided with sample sizes and resulting *approximate* margins of error for the common demographic subgroups that will be compared throughout the remainder of this report. Again, caution should be used in not over-interpreting the approximate margins of error presented in Table 4; they are “average” margins of error, averaging across varying sample proportions that could conceivably be the actual sample proportion for any survey question. Table 4 is provided for explanation to some audience of, for example, the “typical margin of error when investigating results for only males.” Note that the Margin of Error results recorded in Table 4 were directly calculated using the mathematical formula shown on page 12.

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

Sample Sizes

By Gender		By Age		By Education		By Income		By Cigarette Use	
Males	n=203	18-34	n=138	HSG or less	n=219	<\$25,000	n=82	Smoker	n=97
Females	n=197	35-64	n=194	Some College	n=108	\$25-\$50k	n=118	Non-smoker	n=303
		65+	n=69	4+ YD	n=73	\$50,000+	n=117		

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

By Gender		By Age		By Education		By Income		By Cigarette Use	
Males	±8.0%	18-34	±9.7%	HSG or less	±7.7%	<\$25,000	±12.6%	Smoker	±11.6%
Females	±8.1%	35-64	±8.2%	Some College	±11.0%	\$25-\$50k	±10.5%	Non-smoker	±6.5%
		65+	±13.7%	4+ YD	±13.3%	\$50,000+	±10.5%		

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

A table is provided for each survey question that includes the summarized overall results for a group of seventeen counties in Central, Northern, and Western New York that completed tobacco community assessments during June-December 2010 (each of the seventeen counties has been studied by *Joel LaLone Consulting*, using similar methodology to that which has been used in December 2010 in St. Lawrence County). These summarized results include the minimum, maximum, and average values found for each survey question among the seventeen counties. The research question that is being investigated in these comparisons is: “Is St. Lawrence County statistically significantly different from the typical current result for the region regarding some tobacco-related attribute?” The seventeen comparative counties in Central, Northern, and Western New York are: Chenango, Cortland, Herkimer, Jefferson, Lewis, Madison, Monroe, Oneida, Onondaga, Ontario, Orleans, Oswego, Seneca, St. Lawrence, Tompkins, Wayne, and Yates Counties. In this instance, the statistical approach that is used to determine if the difference between the observed sample percentage in St. Lawrence County and the overall regional average percentage is “statistically significant” necessitates the use of only one confidence interval. One must only use Table 3 once, with the appropriate sample percentage and sample size for St. Lawrence County,

construct the appropriate confidence interval, and the decision is made as follows: if the constructed confidence interval *does* include the regional average result then St. Lawrence County is *not* statistically significantly different from the current regional average; conversely, if the constructed confidence interval *does not* include the regional average result then St. Lawrence County *is* statistically significantly different from the current regional average. Since there is only one of these comparison-to-regional-average analyses required for each survey question in the study, all have been calculated and reported for the reader throughout the Presentation of Results section of this report. A comment is made [in blue](#) above each regional comparison table that describes whether or not any difference that can be observed between St. Lawrence County and the current regional average is statistically significant.

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

Comparisons are made between the current results and the results in earlier tobacco community assessment studies completed in St. Lawrence County (2006 and 2008). The research question that is being investigated in these comparisons is, “Has there been a statistically significant change in tobacco-related attributes among the St. Lawrence County residents between 2006 and 2010?”

When interpreting the comparisons that have been provided, the reader should consider the following factors. *Joel LaLone Consulting* also completed the 2006 and 2008 St. Lawrence County studies. The earlier studies used telephone-interviewing methodology that was virtually identical to that which was utilized in the present 2010 St. Lawrence 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 2010. Therefore, only the questions/items that were also measured in 2006 and/or 2008 are available for trend analysis to compare with the current 2010 results. With the similar methodologies and weighting procedures that have been applied, it is valid to make comparisons between the studies – observe changes or trends.

The same concept of statistical significance that was described in the preceding “Correlated Explanatory Variables” and “Regional Comparisons” sections is also applied when a researcher attempts to investigate for whether or not results in St. Lawrence County have changed significantly over the past four years, however, the focus now becomes the comparison of the 2010 St. Lawrence County result to the 2006 and/or 2008 St. Lawrence County results (rather than the comparisons of subgroups to one another, or the comparison of the 2010 St. Lawrence County result to the 2010 Regional Average result, as were the cases earlier).

In this instance the statistical approach that is used to determine if the difference between the observed sample percentage in St. Lawrence County in 2008 and the observed sample percentage in St. Lawrence County in 2010 is “statistically significant” necessitates the use of two confidence intervals, as was the case in the “Correlated Explanatory Variables” analysis. One must use Table 3 twice, with the appropriate sample percentages and sample sizes for St. Lawrence County in the two comparison years, construct the appropriate confidence intervals, and, of course, the decision is made as follows: if the constructed confidence intervals *do overlap* then there has *not* been a statistically significant change in St. Lawrence County over the compared timeframe; conversely, if the constructed confidence intervals *do not overlap* then there *has* been a statistically significant change in St. Lawrence County over the compared timeframe. Since there are relatively few of these trend analyses required for each survey question in the study, all have been calculated and reported for the reader throughout the Presentation of Results section of this report.

A comment is made [in blue](#) above each trend table that describes whether or not any difference that can be observed between the 2006, 2008, and 2010 samples in the trend table is statistically significant.

We now begin the presentation of the detailed quantitative results of the 2010 St. Lawrence County Tobacco Study, including results for each of the following nine sets of questions:

1. Spreading the Message About the Dangers of Tobacco
2. Tobacco Advertising
3. Tobacco Sales
4. Secondhand Smoke Exposure – Your Home and/or Personal Vehicle
5. Secondhand Smoke Exposure – Public Outdoor Locations
6. Secondhand Smoke Exposure – At the Workplace
7. Tobacco Use
8. Further Attitudes, Behaviors, Interests, and Familiarity among Former Smokers
9. Further Attitudes, Behaviors, Interests, and Familiarity among Current Smokers

Spreading the Message About the Dangers of Tobacco

Table 5 – Have you heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership?

2010 Results:

	Have you heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership?	
	Count	%
Yes	225	56.1%
No	170	42.5%
Don't know/Not sure	5	1.4%
Total	400	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (No significant change in "Yes" between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Yes	54.0%	46.2%	56.1%
No	46.0%	51.6%	42.5%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	2.2%	1.4%

Regional Comparison: ("Familiarity" in St. Lawrence County is significantly above the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% "Yes"	5.5%	56.1%	31.9%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Yes	52.0%	60.4%	67.2%	59.1%	25.6%	59.3%	55.1%
No	47.2%	37.7%	31.2%	40.3%	71.4%	40.7%	43.1%
Don't know/Not sure	.9%	1.9%	1.6%	.7%	3.0%	.0%	1.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	197	137	194	69	97	303

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	44.7%	71.4%	67.8%	50.9%	56.5%	71.4%
No	54.6%	25.3%	31.6%	49.1%	42.5%	27.9%
Don't know/Not sure	.7%	3.2%	.6%	.0%	1.0%	.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	108	73	82	118	117

Table 6 – From what source did you hear about the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership? (choose all that apply)

2010 Results:

	Yes		No		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Television	45	20.1%	179	79.9%	225	100.0%
Radio	41	18.3%	184	81.7%	225	100.0%
Newspapers	51	22.8%	173	77.2%	225	100.0%
Doctor or Other Healthcare Professional	4	1.8%	221	98.2%	225	100.0%
Word of Mouth (not a HCP)	25	11.0%	200	89.0%	225	100.0%
Billboards	6	2.7%	219	97.3%	225	100.0%
Work	35	15.5%	190	84.5%	225	100.0%
School	25	10.9%	200	89.1%	225	100.0%
Internet	11	5.0%	213	95.0%	225	100.0%
Don't Know	31	13.9%	193	86.1%	225	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (Several trends, but most commonly, between 2006-2010: significant decrease in “Radio,” and increase in “School”)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Television	28.0%	29.9%	20.1%
Radio	34.7%	22.7%	18.3%
Newspaper	16.1%	11.6%	22.8%
Doctor or other healthcare professional	0.0%	1.9%	1.8%
Word of Mouth	9.8%	13.7%	11.0%
Billboard	4.6%	0.7%	2.7%
Work	9.0%	13.6%	15.5%
School	1.1%	5.4%	10.9%
Internet	0.0%	2.0%	5.0%
Don't Know	9.7%	1.8%	13.9%

Regional Comparison: (none of the sources are significantly different from current regional averages)

Among 10 counties in Central and Western NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Television”	10.6%	44.9%	24.3%
% “Radio”	2.4%	21.0%	15.3%
% “Newspaper”	8.1%	60.4%	24.9%
% “Doctor or other healthcare professional”	0.0%	2.5%	1.8%
% “Word of Mouth”	11.0%	36.2%	14.3%
% “Billboards”	0.0%	12.2%	4.1%
% “Work”	0.7%	30.8%	11.3%
% “School”	0.0%	10.9%	5.2%
% “Internet”	0.0%	12.4%	6.2%
% “Don't Know”	4.8%	17.0%	12.7%

Table 7 – Have you seen or heard the recent media campaign about *tobacco advertising in stores*?

2010 Results:

	Recently seen anti-tobacco ads about TA in stores?	
	Count	%
Yes	181	45.5%
No	201	50.4%
Don't know/Not sure	16	4.0%
Total	398	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: (“Yes” in St. Lawrence County is significantly above the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes”	21.7%	48.9%	35.8%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Yes	44.8%	46.4%	41.0%	52.1%	35.9%	54.6%	42.6%
No	51.7%	49.1%	52.8%	45.6%	59.3%	40.5%	53.6%
Don't know/Not sure	3.6%	4.5%	6.1%	2.3%	4.8%	4.8%	3.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	195	135	194	69	97	300

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	41.8%	50.4%	49.9%	40.2%	49.0%	46.8%
No	53.1%	45.8%	49.1%	56.1%	50.2%	46.1%
Don't know/Not sure	5.2%	3.8%	1.0%	3.7%	.8%	7.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	106	73	82	118	117

Table 8 – Have you ever heard of the NYS Smokers' Quitline?

2010 Results:

	Heard of NYS Smokers' Quitline?	
	Count	%
Yes	304	76.4%
No	92	23.0%
Don't know/Not sure	2	.6%
Total	398	100.0%

Trend Analysis: ("Yes" increased significantly between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Yes	51.3%	68.9%	76.4%
No	48.4%	30.4%	23.0%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.3%	0.7%	0.6%

Regional Comparison: ("Yes" in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% "Yes"	64.2%	84.6%	75.4%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Yes	81.0%	71.5%	83.1%	79.3%	54.7%	91.7%	71.4%
No	18.4%	27.9%	16.9%	20.5%	42.5%	7.3%	28.1%
Don't know/Not sure	.7%	.5%	.0%	.2%	2.8%	1.0%	.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	195	135	194	69	97	300

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	73.4%	86.0%	71.4%	69.6%	82.2%	78.9%
No	25.9%	14.0%	27.4%	30.4%	17.8%	21.1%
Don't know/Not sure	.7%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	106	73	82	118	117

Table 9 – During the past twelve months did any doctor, nurse, or healthcare professional ask if you smoke? (everyone asked this question, both smokers and nonsmokers)

2010 Results:

	Asked if you smoke by a healthcare professional in past year?	
	Count	%
Yes	269	67.8%
No	119	30.0%
Did not see a HCP	5	1.4%
Don't Know/Not Sure	3	.8%
Total	397	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (No significant changes in “Yes” between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Yes	64.0%	63.7%	67.8%
No	26.3%	31.0%	30.0%
“Did not see a healthcare professional in past 12 months.”	9.1%	4.6%	1.4%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.6%	0.8%	0.8%

Regional Comparison: (“Yes” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes”	55.2%	82.5%	68.5%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Yes	64.8%	71.0%	69.2%	69.2%	61.1%	78.3%	64.5%
No	34.4%	25.5%	30.8%	27.5%	35.5%	21.1%	32.9%
Did not see a HCP	.6%	2.2%	.0%	2.1%	1.9%	.0%	1.8%
Don't Know/Not Sure	.2%	1.4%	.0%	1.1%	1.5%	.6%	.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	202	195	135	194	68	97	300

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	63.1%	79.4%	65.1%	77.3%	70.9%	68.8%
No	35.8%	17.6%	30.6%	19.5%	28.3%	28.5%
Did not see a HCP	.3%	1.6%	4.3%	.0%	.8%	2.7%
Don't Know/Not Sure	.8%	1.4%	.0%	3.2%	.0%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	218	106	73	82	118	117

Tobacco Advertising

Table 10 – In the past 30 days, how often have you noticed cigarettes or tobacco products being advertised or promoted *on posters outside or windows facing outside stores where tobacco is sold?*

2010 Results:

	Tobacco Advertising - Outside stores where tobacco sold	
	Count	%
Every Day	61	15.6%
Some Days	87	22.4%
Never (or, Don't Pay Att.)	237	61.4%
Not Sure	2	.6%
Total	387	100.0%

(38.0% "Every day or Some days")

Trend Analysis: (No significant change between 2008-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Every day	60.9%	17.0%	15.6%
Some days (yes)		31.8%	22.4%
Never (or, "Just don't pay attention.")	30.9%	49.5%	61.4%
Not Sure	8.3%	1.6%	0.6%

Regional Comparison: ("Every Day or Some Days" in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% "Every day or Some days"	35.0%	52.4%	42.2%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Every Day	20.2%	11.1%	26.5%	10.8%	9.0%	19.1%	14.6%
Some Days	24.3%	20.5%	26.4%	22.6%	14.3%	29.9%	20.2%
Never (or, Don't Pay Att.)	55.5%	67.2%	47.1%	66.1%	74.7%	50.4%	64.6%
Not Sure	.0%	1.2%	.0%	.5%	2.0%	.6%	.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	194	193	128	192	67	88	299

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Every Day	16.2%	20.6%	6.7%	22.0%	15.5%	12.1%
Some Days	24.3%	17.1%	24.7%	19.9%	28.7%	27.3%
Never (or, Don't Pay Att.)	59.5%	60.6%	67.9%	57.2%	54.8%	60.5%
Not Sure	.0%	1.7%	.6%	1.0%	.9%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	209	105	72	82	108	116

Table 11 – When you go to a convenience store, supermarket, or gas station, how often do you see ads for cigarettes and other tobacco products or items that have tobacco names or pictures on them?

2010 Results:

	Tobacco Advertising - Convenience Stores, Supermarkets, Gas Stations	
	Count	%
All of the time	114	28.8%
Most of the time	53	13.3%
Some of the time	66	16.7%
Hardly ever	61	15.3%
Never	73	18.4%
"I never go to these places."	16	4.0%
Don't know/Not sure	14	3.6%
Total	397	100.0%

(74.1% "at least some")

Trend Analysis: (Exposure "all of the time" decreased significantly between 2008-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
All of the time	48.2%	50.1%	28.8%
Most of the time	13.9%	12.9%	13.3%
Some of the time	15.1%	12.4%	16.7%
Hardly ever	10.3%	10.2%	15.3%
Never	6.2%	5.3%	18.4%
"I never go to these places."	1.0%	3.0%	4.0%
Don't Know/Not Sure	5.3%	6.1%	3.6%

Regional Comparison: (Exposure "at least some" in St. Lawrence not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% "At least some" (A+M+S+H)	64.5%	85.1%	75.8%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
All of the time	30.1%	27.4%	34.0%	27.5%	22.1%	23.1%	30.6%
Most of the time	14.9%	11.5%	15.3%	14.2%	6.5%	15.6%	12.5%
Some of the time	17.3%	16.1%	27.2%	11.8%	9.9%	27.5%	13.2%
Hardly ever	15.3%	15.2%	13.9%	16.5%	14.4%	14.1%	15.6%
Never	16.1%	20.7%	7.2%	22.8%	27.9%	17.9%	18.5%
"I never go to these places."	3.4%	4.7%	.0%	2.9%	15.3%	.6%	5.1%
Don't know/Not sure	2.9%	4.3%	2.4%	4.2%	3.9%	1.1%	4.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	202	195	135	194	68	97	300

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	>\$50,000+
All of the time	28.9%	29.4%	27.4%	36.5%	29.0%	29.4%
Most of the time	10.2%	12.6%	23.3%	8.5%	15.4%	14.7%
Some of the time	21.9%	13.6%	5.9%	10.4%	18.2%	15.7%
Hardly ever	12.3%	22.3%	14.0%	12.7%	18.1%	16.5%
Never	18.3%	18.9%	17.7%	21.6%	13.4%	19.2%
"I never go to these places."	5.9%	2.0%	1.5%	7.2%	2.1%	1.9%
Don't know/Not sure	2.5%	1.2%	10.1%	3.1%	3.7%	2.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	218	106	73	82	118	117

Table 12 – "If tobacco retailers removed tobacco ads it would decrease the number of youth who begin smoking."

2010 Results:

	"Retailers removing tobacco ads would reduce youths starting smoking."	
	Count	%
Strongly Agree	112	28.3%
Agree	111	27.9%
Disagree	98	24.8%
Strongly Disagree	55	13.8%
Don't Know/Not Sure	21	5.3%
Total	396	100.0%

(56.2% "Strongly Agree or Agree")

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: ("Strongly Agree or Agree" in St. Lawrence not significantly different from current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% "Strongly Agree or Agree"	53.0%	59.8%	57.0%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Strongly Agree	27.8%	28.7%	35.6%	23.9%	26.0%	26.5%	28.8%
Agree	26.6%	29.2%	25.7%	29.8%	26.8%	23.4%	29.4%
Disagree	25.8%	23.7%	15.4%	30.4%	27.5%	23.5%	25.2%
Strongly Disagree	16.3%	11.2%	19.2%	11.7%	8.9%	22.4%	11.0%
Don't Know/Not Sure	3.5%	7.1%	4.2%	4.1%	10.8%	4.2%	5.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	201	195	135	193	68	97	299

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Strongly Agree	27.7%	21.9%	39.2%	29.9%	34.0%	28.2%
Agree	21.0%	41.4%	29.0%	25.5%	33.8%	29.2%
Disagree	30.2%	16.6%	20.1%	30.9%	16.0%	23.2%
Strongly Disagree	16.6%	13.1%	6.4%	7.5%	13.1%	12.7%
Don't Know/Not Sure	4.5%	7.0%	5.3%	6.2%	3.2%	6.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	218	106	73	82	118	116

Table 13 – What is your opinion about a policy that would eliminate the display of tobacco products in convenience stores and gas stations?

2010 Results:

	Eliminate displays of tobacco products? - Convenience Stores	
	Count	%
Strongly Favor	147	36.9%
Somewhat Favor	90	22.5%
Neither Favor/Against	57	14.3%
Somewhat Against	56	14.0%
Strongly Against	29	7.3%
Not Sure	20	4.9%
Total	399	100.0%

(59.4% “Strongly or Somewhat in Favor”)

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: (“Strongly or Somewhat Favor” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Strongly or Somewhat in Favor”	50.4%	66.9%	59.5%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Strongly Favor	33.6%	40.3%	32.0%	40.1%	37.7%	25.4%	40.6%
Somewhat Favor	23.4%	21.6%	22.8%	22.4%	22.6%	21.8%	22.8%
Neither Favor/Against	16.1%	12.5%	16.3%	14.8%	8.8%	24.0%	11.2%
Somewhat Against	13.6%	14.4%	19.8%	11.7%	8.8%	21.1%	11.7%
Strongly Against	8.9%	5.7%	.0%	9.7%	15.6%	6.6%	7.6%
Not Sure	4.3%	5.5%	9.1%	1.4%	6.5%	1.2%	6.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	202	197	137	194	68	97	302

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Strongly Favor	32.3%	33.3%	55.9%	35.0%	30.7%	43.6%
Somewhat Favor	19.9%	33.3%	14.6%	31.9%	28.5%	18.1%
Neither Favor/Against	12.2%	18.3%	14.5%	9.3%	18.2%	19.3%
Somewhat Against	18.8%	7.2%	9.6%	12.8%	11.2%	12.5%
Strongly Against	8.1%	7.3%	5.0%	7.6%	6.4%	6.1%
Not Sure	8.5%	.7%	.3%	3.4%	5.0%	.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	218	108	73	82	118	117

Table 14 – What is your opinion about a policy that would eliminate the display of tobacco products in *grocery stores*?

2010 Results:

	Eliminate displays of tobacco products? - Grocery Stores	
	Count	%
Strongly Favor	170	42.7%
Somewhat Favor	79	19.9%
Neither Favor/Against	45	11.2%
Somewhat Against	54	13.6%
Strongly Against	30	7.6%
Not Sure	20	5.0%
Total	399	100.0%

(62.6% “Strongly or Somewhat in Favor”)

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: (“Strongly or Somewhat Favor” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Strongly or Somewhat in Favor”	53.2%	69.3%	63.2%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Strongly Favor	41.2%	44.3%	43.6%	42.7%	40.8%	34.4%	45.4%
Somewhat Favor	20.3%	19.4%	16.8%	21.2%	22.2%	20.7%	19.6%
Neither Favor/Against	11.4%	11.0%	10.7%	13.0%	7.2%	15.6%	9.8%
Somewhat Against	14.2%	13.0%	19.8%	11.0%	8.7%	21.0%	11.3%
Strongly Against	8.6%	6.5%	.0%	10.4%	14.7%	6.6%	7.8%
Not Sure	4.3%	5.7%	9.1%	1.7%	6.4%	1.7%	6.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	202	197	137	194	68	97	302

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Strongly Favor	40.3%	36.7%	58.8%	47.5%	39.0%	45.1%
Somewhat Favor	16.6%	29.8%	15.0%	20.0%	26.8%	19.5%
Neither Favor/Against	7.6%	18.4%	11.2%	8.7%	10.7%	17.3%
Somewhat Against	18.3%	6.4%	10.3%	11.4%	11.2%	12.3%
Strongly Against	8.9%	7.3%	4.0%	8.9%	7.3%	5.4%
Not Sure	8.3%	1.4%	.7%	3.4%	5.0%	.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	218	108	73	82	118	117

Table 15 – What is your opinion about a policy that would eliminate the display of tobacco products in *pharmacies*?

2010 Results:

	Eliminate displays of tobacco products? - Pharmacies	
	Count	%
Strongly Favor	184	46.3%
Somewhat Favor	68	17.2%
Neither Favor/Against	42	10.6%
Somewhat Against	52	13.1%
Strongly Against	32	8.0%
Not Sure	19	4.8%
Total	398	100.0%

(63.5% “Strongly or Somewhat in Favor”)

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: (“Strongly or Somewhat Favor” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Strongly or Somewhat in Favor”	57.8%	75.4%	65.9%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Strongly Favor	43.6%	49.2%	45.2%	47.6%	45.1%	37.1%	49.4%
Somewhat Favor	18.2%	16.2%	16.8%	16.4%	20.4%	20.2%	16.2%
Neither Favor/Against	10.7%	10.5%	9.1%	12.9%	7.1%	13.4%	9.7%
Somewhat Against	13.8%	12.3%	19.8%	9.8%	8.5%	21.0%	10.5%
Strongly Against	9.6%	6.3%	.0%	11.7%	13.5%	6.6%	8.4%
Not Sure	4.1%	5.7%	9.1%	1.7%	5.3%	1.7%	5.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	202	196	137	194	66	97	300

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Strongly Favor	42.7%	42.8%	62.2%	53.4%	42.1%	48.6%
Somewhat Favor	14.4%	27.5%	10.3%	17.8%	24.1%	15.1%
Neither Favor/Against	7.1%	15.7%	13.5%	5.5%	10.7%	17.1%
Somewhat Against	18.4%	5.5%	8.3%	10.9%	10.7%	11.9%
Strongly Against	9.5%	7.3%	4.5%	9.0%	7.3%	6.6%
Not Sure	7.9%	1.2%	1.2%	3.4%	5.2%	.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	217	108	73	82	118	117

Table 16 – Would you like to see store owners voluntarily decrease the number of tobacco ads inside and outside their stores?

2010 Results:

	Like to see store owners voluntarily decrease the number of tobacco ads inside and outside their stores?	
	Count	%
Yes	312	78.8%
No	44	11.2%
Don't know/Not sure	40	10.1%
Total	396	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: (“Yes” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes”	72.3%	84.6%	77.3%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Yes	74.7%	83.0%	72.1%	82.9%	80.3%	54.3%	86.7%
No	15.7%	6.4%	14.4%	7.7%	14.5%	23.6%	7.1%
Don't know/Not sure	9.6%	10.5%	13.4%	9.4%	5.2%	22.0%	6.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	202	194	135	194	67	97	299

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	76.9%	78.2%	85.3%	83.5%	78.2%	77.8%
No	12.3%	11.4%	7.4%	10.2%	11.4%	13.7%
Don't know/Not sure	10.8%	10.4%	7.3%	6.3%	10.5%	8.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	217	106	73	82	116	117

Tobacco Sales

Table 17 – Do you think that *convenience stores and gas stations* should or should not sell tobacco products?

2010 Results:

	Should or should not sell tobacco products? - Convenience stores	
	Count	%
Should	251	63.6%
Should not	104	26.3%
Don't know	40	10.1%
Total	395	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: (“Should not” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Should not”	22.4%	40.9%	28.4%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are *statistically significant differences*, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Should	74.4%	52.4%	70.6%	64.1%	48.0%	86.6%	56.1%
Should not	17.0%	36.0%	21.1%	24.8%	41.1%	10.1%	31.6%
Don't know	8.7%	11.6%	8.2%	11.1%	10.9%	3.2%	12.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	202	193	135	194	66	97	298

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Should	62.9%	67.0%	60.9%	54.3%	66.8%	67.1%
Should not	29.7%	20.1%	25.0%	37.7%	25.2%	22.9%
Don't know	7.3%	13.0%	14.1%	8.0%	8.0%	10.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	216	106	73	82	118	117

Table 18 – Do you think that *grocery stores* should or should not sell tobacco products?

2010 Results:

	Should or should not sell tobacco products? - Grocery stores	
	Count	%
Should	211	53.4%
Should not	150	38.0%
Don't know	34	8.6%
Total	395	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: (“Should not” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Should not”	36.2%	50.5%	43.0%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Should	60.9%	45.6%	58.3%	54.1%	41.6%	68.9%	48.4%
Should not	31.7%	44.6%	36.1%	35.5%	49.4%	27.9%	41.3%
Don't know	7.4%	9.8%	5.7%	10.4%	9.0%	3.2%	10.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	202	193	135	194	66	97	298

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Should	53.2%	56.2%	50.2%	43.0%	53.5%	54.7%
Should not	39.1%	35.9%	37.9%	49.3%	39.2%	36.5%
Don't know	7.7%	8.0%	11.8%	7.7%	7.3%	8.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	216	106	73	82	118	117

Table 19 – Do you think that *pharmacies* should or should not sell tobacco products?

2010 Results:

	Should or should not sell tobacco products? - Pharmacies	
	Count	%
Should	161	40.8%
Should not	207	52.4%
Don't know	27	6.8%
Total	395	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: (“Should not” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Should not”	49.9%	65.4%	57.4%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Should	49.5%	31.8%	37.6%	44.8%	35.7%	63.8%	33.3%
Should not	44.4%	60.7%	58.2%	46.9%	56.6%	32.9%	58.8%
Don't know	6.1%	7.5%	4.2%	8.2%	7.7%	3.2%	7.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	202	193	135	194	66	97	297

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Should	44.2%	37.3%	36.0%	36.1%	45.5%	40.1%
Should not	50.0%	54.7%	56.3%	58.2%	48.1%	51.1%
Don't know	5.8%	8.0%	7.8%	5.8%	6.5%	8.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	216	105	73	82	118	117

Table 20 – Would you support tobacco retailers being required to keep tobacco products out of the view from customers in stores?

2010 Results:

	Support tobacco retailers being required to keep tobacco products out of view from customers?	
	Count	%
Yes	270	67.9%
No	114	28.7%
Not sure/No opinion	13	3.4%
Total	397	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: (“Yes” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes”	59.5%	67.9%	63.3%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Yes	59.6%	76.6%	64.8%	69.6%	69.6%	47.6%	74.5%
No	37.5%	19.7%	35.2%	25.4%	24.8%	48.3%	22.3%
Not sure/No opinion	3.0%	3.7%	.0%	5.0%	5.6%	4.1%	3.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	202	195	137	194	66	97	300

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	61.8%	75.9%	74.3%	73.5%	71.6%	67.3%
No	36.4%	18.3%	21.3%	20.7%	27.7%	29.6%
Not sure/No opinion	1.8%	5.8%	4.3%	5.8%	.7%	3.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	216	108	73	82	118	117

Secondhand Smoke Exposure – Your Home and/or Personal Vehicle

Table 21 – Do you think that breathing smoke from someone else’s cigarettes is:

2010 Results:

	Do you think that breathing smoke from someone else’s cigarettes is:	
	Count	%
Very harmful	280	70.2%
Somewhat harmful	88	22.0%
Not very harmful	13	3.3%
Not at all harmful	7	1.7%
Don't know/Not sure	11	2.8%
Total	399	100.0%

(92.2% “Very harmful or Somewhat harmful”)

Trend Analysis: (“Very Harmful or Somewhat Harmful” has not changed significantly between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Very harmful to one’s health	77.7%	76.2%	70.2%
Somewhat harmful to one’s health	14.6%	15.8%	22.0%
Not very harmful to one’s health	1.7%	4.6%	3.3%
Not harmful at all to one’s health	2.0%	1.7%	1.7%
Don’t Know/Not Sure	4.0%	1.7%	2.8%

Regional Comparison: (“Very or Somewhat Harmful” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Very harmful or Somewhat harmful”	88.6%	95.4%	93.0%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Very harmful	61.2%	79.5%	63.4%	71.4%	80.6%	41.4%	79.5%
Somewhat harmful	25.5%	18.3%	28.3%	21.3%	11.0%	34.7%	17.8%
Not very harmful	5.6%	1.0%	5.7%	1.9%	2.6%	11.3%	.8%
Not at all harmful	2.6%	.6%	.0%	1.9%	4.4%	4.7%	.7%
Don't know/Not sure	5.0%	.6%	2.5%	3.5%	1.4%	7.9%	1.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	196	137	193	69	97	302

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Very harmful	70.1%	61.5%	83.3%	77.4%	62.3%	73.5%
Somewhat harmful	19.8%	30.7%	15.6%	17.1%	26.9%	20.0%
Not very harmful	5.6%	1.0%	.0%	4.6%	6.6%	.8%
Not at all harmful	1.7%	2.3%	.6%	.3%	2.6%	1.6%
Don't know/Not sure	2.8%	4.5%	.6%	.6%	1.5%	4.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	107	73	82	118	116

Table 22 – Which statement best describes the rules about smoking *in your home*?

2010 Results:

	Rules about smoking in your home	
	Count	%
Not Allowed At All	309	77.5%
Allowed Sometimes	37	9.3%
Allowed anywhere	33	8.2%
No rules	18	4.6%
Don't Know/Not Sure	2	.4%
Total	399	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (“Never allowed” has not changed significantly between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Never allowed anywhere in my home	71.4%	76.2%	77.5%
Allowed in some places or sometimes in my home	7.7%	9.7%	9.3%
Allowed anywhere in my home	19.7%	11.4%	8.2%
There are no rules about smoking in my home	1.2%	2.6%	4.6%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%

Regional Comparison: (“Never allowed” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Not allowed at all”	70.1%	89.0%	79.3%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Not Allowed At All	72.0%	83.1%	80.1%	74.8%	80.0%	40.3%	89.5%
Allowed Sometimes	7.2%	11.6%	9.1%	10.9%	5.5%	22.2%	5.2%
Allowed anywhere	12.8%	3.5%	8.2%	8.6%	6.8%	29.2%	1.4%
No rules	7.6%	1.5%	2.5%	5.7%	5.5%	7.7%	3.6%
Don't Know/Not Sure	.5%	.3%	.0%	.0%	2.3%	.6%	.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	202	197	137	193	68	97	302

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Not Allowed At All	71.1%	80.0%	93.2%	72.3%	69.1%	89.8%
Allowed Sometimes	12.6%	8.3%	1.2%	10.6%	13.4%	4.6%
Allowed anywhere	11.2%	5.5%	3.0%	12.8%	15.1%	.0%
No rules	4.4%	6.3%	2.7%	3.6%	1.6%	5.6%
Don't Know/Not Sure	.7%	.0%	.0%	.7%	.8%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	107	73	82	118	116

Table 23 – Which statement best describes the rules about smoking *in your personal vehicle(s)*?

2010 Results:

	Rules about smoking in your personal vehicle	
	Count	%
Not Allowed At All	300	75.0%
Allowed Sometimes	36	9.1%
Allowed in All Vehicles	56	14.0%
Don't Have a Vehicle	7	1.7%
Don't Know/Not Sure	1	.2%
Total	400	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (“Never allowed” has not changed significantly between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Never allowed in any vehicles	70.9%	74.9%	75.0%
Allowed sometimes or in some vehicles	6.9%	9.6%	9.1%
Allowed in all vehicles	20.4%	13.3%	14.0%
Do not have a vehicle	1.5%	2.2%	1.7%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%

Regional Comparison: (“Never allowed” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Not allowed at all”	65.3%	83.1%	74.8%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Not Allowed At All	66.0%	84.3%	72.3%	73.8%	83.9%	32.4%	88.8%
Allowed Sometimes	9.4%	8.7%	8.2%	11.0%	5.2%	16.7%	6.6%
Allowed in All Vehicles	23.1%	4.6%	19.5%	12.7%	6.5%	47.1%	3.3%
Don't Have a Vehicle	1.3%	2.1%	.0%	2.4%	2.9%	3.2%	1.2%
Don't Know/Not Sure	.2%	.3%	.0%	.0%	1.4%	.6%	.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	197	137	194	69	97	303

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Not Allowed At All	70.5%	72.4%	92.4%	72.1%	58.3%	85.7%
Allowed Sometimes	6.6%	18.2%	2.9%	7.6%	9.6%	12.0%
Allowed in All Vehicles	20.5%	7.4%	4.2%	12.1%	32.1%	1.9%
Don't Have a Vehicle	2.1%	1.9%	.0%	7.5%	.0%	.0%
Don't Know/Not Sure	.3%	.0%	.6%	.7%	.0%	.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	108	73	82	118	117

Table 24 – If New York State implemented a law prohibiting smoking inside a car when a person under the age of 18 is present, would you agree or disagree with this law?

2010 Results:

	Law prohibiting smoking inside a car when person under 18 is present, would you agree or disagree?	
	Count	%
Strongly Agree	204	51.0%
Agree	94	23.5%
Neutral	7	1.8%
Disagree	57	14.2%
Strongly Disagree	35	8.6%
Don't Know/Not Sure	3	.8%
Total	400	100.0%

(74.5% “Strongly Agree or Agree”)

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: (“Strongly Agree or Agree” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Agree or Strongly Agree”	64.5%	77.0%	70.1%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Strongly Agree	42.1%	60.2%	52.2%	50.5%	50.3%	33.4%	56.7%
Agree	24.5%	22.5%	24.2%	24.5%	19.3%	33.5%	20.3%
Neutral	2.9%	.8%	.0%	2.6%	3.4%	3.8%	1.2%
Disagree	19.8%	8.5%	21.1%	9.8%	13.0%	16.4%	13.5%
Strongly Disagree	10.3%	6.9%	2.5%	11.8%	12.0%	12.3%	7.4%
Don't Know/Not Sure	.4%	1.2%	.0%	.9%	2.1%	.6%	.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	197	137	194	69	97	303

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Strongly Agree	45.8%	52.2%	64.8%	45.0%	44.0%	60.6%
Agree	24.1%	25.6%	18.6%	28.8%	32.0%	20.2%
Neutral	2.2%	1.9%	.6%	2.2%	2.1%	1.1%
Disagree	17.1%	12.4%	8.1%	10.2%	14.4%	8.6%
Strongly Disagree	10.2%	7.6%	5.5%	13.5%	7.4%	8.0%
Don't Know/Not Sure	.5%	.2%	2.3%	.3%	.0%	1.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	108	73	82	118	117

Secondhand Smoke Exposure – At the Workplace

Table 25 – Are you currently employed?

2010 Results:

	Employment Status	
	Count	%
Employed for wages	195	48.8%
Self-employed	15	3.7%
Out of work (1+ year)	13	3.3%
Out of work (<1 year)	39	9.9%
Homemaker	13	3.4%
Student	12	2.9%
Retired	89	22.4%
Unable to work	22	5.5%
Don't Know/Not Sure	1	.1%
Total	399	100.0%

(52.5% "Currently employed")

Trend Analysis: (No significant change in "Employed" between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Yes	57.1%	55.4%	52.5%
No	42.9%	44.6%	47.4%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%

Regional Comparison: ("Employed" in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% "Employed"	48.2%	73.8%	57.6%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Employed for wages	48.4%	49.3%	60.3%	55.3%	7.1%	52.3%	47.7%
Self-employed	5.2%	2.3%	2.4%	4.8%	3.2%	1.9%	4.3%
Out of work (1+ year)	1.7%	4.9%	3.5%	4.3%	.0%	8.1%	1.7%
Out of work (<1 year)	13.8%	5.9%	22.0%	4.8%	.0%	10.3%	9.8%
Homemaker	.0%	6.9%	3.5%	3.6%	2.5%	.0%	4.5%
Student	3.4%	2.4%	8.4%	.0%	.0%	3.6%	2.7%
Retired	21.0%	23.8%	.0%	15.9%	86.3%	15.2%	24.7%
Unable to work	6.6%	4.3%	.0%	11.0%	.9%	8.6%	4.5%
Don't Know/Not Sure	.0%	.3%	.0%	.3%	.0%	.0%	.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	202	197	137	193	68	97	301

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Employed for wages	33.7%	69.5%	63.4%	23.0%	56.2%	72.7%
Self-employed	3.6%	1.9%	6.8%	5.9%	2.4%	5.7%
Out of work (1+ year)	4.5%	2.5%	.6%	7.8%	.0%	1.1%
Out of work (<1 year)	16.1%	3.2%	1.3%	2.7%	16.2%	.0%
Homemaker	5.3%	1.4%	.6%	7.7%	2.1%	1.8%
Student	2.2%	3.3%	4.5%	.0%	2.8%	7.1%
Retired	26.8%	15.0%	20.1%	35.9%	18.6%	11.6%
Unable to work	7.8%	2.8%	2.6%	16.9%	1.6%	.0%
Don't Know/Not Sure	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	218	107	73	82	118	117

Table 26 – Is there a policy that prohibits smoking on the entire grounds of your workplace?

2010 Results:

	Policy Prohibiting Smoking on Entire Grounds at Work	
	Count	%
Yes	108	51.5%
No	97	46.4%
Don't know/Not sure	4	2.1%
Total	209	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (No significant change in “Yes” between 2008-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Yes	NA	56.1%	51.5%
No	NA	43.3%	46.4%
Don't Know/Not Sure	NA	0.6%	2.1%

Regional Comparison: (“Yes” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes”	33.9%	53.9%	46.6%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Yes	40.6%	63.2%	40.3%	60.5%	40.2%	43.5%	54.2%
No	57.7%	34.3%	59.7%	35.7%	59.8%	53.0%	44.1%
Don't know/Not sure	1.7%	2.5%	.0%	3.8%	.0%	3.4%	1.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	108	101	86	116	7	53	157

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	43.9%	46.7%	70.8%	50.5%	50.5%	54.0%
No	52.5%	52.0%	28.3%	49.5%	47.1%	43.5%
Don't know/Not sure	3.6%	1.3%	.9%	.0%	2.4%	2.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	81	77	51	24	69	91

Table 27 – Would you be”/”Are you” in favor of a/the policy that prohibits smoking on the entire grounds of your workplace?

2010 Results:

	Support policy prohibiting smoking at work?	
	Count	%
Yes	121	57.7%
No	80	38.3%
Don't know/Not sure	8	4.0%
Total	209	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (No significant change in “Yes” between 2008-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Yes	NA	60.5%	57.7%
No	NA	41.4%	38.3%
Don't Know/Not Sure	NA	8.1%	4.0%

Regional Comparison: (“Yes” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes”	51.1%	64.3%	58.4%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Yes	43.7%	72.7%	33.6%	74.4%	78.0%	32.5%	66.3%
No	49.1%	26.8%	58.2%	24.5%	22.0%	60.9%	30.7%
Don't know/Not sure	7.2%	.5%	8.1%	1.1%	.0%	6.6%	3.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	108	101	86	116	7	53	157

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	48.4%	48.9%	85.7%	70.9%	44.6%	62.9%
No	51.6%	40.3%	14.3%	29.1%	55.4%	29.5%
Don't know/Not sure	.0%	10.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	7.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	81	77	51	24	69	91

Table 28 – In the past 12 months, has your employer offered any stop-smoking program or any other help to employees who want to quit smoking?

2010 Results:

	Employer offered stop-smoking program?	
	Count	%
Yes	66	31.7%
No	132	62.9%
Don't know/Not sure	11	5.4%
Total	209	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (No significant change in “Yes” between 2008-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Yes	NA	34.8%	31.7%
No	NA	57.0%	62.9%
Don't Know/Not Sure	NA	8.2%	5.4%

Regional Comparison: (“Yes” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes”	24.5%	34.3%	29.3%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Yes	21.8%	42.2%	34.8%	29.5%	28.7%	23.2%	34.5%
No	73.6%	51.5%	65.2%	60.7%	71.3%	76.8%	58.2%
Don't know/Not sure	4.6%	6.3%	.0%	9.8%	.0%	.0%	7.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	108	101	86	116	7	53	157

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	22.7%	42.5%	29.7%	28.1%	31.1%	34.1%
No	69.6%	53.4%	66.4%	67.2%	64.9%	60.2%
Don't know/Not sure	7.7%	4.1%	3.9%	4.7%	4.0%	5.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	81	77	51	24	69	91

Secondhand Smoke Exposure – Public Outdoor Locations

For the following list of public outdoor locations, this introductory statement was read: “Next, I am going to read you a short list of public outdoor locations, for each can you tell me if you think smoking should be allowed anywhere; be restricted to certain areas; or not allowed at all.”

Table 29 – SUMMARY – Attitudes about restricting or eliminating smoking at public outdoor locations:

	Public Outdoor Recreation Area (parks, pools, beaches, etc.)		Public Building Entryways		Sporting Events	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Allow Anywhere	59	14.6%	60	14.9%	51	12.8%
Restrict to Certain Areas	176	44.1%	95	23.7%	116	29.1%
Not Allowed at All	161	40.2%	238	59.4%	228	57.0%
Not Sure/No Opinion	5	1.1%	8	2.0%	4	1.1%
Total	400	100.0%	400	100.0%	399	100.0%

Table 30 – At an outdoor recreation area such as a public park, pool, or beach in your county, do you think smoking should be allowed anywhere, restricted to certain areas, or not allowed at all?

2010 Results:

	Public Outdoor Recreation Area (parks, pools, beaches, etc.)	
	Count	%
Allow Anywhere	59	14.6%
Restrict to Certain Areas	176	44.1%
Not Allowed at All	161	40.2%
Not Sure/No Opinion	5	1.1%
Total	400	100.0%

(84.3% "Restrict or Do Not Allow")

Trend Analysis: (in previous St. Lawrence County studies, "park," "pool," and "beach" were separate survey questions)

Regional Comparison: ("Restrict or Not Allow" in St. Lawrence County is significantly above the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% "Restrict or Do Not Allow"	70.2%	85.7%	79.1%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Allow Anywhere	20.4%	8.7%	11.3%	15.7%	18.2%	24.0%	11.6%
Restrict to Certain Areas	44.4%	43.7%	43.0%	47.8%	35.5%	36.3%	46.5%
Not Allowed at All	34.4%	46.1%	45.7%	34.5%	45.1%	39.6%	40.3%
Not Sure/No Opinion	.8%	1.5%	.0%	1.9%	1.2%	.0%	1.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	197	137	194	69	97	303

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Allow Anywhere	17.8%	8.8%	13.8%	12.6%	17.4%	7.1%
Restrict to Certain Areas	38.8%	57.1%	40.5%	43.9%	38.9%	55.9%
Not Allowed at All	42.6%	32.2%	44.6%	41.5%	43.0%	35.9%
Not Sure/No Opinion	.8%	1.9%	1.0%	2.0%	.7%	1.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	108	73	82	118	117

Table 31 – When walking though an *area around public building entryways* in your county, do you think smoking should be allowed anywhere, restricted to certain areas, or not allowed at all?

2010 Results:

	Public Building Entryways	
	Count	%
Allow Anywhere	60	14.9%
Restrict to Certain Areas	95	23.7%
Not Allowed at All	238	59.4%
Not Sure/No Opinion	8	2.0%
Total	400	100.0%

(83.1% “Restrict or Do Not Allow”)

Trend Analysis: (No significant change in “Restrict or Not Allow” between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Allowed anywhere	11.8%	11.5%	14.9%
Restricted to certain areas	30.4%	28.5%	23.7%
Not allowed at all	54.2%	59.1%	59.4%
Not Sure/No Opinion	3.6%	1.0%	2.0%

Regional Comparison: (“Restrict or Not Allow” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Restrict or Do Not Allow”	74.6%	91.4%	84.8%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Allow Anywhere	22.4%	7.2%	23.0%	10.0%	12.7%	31.2%	9.6%
Restrict to Certain Areas	23.0%	24.4%	23.8%	25.0%	19.9%	22.6%	24.1%
Not Allowed at All	52.8%	66.2%	53.2%	63.2%	61.0%	45.7%	63.8%
Not Sure/No Opinion	1.7%	2.3%	.0%	1.9%	6.5%	.5%	2.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	197	137	194	69	97	303

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Allow Anywhere	20.5%	8.1%	8.2%	8.6%	18.9%	13.5%
Restrict to Certain Areas	21.1%	26.7%	27.0%	26.4%	21.4%	23.8%
Not Allowed at All	56.7%	61.8%	63.8%	62.2%	57.6%	61.8%
Not Sure/No Opinion	1.7%	3.4%	1.0%	2.8%	2.1%	.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	108	73	82	118	117

Table 32 – At sporting events in your county, do you think smoking should be allowed anywhere, restricted to certain areas, or not allowed at all?

2010 Results:

	Sporting Events	
	Count	%
Allow Anywhere	51	12.8%
Restrict to Certain Areas	116	29.1%
Not Allowed at All	228	57.0%
Not Sure/No Opinion	4	1.1%
Total	399	100.0%

(86.1% "Restrict or Do Not Allow")

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: ("Restrict or Not Allow" in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% "Restrict or Do Not Allow"	78.0%	88.6%	84.1%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Allow Anywhere	22.2%	3.1%	19.5%	8.0%	12.9%	32.5%	6.4%
Restrict to Certain Areas	30.4%	27.8%	26.4%	33.4%	22.4%	26.1%	30.1%
Not Allowed at All	47.1%	67.2%	54.1%	56.7%	63.9%	39.4%	62.7%
Not Sure/No Opinion	.4%	1.8%	.0%	2.0%	.9%	1.9%	.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	197	137	193	69	97	302

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Allow Anywhere	17.0%	8.6%	6.5%	7.2%	18.0%	8.1%
Restrict to Certain Areas	26.4%	33.6%	30.5%	30.8%	29.2%	32.4%
Not Allowed at All	55.9%	56.9%	60.7%	61.4%	51.9%	58.6%
Not Sure/No Opinion	.8%	.9%	2.3%	.7%	.9%	.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	107	73	82	118	117

Tobacco Use

Table 33 – Have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your entire life?

2010 Results:

	Smoked 100+ cigarettes in your entire life?	
	Count	%
Yes	217	54.2%
No	183	45.8%
Total	400	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (No significant change in “Yes” between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Yes	47.1%	53.4%	54.2%
No	52.9%	46.6%	45.8%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: (“Smoked 100+” in St. Lawrence County is significantly above the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes”	40.0%	55.9%	46.5%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Yes	59.5%	48.9%	52.0%	57.0%	51.0%	100.0%	39.5%
No	40.5%	51.1%	48.0%	43.0%	49.0%	.0%	60.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	197	137	194	69	97	303

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	63.4%	55.9%	24.3%	68.5%	68.9%	41.2%
No	36.6%	44.1%	75.7%	31.5%	31.1%	58.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	108	73	82	118	117

Table 34 – Do you now smoke cigarettes everyday, some days, or not at all?

2010 Results:

	Current cigarette smoking frequency	
	Count	%
Smoke Every Day	76	19.1%
Smoke Some Days	21	5.3%
Do Not Smoke At All	303	75.6%
Total	400	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (“Smoke every day” has not changed significantly between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Every day	21.7%	20.1%	19.1%
Some days	3.7%	3.3%	5.3%
Not at all	74.6%	76.6%	75.6%
Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: (“Smoke every day” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Smoke Every Day”	8.8%	20.8%	13.7%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Smoke Every Day	25.5%	12.5%	26.1%	17.9%	8.3%	78.2%	.0%
Smoke Some Days	6.3%	4.3%	12.7%	1.4%	1.5%	21.8%	.0%
Do Not Smoke At All	68.2%	83.2%	61.2%	80.7%	90.2%	.0%	100.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	197	137	194	69	97	303

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Smoke Every Day	26.2%	14.7%	4.1%	18.5%	35.6%	6.7%
Smoke Some Days	3.3%	12.6%	.6%	3.1%	9.0%	6.0%
Do Not Smoke At All	70.5%	72.7%	95.3%	78.4%	55.5%	87.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	108	73	82	118	117

Table 35 – Current cigarette smoking status among adult residents:

2010 Results:

	Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Count	%
Current smoker	97	24.4%
Former smoker	120	29.9%
Never a smoker	183	45.8%
Total	400	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (No significant changes in “Current smoker” rate; the 2010 rate of 24.4% is not significantly different from either of the 2006 or 2008 rates found)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Current smoker	25.4%	23.4%	24.4%
Former smoker	21.7%	30.0%	29.9%
Never smoker	52.9%	46.6%	45.8%
Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: (“Current smoker” in St. Lawrence County is significantly above the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Current smokers”	11.5%	24.4%	17.5%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Current smoker	31.8%	16.8%	38.8%	19.3%	9.8%	100.0%	.0%
Former smoker	27.7%	32.1%	13.2%	37.7%	41.2%	.0%	39.5%
Never a smoker	40.5%	51.1%	48.0%	43.0%	49.0%	.0%	60.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	197	137	194	69	97	303

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Current smoker	29.5%	27.3%	4.7%	21.6%	44.5%	12.7%
Former smoker	33.9%	28.6%	19.6%	46.9%	24.4%	28.4%
Never a smoker	36.6%	44.1%	75.7%	31.5%	31.1%	58.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	108	73	82	118	117

Table 36 – SUMMARY: Use of Other Types of Non-cigarette Tobacco Products

2010 Results:

	Smokeless Tobacco Use		"e-cigarettes" Use	
	Count	%	Count	%
Every day	17	4.2%	0	.0%
Some days	0	.0%	2	.5%
Never	383	95.8%	398	99.5%
Total	400	100.0%	400	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (Use of each of smokeless tobacco has not changed significantly between 2006-2010, e-cigarettes not studied in earlier years)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
% use smokeless tobacco	2.5%	3.8%	4.2%
% use e-cigarettes	NA	NA	0.5%

Regional Comparison: ("Use of non-cigarette tobacco products" in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from regional averages)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% use smokeless tobacco	0.3%	6.3%	3.4%
% use e-cigarettes	0.5%	0.9%	0.8%

Table 37 – Use of At Least One Other Type of Non-cigarette Tobacco Product

2010 Results:

	Do you currently use any other types of tobacco products? (other than cigarettes)	
	Count	%
Yes	19	4.7%
No	381	95.3%
Total	400	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (“Use at least one type of non-cigarette tobacco product” has not changed significantly between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Use at least one non-cigarette product	4.5%	8.5%	4.7%
Do not	95.5%	91.5%	95.3%
Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: (“Use at least one type of non-cigarette tobacco product” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from regional average)

Regional Comparison: Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% use a non-cigarette tobacco product	3.2%	10.7%	6.0%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Yes	8.9%	.3%	8.2%	3.8%	.0%	15.8%	1.1%
No	91.1%	99.7%	91.8%	96.2%	100.0%	84.2%	98.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	197	137	194	69	97	303

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	5.2%	6.0%	1.0%	.0%	9.3%	6.6%
No	94.8%	94.0%	99.0%	100.0%	90.7%	93.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	108	73	82	118	117

Table 38 – Overall Tobacco Use Status among adult residents

2010 Results:

	Overall Tobacco Use	
	Count	%
Use No Tobacco Products	299	74.8%
Other Tobacco Only	3	.8%
Cigarettes Only	82	20.5%
Both Cigarettes and Other Tobacco	15	3.9%
Total	400	100.0%

(25.2% “Use at least one type of tobacco product”)

Trend Analysis: (No significant changes in “Use at least one type of tobacco product”; the 2010 rate of 25.2% is not significantly different from either of the 2006 or 2008 rates found ... 28.3%, and 27.3%, respectively)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Use NO TOBACCO	71.7%	72.7%	74.8%
Non-cigarette tobacco products only	2.9%	3.9%	0.8%
Smoke cigarettes only	23.8%	18.8%	20.5%
Both smoke cigarettes and use other non-cigarette tobacco	1.6%	4.6%	3.9%
Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: (“Use tobacco” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Use at least one type of tobacco product”	13.7%	30.8%	20.6%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status	
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker	Non-smoker
Use No Tobacco Products	66.7%	83.2%	61.2%	79.0%	90.2%	.0%	98.9%
Other Tobacco Only	1.6%	.0%	.0%	1.7%	.0%	.0%	1.1%
Cigarettes Only	24.4%	16.5%	30.6%	17.2%	9.8%	84.2%	.0%
Both Cigarettes and Other Tobacco	7.4%	.3%	8.2%	2.1%	.0%	15.8%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	203	197	137	194	69	97	303

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Use No Tobacco Products	70.5%	70.4%	94.3%	78.4%	54.8%	85.2%
Other Tobacco Only	.0%	2.3%	1.0%	.0%	.7%	2.1%
Cigarettes Only	24.3%	23.6%	4.7%	21.6%	36.0%	8.2%
Both Cigarettes and Other Tobacco	5.2%	3.7%	.0%	.0%	8.6%	4.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	219	108	73	82	118	117

Further Attitudes, Behaviors, Interests, and Familiarity among Former Smokers

Table 39 – How long ago did you quit smoking?

2010 Results:

	How long ago did you quit smoking?	
	Count	%
<1 month	0	.3%
1-3 months	6	5.2%
3-6 months	1	.6%
6 months - 1 year	3	2.9%
1-2 years	15	12.9%
3-7 years	15	12.3%
7+ years	78	64.9%
Don't know	1	.8%
Total	120	100.0%

(21.9% "Quit in the past 2 years")

Trend Analysis:

(No significant change in "<2 years ago" between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
< 2 years ago	23.7%	14.1%	21.9%
More than 2 years ago	76.3%	85.9%	77.2%
Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%

Regional Comparison: ("Quit in past 2 years" in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% "quit within past 2 years"	5.5%	23.8%	14.6%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results):

(To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Non-smoker
	<1 month	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.4%
1-3 months	3.2%	6.9%	11.8%	5.5%	.0%	5.2%
3-6 months	1.4%	.0%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	.6%
6 months - 1 year	3.2%	2.5%	.0%	4.7%	.0%	2.9%
1-2 years	17.4%	9.0%	19.2%	16.0%	.9%	12.9%
3-7 years	2.8%	20.8%	26.2%	11.8%	4.9%	12.3%
7+ years	71.3%	59.2%	42.8%	59.5%	92.8%	64.9%
Don't know	.0%	1.6%	.0%	1.4%	.0%	.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	56	63	18	73	28	120

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
	<1 month	.0%	.0%	2.8%	.0%	.0%
1-3 months	5.4%	6.9%	.0%	5.7%	6.3%	.0%
3-6 months	.0%	.0%	5.3%	.0%	.0%	2.3%
6 months - 1 year	3.9%	1.6%	.0%	7.6%	1.7%	.0%
1-2 years	13.3%	18.1%	.0%	8.9%	14.4%	12.9%
3-7 years	14.7%	8.4%	8.6%	26.4%	6.8%	5.3%
7+ years	62.6%	61.6%	83.2%	51.4%	69.0%	76.7%
Don't know	.0%	3.2%	.0%	.0%	1.7%	1.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	74	31	14	39	29	33

Table 40 – Has the price of tobacco had an effect on your tobacco use? Which of the following best describes the effect? (only asked of recently-quit former smokers, must have quit in past 2 years)

2010 Results:

	Effect of the price of tobacco on your smoking.	
	Count	%
No effect.	14	53.2%
Contributed, but did not cause quit.	9	32.5%
Caused me to quit.	4	14.3%
Total	26	100.0%

(46.8% “caused some (+) effect”)

Trend Analysis: (“Caused some (+) effect” has not significantly between 2008-2010) (very small sample sizes)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
No effect on my tobacco use (price did not cause me to quit).	NA	79.5%	53.2%
The high price contributed to a quit attempt but did not actually cause it.	NA	9.9%	32.5%
The high price caused me to quit.	NA	10.6%	14.3%
Refused	NA	0.0%	0.0%
Don't Know/Not Sure	NA	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: (“Caused some (+) effect” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average, note the small sample size)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Price increase caused some (+) effect”	0.0%	67.1%	25.8%

Cross-tabulations (not calculated since only 27 of the 400 participants sampled in this study are recent-quitters)

Further Attitudes, Behaviors, Interests, and Familiarity among Current Smokers

Table 41 – On the days that you smoke, what is the average number of cigarettes that you smoke?

2010 Results:

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	SD
Number of cigarettes per day.	13.61	15.00	1.00	60.00	9.82

Trend Analysis: (Number of cigarettes/day has not changed significantly between 2006-2010)

	2006	2008	2010
Mean # cigarettes/day	14.17	14.70	13.61

Regional Comparison: (St. Lawrence County “number of cigarettes/day” is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
Mean # cigarettes/day	10.39	16.89	12.84

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (no significant differences are present when comparing any demographic subgroups)

Number of cigarettes per day.

		Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	SD
Gender	Male	16.22	15.00	1.00	60.00	10.04
	Female	8.53	6.00	1.00	40.00	7.10
Age Group	18-34	9.98	9.08	1.00	20.00	6.49
	35-64	17.11	17.08	1.00	40.00	9.05
	65+	22.90	14.70	4.00	60.00	20.42
Education Level	No College	15.86	15.00	1.00	60.00	9.42
	Some College	8.30	6.59	1.00	40.00	8.23
	4+ Year Degree	16.79	17.35	1.00	40.00	14.94
Annual Household Income	<\$25,000	17.07	16.00	4.00	40.00	10.47
	\$25,000-\$50,000	13.89	15.00	1.00	40.00	8.54
	\$50,000+	8.53	7.00	2.00	20.00	6.49

Table 42 – In the past twelve months did any doctor, nurse, or healthcare professional advise you to quit smoking?

2010 Results:

	Advised to Quit Smoking in Past 12 Months?	
	Count	%
Yes	65	67.7%
No	31	32.3%
Total	97	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (No significant changes in “Yes” between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Yes	60.8%	57.3%	67.7%
No	32.1%	36.7%	32.3%
Did not see any doctor, nurse, or other healthcare professional.	7.1%	6.0%	0.0%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: (“Advised” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes”	51.0%	82.7%	63.3%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker
Yes	58.6%	85.2%	61.7%	78.6%	53.0%	67.7%
No	41.4%	14.8%	38.3%	21.4%	47.0%	32.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	63	33	53	37	6	97

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	75.0%	50.9%	77.7%	53.3%	77.5%	47.6%
No	25.0%	49.1%	22.3%	46.7%	22.5%	52.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	64	29	3	17	52	15

Table 43 – During the past twelve months have you stopped smoking for one day or longer because you were trying to quit smoking?

2010 Results:

	Stopped for at least one day in past year, trying to quit?	
	Count	%
Yes	43	44.1%
No	54	55.9%
Total	97	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (No significant changes in “Yes” between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Yes	47.8%	51.9%	44.1%
No	52.2%	48.1%	55.9%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: (“Stopped for 1+ day” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes”	30.0%	69.9%	53.3%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker
Yes	46.8%	38.9%	38.3%	51.6%	48.6%	44.1%
No	53.2%	61.1%	61.7%	48.4%	51.4%	55.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	64	33	53	37	7	97

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	36.6%	55.7%	86.3%	45.5%	39.1%	63.2%
No	63.4%	44.3%	13.7%	54.5%	60.9%	36.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	65	29	3	18	52	15

Table 44 – How many times have you attempted to quit smoking in the past three years?

2010 Results:

	How many times have you attempted to quit smoking in the past three years?	
	Count	%
None	36	36.8%
Once	9	9.4%
Twice	9	9.0%
3-5 times	13	13.3%
More than 5 times	22	23.1%
Don't know/Not sure	8	8.5%
Total	97	100.0%

(54.7% "at least once")

Trend Analysis: (No significant changes in "Tried at least once" between 2008-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
None	NA	23.9%	36.8%
Once	NA	22.1%	9.4%
Twice	NA	15.8%	9.0%
3-5 times	NA	21.1%	13.3%
More than 5 times	NA	15.8%	23.1%
Don't Know/Not Sure	NA	1.4%	8.5%

Regional Comparison: ("At least once" in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% "at least once"	42.8%	74.5%	64.8%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker
None	35.8%	39.0%	34.1%	36.6%	60.1%	36.8%
Once	5.3%	17.3%	4.0%	18.6%	.0%	9.4%
Twice	10.7%	5.5%	6.6%	13.3%	3.7%	9.0%
3-5 times	9.7%	20.3%	4.0%	26.7%	12.4%	13.3%
More than 5 times	33.1%	3.5%	35.8%	4.8%	23.8%	23.1%
Don't know/Not sure	5.4%	14.4%	15.5%	.0%	.0%	8.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	64	33	53	37	7	97

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
None	42.1%	28.1%	13.7%	40.4%	37.9%	15.6%
Once	4.5%	16.8%	36.0%	2.8%	6.5%	26.4%
Twice	4.5%	14.7%	43.2%	17.4%	2.1%	23.6%
3-5 times	12.8%	15.1%	7.2%	23.6%	8.1%	10.9%
More than 5 times	28.7%	13.3%	.0%	15.9%	36.4%	.0%
Don't know/Not sure	7.4%	11.9%	.0%	.0%	9.1%	23.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	65	29	3	18	52	15

Table 45 – In the past 12 months, have you or a friend or relative purchased cigarettes for your own use from a website or on the Internet?

2010 Results:

	Purchasing Cigarettes from a Website in Past Year	
	Count	%
Yes, all the time	1	1.1%
Yes, but rarely	2	2.2%
No, never	93	95.8%
Don't know/Not sure	1	.8%
Total	97	100.0%

(3.3% “Yes, at least some”)

Trend Analysis: (No significant changes in “Yes” between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Yes, all the time.		1.0%	1.1%
Yes, sometimes.	2.7%	2.1%	0.0%
Yes, but rarely.	(yes)	0.0%	2.2%
No, never.	97.3%	94.9%	95.8%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	2.1%	0.8%

Regional Comparison: (“At least some” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes, at least some”	1.2%	25.4%	6.4%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker
Yes, all the time	.0%	3.4%	.0%	3.0%	.0%	1.1%
Yes, but rarely	.0%	6.5%	4.0%	.0%	.0%	2.2%
No, never	98.7%	90.2%	96.0%	94.7%	100.0%	95.8%
Don't know/Not sure	1.3%	.0%	.0%	2.2%	.0%	.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	64	33	53	37	7	97

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes, all the time	1.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.1%	.0%
Yes, but rarely	.0%	7.5%	.0%	12.6%	.0%	.0%
No, never	98.3%	89.7%	100.0%	87.4%	97.9%	100.0%
Don't know/Not sure	.0%	2.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	65	29	3	17	52	15

Table 46 – In the past 12 months, have you or a friend or relative purchased cigarettes for your own use at an Indian reservation or through an Indian enterprise? (or, "Native American shops")

2010 Results:

	Purchasing Cigarettes from Indian Enterprises (Native American Shops)	
	Count	%
Yes, all the time	31	31.3%
Yes, sometimes	20	20.6%
Yes, but rarely	10	9.9%
No, never	37	38.2%
Total	97	100.0%

(61.8% "Yes, at least some")

Trend Analysis: (No significant changes in "Yes" between 2008-2010, both these rates are below the reported rate in 2006)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Yes, all the time.		37.4%	31.3%
Yes, sometimes.	82.2% (yes)	20.4%	20.6%
Yes, but rarely.		4.9%	9.9%
No, never.	17.8%	35.4%	38.2%
Don't Know/Not Sure	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%

Regional Comparison: ("At least some" in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% "Yes, at least some"	30.8%	64.4%	51.5%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker
Yes, all the time	33.1%	27.7%	13.1%	58.1%	26.1%	31.3%
Yes, sometimes	18.6%	24.4%	23.5%	19.4%	3.7%	20.6%
Yes, but rarely	13.3%	3.3%	14.6%	3.5%	8.7%	9.9%
No, never	34.9%	44.6%	48.7%	19.0%	61.5%	38.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	64	33	53	37	7	97

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes, all the time	29.3%	37.8%	13.7%	45.8%	25.9%	41.2%
Yes, sometimes	24.0%	8.9%	56.8%	7.4%	29.4%	12.2%
Yes, but rarely	13.0%	4.5%	.0%	.0%	14.8%	.0%
No, never	33.8%	48.8%	29.5%	46.8%	29.8%	46.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	65	29	3	18	52	15

Table 47 – Has the price of tobacco had an effect on your tobacco use? Which of the following best describes the effect?

2010 Results:

	Effect of the price of tobacco on your smoking.	
	Count	%
Caused me to plan to quit.	4	3.8%
Caused me to reduce # cigarettes.	14	14.5%
Both plan to quit & reduce # cigs.	22	23.2%
No effect.	55	56.8%
Refused	1	1.0%
Don't know/Not sure	1	.8%
Total	97	100.0%

(41.5% "caused some (+) effect")

Trend Analysis: (No significant change in "Some (+) effect" between 2008-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Caused me to plan to quit.	NA	4.2%	3.8%
Caused me to reduce the # cigs. smoked	NA	25.8%	14.5%
Both plan and reduce.	NA	13.3%	23.2%
No effect.	NA	54.9%	56.8%
Refused.	NA	1.9%	1.0%
Don't Know/Not Sure	NA	0.0%	0.8%

Regional Comparison: ("Some (+) effect" in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% "Price increase caused some (+) effect"	38.5%	66.3%	53.3%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker
	Caused me to plan to quit.	5.7%	.0%	.0%	9.7%	.0%
Caused me to reduce # cigarettes.	11.7%	19.8%	4.0%	28.9%	17.6%	14.5%
Both plan to quit & reduce # cigs.	20.4%	28.5%	34.1%	9.5%	10.2%	23.2%
No effect.	60.7%	49.4%	61.9%	50.6%	51.3%	56.8%
Refused	1.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.6%	1.0%
Don't know/Not sure	.0%	2.3%	.0%	1.3%	4.3%	.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	63	33	53	37	6	97

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Caused me to plan to quit.	5.7%	.0%	.0%	21.5%	.0%	.0%
Caused me to reduce # cigarettes.	14.7%	10.4%	44.7%	27.0%	10.4%	5.2%
Both plan to quit & reduce # cigs.	20.6%	28.1%	27.3%	20.3%	26.4%	27.0%
No effect.	57.4%	59.8%	20.8%	31.2%	62.2%	67.9%
Refused	1.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Don't know/Not sure	.0%	1.7%	7.2%	.0%	1.0%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	64	29	3	17	52	15

Table 48 – Have recent local laws or restrictions on outdoor smoking at all influenced the amount you smoke?

2010 Results:

	Have recent local laws or restrictions on outdoor smoking at all influenced the amount you smoke?	
	Count	%
Yes	29	29.8%
No	68	69.6%
Don't know/Not sure	1	.6%
Total	97	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: (“Yes” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes”	20.1%	43.7%	29.0%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker
Yes	15.4%	57.9%	21.9%	44.8%	8.7%	29.8%
No	84.6%	40.3%	78.1%	55.2%	82.6%	69.6%
Don't know/Not sure	.0%	1.8%	.0%	.0%	8.7%	.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	64	33	53	37	7	97

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	36.6%	15.1%	27.3%	61.4%	19.8%	14.2%
No	62.5%	84.9%	72.7%	38.6%	80.2%	85.8%
Don't know/Not sure	.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	65	29	3	18	52	15

Table 49 – Would you like to quit smoking now?

2010 Results:

	Want to quit smoking now?	
	Count	%
Yes	42	42.8%
No	54	55.5%
Don't know/Not sure	2	1.7%
Total	97	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (No significant change in “Yes” between 2006-2010)

Responses:	2006	2008	2010
Yes	60.3%	48.5%	42.8%
No	32.8%	50.5%	55.5%
Don't Know/Not Sure	6.9%	0.9%	1.7%

Regional Comparison: (“Yes” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes”	31.3%	62.8%	47.4%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker
	Yes	36.0%	56.2%	39.0%	50.4%	31.2%
No	64.0%	38.9%	61.0%	45.3%	68.8%	55.5%
Don't know/Not sure	.0%	4.9%	.0%	4.3%	.0%	1.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	64	33	53	37	7	97

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	49.5%	25.7%	64.0%	34.6%	42.7%	27.0%
No	48.7%	72.6%	36.0%	65.4%	57.3%	62.2%
Don't know/Not sure	1.7%	1.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	10.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	65	29	3	18	52	15

Table 50 – If your health insurance paid for quit-tobacco medications, such as the nicotine patch, would you be more likely to try to quit?

2010 Results:

	If you had health insurance that paid for quit tobacco medications, would you be more likely to quit?	
	Count	%
Yes	52	53.3%
No	43	44.4%
Don't know/Not sure	2	2.3%
Total	97	100.0%

Trend Analysis: (not measured in previous St. Lawrence County studies)

Regional Comparison: (“Yes” in St. Lawrence County is not significantly different from the current regional average)

Among 17 counties in Central, Western, and Northern NY studied in 2010, only includes those counties which used this survey question:	Minimum	Maximum	Average
% “Yes”	51.8%	65.4%	55.7%

Cross-tabulations (Using 2010 Results): (To identify which observed differences in the tables below are statistically significant differences, refer to the instructions and illustrations on pages 15-17 of this report)

	Gender		Age Group			Cigarette Smoking Status
	Male	Female	18-34	35-64	65+	Smoker
Yes	47.2%	65.1%	64.2%	45.0%	12.4%	53.3%
No	50.0%	33.5%	35.8%	48.9%	87.6%	44.4%
Don't know/Not sure	2.8%	1.4%	.0%	6.1%	.0%	2.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	64	33	53	37	7	97

	Education Level			Annual Household Income		
	No College	Some College	4+ Year Degree	<\$25,000	\$25,000-\$50,000	\$50,000+
Yes	56.8%	46.8%	43.2%	18.9%	64.9%	37.8%
No	40.4%	53.2%	43.2%	68.2%	35.1%	62.2%
Don't know/Not sure	2.8%	.0%	13.7%	12.8%	.0%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	65	29	3	18	52	15

Concluding Comments

This report is a summary of the data collected in a community tobacco survey completed in St. Lawrence County, New York on behalf of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership in December 2010. 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 St. Lawrence County in 2012. 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 2010. The only significant changes recommended for 2012 (and similarly, limitations to the current study) would be the slight rephrasing and reordering of a small number of the questions used in the interview. With improved phrasing, the same characteristic, attitude, or behavior can be measured while minimizing confusion on the part of the interviewee in future surveying. Finally, if further investigation of the data presented in this report is desired, for example, if any further sorts, cross-tabulations, or correlations to further investigate specific St. Lawrence County subpopulations is of interest, please contact the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership.

Appendix – The Survey Instrument

The following pages include a copy of the scripted introduction and the actual survey instrument that was used for the interviews in this study.

St. Lawrence Tobacco Survey December 2010

Introductory Script

Hello, my name is _____ I'm calling ON BEHALF OF the Department of Health. How are you this evening? We are not selling anything, we are doing a short survey in St. Lawrence County about health-related issues. The survey should only take about 4-5 minutes; can you help us out tonight?

If YES- "Great, thanks."

If NO-try to arrange a CALL BACK time.

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

SECONDHAND SMOKE EXPOSURE:

The first few questions deal with secondhand smoke exposure.

Q1: Do you think that breathing smoke from someone else's cigarettes is: (read choices)

- Very harmful to one's health
- Somewhat harmful to one's health
- Not very harmful to one's health
- Not harmful at all to one's health
- Don't Know/Not Sure

Q2: Which statement best describes the rules about smoking in your home? (read choices)

- Smoking is not allowed anywhere inside the 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
- Don't Know/Not Sure

St. Lawrence Tobacco Survey December 2010

Q3: Which statement best describes the rules about smoking in your personal vehicle (s)? (read choices)

- Smoking is NEVER ALLOWED in any vehicles
- Smoking is allowed SOMETIMES or IN SOME VEHICLES
- Smoking is ALLOWED IN ALL VEHICLES
- DO NOT HAVE a vehicle
- Don't Know/Not Sure

Q4: If New York State implemented a law prohibiting smoking inside a car when a person under the age of 18 is present, would you agree or disagree with this law? (read choices)

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know/Not Sure

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

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

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

	Allowed anywhere	Restricted to certain areas	Not allowed at all	Not sure/No opinion
Q6. an outdoor recreation area such as a public park, pool, or beach?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q7. when walking through an area around building entryways?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q10. at sporting events?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Workplace Issues

The following few questions relate to tobacco use in the workplace.

Q85: What is your current employment status?

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

St. Lawrence Tobacco Survey December 2010

If employed ... further workplace questions:

Q14: Is there a policy that prohibits smoking on the entire grounds of your workplace?

Yes

No

Don't Know/Not Sure

Q15: "Would you be"/"Are you" in favor of a/the policy that prohibits smoking on the entire grounds of your workplace?

Yes

No

Don't Know/Not Sure

Q16: In the past 12 months, has your employer offered any stop-smoking program or any other help to employees who want to quit smoking?

Yes

No

Don't Know/Not Sure

Heard of Local Tobacco Community Partnership?

Q25: Have you ever heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership?

Yes

No

Don't Know/Not Sure

Source where heard of Local Community Partnership:

Q26: From what source did you hear about the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership? (read choices, check all that apply)

Television

Word of Mouth (not a doctor)

Internet

Radio

Billboards

Don't Know

Newspapers

Work

Doctor or other HCP

School

Other (please specify the source)

Dangers of Tobacco - Further Questions

St. Lawrence Tobacco Survey December 2010

Q27: Have you seen or heard the recent media campaign about tobacco advertising in stores?

Yes

No

Don't Know/Not Sure

**Q28: Have you ever heard of the New York State Smokers' Quitline?
[if participant is interested: Quit Line: 1-866-NY-QUITS 1-866-697-8487]**

Yes

No

Don't Know/Not Sure

Q31: During the past 12 months, did any doctor, nurse or health professional ask if you smoke? (ASK CAREFULLY, probe if necessary!)

Yes

No

"Did not see a HCP in past 12 months."

Don't Know/Not Sure

Tobacco Advertising

The next set of questions involves Tobacco Advertising and Tobacco Sales.

In the past 30 days, how often have you noticed cigarettes or tobacco products being advertised or promoted at any of the following...

	Every day	Some Days	Never (or, Just Don't Pay Attention)	Not Sure
Q33: on posters outside or windows facing outside of stores where tobacco is sold?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q35: When you go to a convenience store, supermarket, or gas station, how often do you see ads for cigarettes and other tobacco products or items that have tobacco names or pictures on them?

All of the time

Never

Most of the time

"I never go to these places."

Some of the time

Don't Know/Not Sure

Hardly ever

Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/Not sure
Q36: "If tobacco retailers removed tobacco ads it would decrease the number of youths who begin smoking."	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

St. Lawrence Tobacco Survey December 2010

Do you now use any of the following tobacco products?

	Yes, every day.	Yes, some days.	No, never.	Don't know/Not sure
Q57: Smokeless Tobacco (ie chewing tobacco, snuff, dip, like Skoal, Redman, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q61: "e-cigarettes or electronic cigarettes"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* SCREENING QUESTION: Current Cigarette Smoking Status

- Current Never
- Former Don't Know/Not Sure

FORMER SMOKERS - how long ago?

Q64: How long ago did you quit smoking?

- Less than 1 month ago 1-2 years ago (more than 1 year, but less than 3 years)
- 1-3 months ago 3-7 years ago (at least 3 years, but less than 7 years)
- 3-6 months ago (more than 3, but not more than 6 months) 7 or more years ago
- 6 months - 1 year ago (more than 6 months, but not more than 1 year) Don't know

FORMER SMOKERS - Recent Quitters (within past 2 years) Questions

Q66: Has the price of tobacco had an effect on your tobacco use? Which of the following best describes the effect?

- No effect on my tobacco use (price did not cause me to quit).
- The high price contributed to a quit attempt but did not actually cause it.
- The high price caused me to quit.
- Refused
- Don't Know/Not Sure

CURRENT SMOKERS QUESTIONS START HERE

St. Lawrence Tobacco Survey December 2010

Q67: On the days that you smoke, what is the average number of cigarettes that you smoke?

(NOTE 1: 1 pack = 20 cigarettes)

(NOTE 2: if they give you an interval, like 15-20 cigs, enter a single #, the midpoint of the interval, NOT an interval, i.e. 15-20 = 17.5)

Q68: In the past 12 months, has a doctor, nurse, or other health professional advised you to quit smoking?

Yes

Did not see a doctor, nurse, or other health professional in the past 12 months.

No

Don't Know/Not Sure

Q69: During the past 12 months, have you stopped smoking for one day or longer because you were trying to quit smoking?

Yes

No

Don't Know/Not Sure

Q71: How many times have you attempted to quit smoking in the past three years?

Not at all in the past 3 years.

3-5 times

Once

More than 5 times

2 times

Don't Know/Not Sure

Q73: In the past 12 months, have you or a friend or relative purchased cigarettes for your own use from a website or on the Internet?

Yes, all the time.

No, never.

Yes, sometimes.

Don't Know/Not Sure

Yes, but rarely.

Q74: In the past 12 months, have you or a friend or relative purchased cigarettes for your own use at an Indian reservation or through an Indian enterprise?

Yes, all the time.

No, never.

Yes, sometimes.

Don't Know/Not Sure

Yes, but rarely.

St. Lawrence Tobacco Survey December 2010

Q77: Has the price of tobacco had an effect on your tobacco use? Which of the following best describes the effect?

- The high price has caused me to plan to quit (or, consider more strongly).
- The high price has caused me to reduce the # of cigarettes that I smoke.
- The high price has BOTH caused me to plan to quit AND reduce the # cigarettes that I smoke.
- No effect on my tobacco use (still smoking at same rate and no greater plans to quit).
- Refused
- Don't Know/Not Sure

Q79: Have recent local laws or restrictions on outdoor smoking at all influenced the amount you smoke?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know/Not Sure

Q80: Would you like to quit smoking now?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know/Not Sure

Q81: If you had health insurance that paid for quit tobacco medications, such as the nicotine patch, would you be more likely to try to quit?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know/Not Sure

Demographics Start Here (all participants)

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

*** Q84: What is your age (read intervals...)?**

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

Q86: How many children live in your household who are under 18 years old?

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

St. Lawrence Tobacco Survey December 2010

* **Q87: What is the highest level of school you completed or the highest degree you received?**

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

Q89: What is your annual household income from all sources ... you can stop me when I get to your interval. READ INTERVALS. (Reason why asked: to allow determining whether the sample we select is representative of the population that lives in _____ County)

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Less than \$10,000 | <input type="radio"/> \$25,000 to less than \$35,000 | <input type="radio"/> \$100,000 or more |
| <input type="radio"/> \$10,000 to less than \$15,000 | <input type="radio"/> \$35,000 to less than \$50,000 | <input type="radio"/> Refused |
| <input type="radio"/> \$15,000 to less than \$20,000 | <input type="radio"/> \$50,000 to less than \$75,000 | |
| <input type="radio"/> \$20,000 to less than \$25,000 | <input type="radio"/> \$75,000 to less than \$100,000 | |

Q90: Are you currently covered by any kind of health insurance, that is, any policy or program that provides or pays for medical care?

- Yes No Don't Know/Not Sure

* **Q92: If you don't mind me asking, what is your gender?**

- Male Female

The Survey is Complete

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Benjamin Todd, at:

St. Lawrence Tobacco Survey December 2010

Mr. Benjamin Todd (or, Ms. Laurie Maki)
St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Community Partnership
St. Lawrence County Public Health Department
80 State Highway 310
Suite 2
Canton, New York 13617
Phone: 315-386-2325
Fax: 315-386-2744
lmaki@co.st-lawrence.ny.us
btodd@co.st-lawrence.ny.us

REQUIRED BOOK-KEEPING - AFTER YOU HANG UP!

Before a survey is entered into the database, you must complete each of the following:

* **County of residence:**

* **Zip code:**

* **Town of Residence:**

* **Phone Number of Interviewed Resident (in the format of 607-123-4567)**

* **INTERVIEWER:**

Anything Joel LaLone should know about this call? Like: complaints, adorations, swearing, threatening, hilarious situations ... anything you think he might need to reference in the future: