

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

Opinions, Behaviors, and Perceptions
Related to Tobacco Use, The Dangers of
Tobacco, Tobacco Cessation, Tobacco
Advertising, and Exposure to Secondhand
Smoke

December 2006

Conducted for the
St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition
Canton, New York

Prepared by
Joel LaLone Consulting
Watertown, New York

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	Page 1
Methodology.....	Page 1
Socio-demographics of the Sample – Who was interviewed?.....	Page 2
Summary of Findings.....	Page 5
Results and Analysis.....	Page 10
Technical Comments for Interpretation of Presented Results.....	Page 10
Margin of Error – Using this Data to Estimate for the Entire St. Lawrence County Adult Population.....	Page 10
Tests for Statistical Significance – Using this Data to Test for Significant Differences, and Relationships.....	Page 12
Organization of the Presented Statistics for this Study.....	Page 14
Helping the Practitioners Use this Evaluation Data – “Five Ways to Frame a Statistic”.....	Page 14
Tobacco Use Results.....	Page 16
Cigarette Smoking Rates.....	Page 16
Other Tobacco Product Use.....	Page 17
Overall Tobacco Use Rates.....	Page 18
Purchasing cigarettes at Indian enterprises.....	Page 18
Purchasing cigarettes via the Internet.....	Page 19
Tobacco Cessation Results.....	Page 20
<u>Among All Respondents:</u>	
Asked if smoke?.....	Page 20
Heard of NYS Smokers’ Quitline.....	Page 20
<u>Among Current Smokers:</u>	
Advised to quit?.....	Page 21
Recent attempts to quit.....	Page 22
Want to quit now?.....	Page 23
Familiarity and interest in cessation services.....	Page 24
Impact of The Clean Indoor Air Act.....	Page 24
<u>Among Former Smokers:</u>	
How long ago quit?.....	Page 25
Strategies for quitting?.....	Page 25
Impact of The Clean Indoor Air Act.....	Page 25
Spreading the Message About the Dangers of Tobacco Results.....	Page 26
Television and radio watching/listening rates.....	Page 26
Frequency reading newspaper, pennysaver and/or pennysaver.....	Page 26
Exposure to advertisements regarding the dangers of tobacco.....	Page 27
Heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition?.....	Page 29
Heard of Reality Check?.....	Page 29
Seen recent ad by St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition?.....	Page 30
Smoking portrayal in the news.....	Page 30
Tobacco Advertising Results – Recall Exposure.....	Page 31
Where most commonly exposed to tobacco advertising.....	Page 31
Noticing smoking in movies.....	Page 34
Tobacco Advertising Results – Opinions.....	Page 35
Tobacco ads contributing to youth experimentation.....	Page 35
Should tobacco advertising be allowed IN STORES.....	Page 35
Should tobacco advertising be allowed IN MAGAZINES.....	Page 35
Interest in Tobacco-free versions of magazines.....	Page 36
Eliminate tobacco ads in school magazines.....	Page 36
Tobacco ads targeting the youth.....	Page 37
Should smoking be allowed in G, PG, PG-13 movies.....	Page 37
By sponsoring community events, tobacco companies targeting the youth.....	Page 37

Table of Contents (continued)

Tobacco Policies at Schools.....	Page 38
Awareness.....	Page 38
Enforcement.....	Page 38
Indoor Secondhand Smoke Exposure Results.....	Page 39
Breathing secondhand smoke is dangerous?.....	Page 39
Smoking policies in home and vehicles.....	Page 39
Bar visitation and secondhand smoke exposure	Page 40
Secondhand smoke exposure at work.....	Page 40
Smoking policies at rental properties.....	Page 41
Exposure to secondhand smoke in community at locations <i>other than bars</i>	Page 42
Outdoor Secondhand Smoke Exposure Results.....	Page 43
Public outdoor events such as an auto show, music festival, or concert.....	Page 43
Public beach.....	Page 44
Public park.....	Page 45
Public playground.....	Page 46
Public building entryways.....	Page 47
Grounds of a hospital or medical facility.....	Page 48
Perceived Reduced Harm of Tobacco Results.....	Page 49
Among current smokers – ever switch to lights to reduce harm?.....	Page 49
Perception that Smokeless Tobacco is safer than Regular Cigarettes.....	Page 49
Concluding Comments.....	Page 49
Appendix – The Survey Instrument.....	Page 50

Contact Information

St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition

Ms. Sue Britton
80 State Highway 310
Suite 2
Canton, New York 13617
Phone: 315-386-2325
Fax: 315-386-2744
sbritton@co.st-lawrence.ny.us

Joel LaLone Consulting

Joel LaLone
15575 County Route 156
Watertown, New York 13601
Phone: 315-788-3617
joel@joellaloneconsulting.com, or
jlalone@sunyjefferson.edu
www.joellaloneconsulting.com

NYS Smokers' Quitline

1-866-NY-QUITS 1-866-697-8487

Introduction

The St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition is an agency affiliated with the New York Tobacco Control Program, a part of the New York State Department of Health, whose goals are to advocate, initiate, fund, and support 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 counties.

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 Coalition has a need for current and accurate information regarding tobacco-related behaviors and attitudes among St. Lawrence County residents.

Using this information, the community partnership will be able 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 Coalition, and
- *measure and evaluate the effectiveness of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition* 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 Coalition 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 approximately 400 adult residents from St. Lawrence County. The survey included the following nine primary sections of questions/information regarding attitudes and behaviors related to tobacco:

1. Tobacco Use
2. Tobacco Cessation
3. Spreading the Message About the Dangers of Tobacco
4. Tobacco Advertising – Recalling Exposure
5. Tobacco Advertising – Opinions
6. Tobacco Policies at Schools
7. Indoor Secondhand Smoke Exposure
8. Outdoor Secondhand Smoke Exposure
9. Perceived Reduced Harm of Tobacco

This report is a summary and explanation of the findings of this community tobacco study completed for the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition in December 2006. When possible, comparisons of the St. Lawrence County results are made to results of similar community tobacco studies completed in eleven other Central and Northern New York counties throughout 2006.

Methodology

The survey instrument that was used in this study was provided by the New York State Department of Health Tobacco Control Program. The instrument, the introductory script used by interviewers on the telephone, and the required methodology to collect the data (complete interviews) were approved by the Institutional Review Board of the New York State Department of Health in December 2006. The survey included over 100 items (questions) regarding the tobacco issues outlined in the introduction above. Copies of the script and survey instrument are attached as an appendix.

The study included completing interviews of 398 St. Lawrence County adult residents. All interviews were completed via telephone. To be eligible to complete the survey, the resident was required to be at least 18 years old. Two thousand five hundred (2,500) personal residence telephone numbers were randomly selected from St. Lawrence County. These numbers were obtained from *Accudata America*, a subsidiary of Primis, Inc. *Accudata America* is a firm that specializes in providing contact information for residents of the United States. The telephone numbers were obtained from an unscrubbed list, ensuring that individuals whose households are included in the "telemarketing do-not-call list" would be represented in this study. After receiving the 2,500 randomly selected 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 21st,

December 26th, and December 27th, 2006. 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 randomly generated personal residence telephone numbers initially generated for St. Lawrence County, it was only necessary to attempt to contact 2,108 households before completing the approximately 400 interviews. When each of the 2,108 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 half of the questions on the survey had to be completed. The resident’s refusal to answer more than half of the questions was considered a decline to be interviewed. The typical length of a completed survey was approximately five to ten minutes. Declines to be interviewed (refusals) were not called back in an attempt to convince the resident to reconsider the interview. If no contact was made at a telephone number (No Answer/Busy), call-backs 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. No messages were left on answering machines at homes where no person answered the telephone. The response rate results for the study are summarized below.

Result:	Complete Interview	Decline to be Interviewed	Not Valid Telephone Number	No Answer/Busy	TOTALS
Frequency	398	465	341	904	2,108
% of Numbers Attempted	18.9%	22.1%	16.2%	42.9%	100%
% of Valid Numbers	22.5%	26.3%		51.2%	100%
% of Contacted Residents	46.1%	53.9%			100%

Within the fields of social science and public health research, when using telephone interview methodology, a response rate of over 45% of all successful contacts where a person is actually talking on the phone is considered quite successful.

Socio-demographics of the Sample – Who was interviewed?

This section of the report includes a description of the results for the socio-demographic variables included in the survey sample. The socio-demographic characteristics of the sampled adult residents can be used to attain 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 typical household size, educational profile, and income level in St. Lawrence County?). Secondly, this socio-demographic information facilitates the ability for the data to be sorted or partitioned to investigate for significant relationships – relationships between socio-demographic characteristics of people and their attitudes and behaviors regarding tobacco. Identification of significant relationships allows the tobacco community partnerships to use the data more effectively to target certain subgroups of their county population for programming and interventions. Finally, the socio-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 socio-demographic questions in the survey are summarized in the following table. Note that the socio-demographic data presented is raw, or unweighted; it represents the actual characteristics of the residents who were interviewed via the previously described telephone methodology. The socio-demographic characteristics of the entire St. Lawrence County adult population that were reported in US Census 2005 are also provided for comparison.

Socio-demographic Characteristic:	St. Lawrence County Sample December 2006 (this study)		St. Lawrence County Population Parameters (U.S. Census 2005)
	n	%	%
Gender			
Male	144	36.2%	50.5%
Female	254	63.8%	49.5%

Table 2 - Socio-demographics of the Sample Compared to Census Estimates for St. Lawrence County			
Socio-demographic Characteristic:	St. Lawrence County Sample December 2006 (this study)		St. Lawrence County Population Parameters (U.S. Census 2005)
	n	%	%
Age Group (US Census %'s are among those age 18 or older)			
18-24	25	6.3%	16.8%
25-34	60	15.1%	16.2%
35-44	93	23.3%	20.1%
45-54	74	18.6%	17.8%
55-64	58	14.6%	11.9%
65+	88	22.1%	17.2%
Education Level			
Did not complete HS	30	8.4%	14.4%
HS Graduate	149	41.7%	37.0%
Some College	105	29.4%	27.8%
College Graduate (4+years)	73	20.4%	20.8%
Annual Household Income			
Less than \$25,000	106	38.5%	34.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	93	33.8%	29.9%
\$50,000-\$75,000	46	16.7%	19.4%
More than \$75,000	30	10.9%	17.2%
Employment Status			
Employed	223	56.6%	54.8%
Out of Work	20	5.1%	3.3%
Homemaker	25	6.3%	41.9% not in Labor Force
Student	8	2.0%	
Retired	93	23.6%	
Unable to Work	24	6.1%	
County Where Employed			
St. Lawrence	186	91.2%	No St. Lawrence County Estimate Available
Jefferson	9	4.4%	
Franklin	5	2.5%	
Lewis	2	1.0%	
No other county >1	-	-	
Children Living in the Home			
No children	222	59.8%	66.0%
1 child	55	14.8%	34.0% have at least one child in the home
2 children	57	15.4%	
3 children	23	6.2%	
4 or more children	14	3.8%	
Race/Ethnicity			
White	367	96.8%	96.6%
Black or African American	1	0.3%	0.5%
Hispanic or Latino	0	0.0%	1.0%
Asian	2	0.5%	1.0%
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	1	0.3%	0.0%
American Indian, Alaska Native	6	1.6%	0.6%
Other	2	0.5%	0.3%
Health Insurance			
Yes, have coverage	319	86.9%	No St. Lawrence County Estimate Available
No, do not, or not sure.	48	13.1%	
Type of Health Insurance			
Private	197	63.3%	No St. Lawrence County Estimate Available
Medicare	57	18.3%	
Medicaid	28	9.0%	
Military	3	1.0%	
Don't Know	26	8.4%	

In general, the responses to the socio-demographic questions included in the survey appear to accurately parallel that which is true for the entire adult populations of St. Lawrence County. The postal zip code for each participant was recorded, and the geographic distribution of this sample appears to represent St. Lawrence County accurately. The only significant exceptions were that women were more likely than men to answer the telephone and/or agree to a survey and that older residents were more likely to be sampled than younger residents. The 2005 U.S. Census reports for gender and age distributions of the actual adult populations that reside in St. Lawrence County are shown in the following table. Additionally, the gender and age distributions of the interviewed adults for this study are shown for comparison.

Age Groups:	St. Lawrence County Sample			Age Groups:	St. Lawrence County US Census 2005 Parameters		
	% Male	% Female	Totals		Male	Female	Totals
18-24	2.8%	3.5%	6.3%	18-24	9.3%	7.5%	16.8%
25-34	6.3%	8.8%	15.1%	25-34	8.7%	7.5%	16.2%
35-44	9.2%	14.1%	23.3%	35-44	10.5%	9.6%	20.1%
45-54	6.8%	11.8%	18.6%	45-54	9.1%	8.7%	17.8%
55-64	3.8%	10.8%	14.6%	55-64	5.8%	6.1%	11.9%
65+	7.3%	14.8%	22.1%	65+	7.1%	10.1%	17.2%
Totals	36.2%	63.8%	100.0%	Totals	50.5%	49.5%	100.0%

The information included in the table above clearly illustrates a type of sampling error that is inherent in telephone methodology: females and older persons are typically overrepresented – regardless of the subject of the survey. To compensate for this overrepresentation of females and older residents in the sample collected in this study, post-stratification weightings by gender and age have been completed 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 and age.

Given the extreme diligence placed on scientific sampling design, and the high response rates, after application of post-stratification weightings by age and gender, it is felt that this random sample of the St. Lawrence County adults does accurately represent the population of St. Lawrence County adults. Therefore, it is with no hesitation that the findings of this study are generalized to the populations of all adults of at least 18 years of age living in St. Lawrence County. The exact margin of error is question-specific, depending upon the sample size for each question and sample statistics that resulted 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 been advised to quit) 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 398 residents may be generalized to the population of all adults at least 18 years of age residing in St. Lawrence County with a 95% confidence level to within a margin of error of approximately ± 4 to ± 5 percentage points. For questions that were only posed to certain specific subgroups such as current cigarette smokers, the resulting sample sizes of $n=50-100$ allow generalization to the specific subpopulation of all adults at least 18 years of age residing in that St. Lawrence County (i.e. generalization of some specific characteristics of sampled smokers to *all St. Lawrence County cigarette smokers*) with a 95% confidence level to within a margin of error of approximately ± 8 to ± 10 percentage points. Further technical details regarding the margin of error for this survey will be provided in a later section of this report (Page 10). All data compilation and statistical analyses within this study have been completed using *Minitab, Release 14* and *SPSS, Release 14*.

Summary of Findings

The following is a summary of the overall findings of this study completed in December 2006 regarding the attitudes and behaviors related to tobacco use among St. Lawrence County (New York) adults.

Tobacco Use Findings:

1. The **current smoking rate in St. Lawrence County** is 25.4%, with 23.8% smoking only cigarettes and an additional 1.6% both smoking cigarettes as well as using other types of tobacco products. These rates are not significantly different from the average rates found in other Central and Northern New York counties recently surveyed (hereafter referred to as “regional rates”). Among the twelve Central and Northern New York counties studied, the minimum current cigarette smoking rate was 18.8%, the maximum rate was 29.2%, and the average rate was 24.6%. (Tables 8 and 16, on Pages 16 and 18, respectively)
2. For comparison, the following current cigarette smoking rates are provided. The 2005 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS, completed by the Center for Disease Control) results indicate that the current cigarette smoking rate among adults in the United States is 20.6%, with a current cigarette smoking rate in New York State of 20.5%. The **current cigarette smoking rates among the 50 states range from a low of 11.5% to a high of 28.7%**. The following is a list of extreme values of smoking rates among states in 2005: (found at <http://www.cdc.gov/brfss>, and <http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/brfss/list.asp?cat=TU&yr=2005&qkey=4396&state=All>)

Low rates:	Utah	11.5%
	California	15.2%
High rates:	West Virginia	26.7%
	Tennessee	26.7%
	Indiana	27.3%
	Kentucky	28.7%

New York State participates in the ATS (Adult Tobacco Survey) with the goal of monitoring tobacco use and other tobacco-related issues. The most recent current cigarette smoking rates reported by the ATS for New York State (Quarter 1 of Year 2006) were not available for release at the time that this St. Lawrence County study was published.

3. Use of **other tobacco products (those other than cigarettes)** among St. Lawrence County residents is very low, and similar to regional rates. The most common non-cigarette type of tobacco used is smokeless tobacco (2.5% indicate that they currently use smokeless tobacco). Only 4.5% of the surveyed residents reported using any non-cigarette type of tobacco product, the regional average is 4.2%. (Tables 10-15, on Pages 17-18)
4. The **overall tobacco-use rate** among St. Lawrence County residents is 28.3%, with 23.8% only smoking cigarettes, 2.9% only using non-cigarette tobacco products, and 1.6% using a combination of both cigarette and non-cigarette tobacco. The overall use of tobacco by St. Lawrence County residents is not significantly different from the regional average of 26.6%. (Table 16, Page 18)
5. Among St. Lawrence County adults, gender, age, education level, and income level are **significant factors correlated to tobacco use**, with males, younger residents (age 18 to 34), those residents who have not attended any college, and those from households with lower annual incomes (<\$25,000 annually) most likely to be tobacco users. (Table 16, Page 18)
6. Smokers in St. Lawrence County very commonly **purchase their cigarettes at an Indian reservation or enterprise**, with 82.2% reporting to do so, significantly higher than current regional rates (the average among ten counties who recorded is 60.3%). Among those smokers who purchase cigarettes at an Indian reservation or enterprise, almost 40% report to purchase their cigarettes at these locations *all of the time*. Smokers in St. Lawrence County are far less likely to **purchase their cigarettes from a website or on the Internet**, with only 2.7% reporting to do so –significantly less than the 8.6% regional average. (Tables 17-20, Pages 18-19)

Tobacco Cessation Findings:

7. The majority of St. Lawrence County adults (64.0%), including both smokers and nonsmokers, have been **asked whether or not they smoke by health professionals** in the past twelve months. However, this 64% rate of inquiry is significantly lower than the regional average rate of 71.3%. Current smokers were significantly more likely to have been asked than nonsmokers (74.2% vs. 60.9%), and males are less likely to have been asked than females. (Table 21, Page 20)
8. More than half of the sampled St. Lawrence County residents (51.3%) have ever **heard of the New York State Smokers’ Quitline**; this level of familiarity is not significantly different from the rate found among residents of neighboring counties (rate as low as 42.9% in one county, as high as 57.0% in one county - the twelve-county regional average is 51.5%). Current cigarette smokers in St. Lawrence County are far more likely to be familiar with the quitline than nonsmokers (66.0% vs. 46.1%). Familiarity with the quitline is also correlated with age, residents under the age of 65 are the most likely to have heard of this type of cessation service. The most common way that St. Lawrence County residents learn

about this free quitline is via television, with radio the second most common source. Among the twelve regional counties studied, the 21.2% of quitline-aware St. Lawrence county residents who reported that they had heard of the quitline *on the radio* is the largest rate found. Despite the high rate of familiarity with the New York State Smokers' Quitline, very few St. Lawrence County residents have ever called this quitline (1.1% of the residents who had heard of it). (Tables 22-24, Pages 20-21)

9. Among cigarette smokers in St. Lawrence County, 60.8% have been **advised to quit by health professionals** in the past twelve months, a rate that is typical currently among Central and Northern New York counties (average rate of 65.6% of smokers advised to quit). Residents under age 35 are the least likely to have been advised, with those age 65+ most likely. By far, the most common advice provided by healthcare professionals is to prescribe nicotine patches, gum, spray, inhalers, and/or pills. (Tables 25-26, Pages 21-22)
10. During the past year, 47.8% of the St. Lawrence County smokers have **attempted to quit smoking**, a rate very similar to regional averages (49.5%), and not significantly correlated with any of gender, age, education, or income. However, the majority of smokers who attempted to quit remained tobacco-free for less than one month (69.2%). Smokers from the lower level household income group (less than \$25,000 annually) are the most likely to have their cessation period last for less than one month (87.5% of this group). The most common cessation method utilized in these unsuccessful cessation attempts is giving up cigarettes all at once – “Cold Turkey.” The average number of attempts to quit smoking in the past three years among current St. Lawrence County smokers is 2.18. (Tables 27-30, Pages 22-23)
11. Over half of the current St. Lawrence County smokers report that they **want to quit smoking** (60.3%), a very typical regional rate, with interest levels not significantly correlated to any of age, gender, education level, or income level. (Table 31, Page 23)
12. In St. Lawrence County, 65.9% of the smokers report **familiarity with local tobacco cessation services**, a rate significantly higher than the regional average rate of 54.2%. Female smokers are significantly more likely to be familiar with local tobacco cessation services than male smokers (76.3% versus 57.4%). Disappointingly, less than one third (30.6%) of the current St. Lawrence County smokers are interested in learning more about cessation services, a rate that is similar to that within neighboring counties. (Tables 32-33, Page 24)
13. Among St. Lawrence County current smokers, when asked the effect that the smokefree workplace law enacted in 2003 in New York State has had upon their smoking, 2.9% indicated that **The Clean Indoor Air Act** has caused them to plan to quit, a rate quite typical compared to neighboring county rates; 19.2% reported that the law had caused them to reduce the number of cigarettes they smoke – again, a very typical regional rate. (Table 34, Page 24)
14. Approximately one in four (23.7%) St. Lawrence County **former smokers had quit smoking within the past three years**. When asked the effect that the smokefree workplace law has had upon their smoking, 14.5% indicated that The Clean Indoor Air Act has caused them to already quit smoking, a rate similar to the regional average of 14.7%. Among these recent tobacco quitters, the most commonly reported approach to quitting smoking that was successfully utilized by St. Lawrence County former smokers was to “Give up cigarettes all at once – Cold Turkey” (70.5% of the former smokers). (Tables 35-37, Page 25)

Spreading the Message About the Dangers of Tobacco Findings:

15. Over half of the St. Lawrence County residents (54.0%) had **heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition** before completing this survey, while 45.7% had **heard of Reality Check**. Both these familiarity rates, with the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition and with Reality Check, are significantly higher than the regional average rates. The average Community Partnership familiarity rate is 39.7%, and the average Reality Check familiarity rate is 38.3%. Younger county residents are significantly more likely to have heard of these organizations than those residents age 35 or older. The source where residents most commonly have heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition is on the radio, a very high rate compared to the regional average. The rate of hearing about a tobacco community partnership on television is significantly lower among St. Lawrence County residents than among residents of neighboring counties. Current smokers are significantly more likely than nonsmokers to have heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition (64.0% vs. 50.3%), however, familiarity levels with Reality Check are *not* significantly different between smokers and nonsmokers. (Tables 45-47, Page 29)
16. About one out of every three St. Lawrence County residents (34.7%) recalls **noticing a St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition tobacco awareness advertisement recently**, a rate significantly higher than the regional average rate of 24.2%. Current smokers, and those residents under the age of 35 are most likely to report recalling observation of these advertisements. (Table 48, Page 30)
17. Television is by far the most common medium **where residents recall seeing anti-tobacco advertising** (produced by the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition as well as possibly produced by groups other than the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition). Over 75% of the St. Lawrence County adults (76.1%) report noticing television advertising

about the dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking, very similar to the regional rate of 75.7%. Less frequently, 44.6% of the St. Lawrence County adults report noticing advertising about the dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking on the radio during the past 30 days, but not significantly different from the regional average. Least commonly - only 40.9% - residents report noticing advertising about the dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking in the newspaper during the past 30 days, again not significantly different from regional averages. In general, younger residents report noticing these advertisements more frequently than older residents, and current smokers report recalling the advertisements more often than nonsmokers. (Tables 42-44, Pages 27-28)

18. The majority of St. Lawrence County adults **read newspapers** (85.9%) and the **Pennysaver/Pennyshoppers** (70.3%). Newspaper reading among county residents is not significantly different from the regional average (82.7%), however, Pennysaver/Pennyshoppers reading is at a rate significantly higher than the regional average (61.6%). (Tables 40-41, Pages 26-27)
19. The residents of St. Lawrence County believe that **smoking is portrayed far more negatively than positively by the media** in news stories (61.7% negatively and 4.3% positively). The rate of agreement that smoking is portrayed negatively by the media in news stories is similar to the regional average rate of 61.5%. Nonsmokers are significantly more likely than smokers to perceive news coverage as negative (64.5% vs. 53.5%). (Table 49, Page 30)

Tobacco Advertising Findings – Recall Exposure:

20. Almost 80% of the adult residents of St. Lawrence County report that they **recall seeing tobacco advertising** at least some during the past 30 days. This rate is similar to the regional average of 77.3%, and it is significantly correlated with age – over 90% of the residents between the ages of 18 and 24 recall seeing tobacco advertising. Among the following four typical locations for tobacco advertising that were further studied the rates of recalling exposure to the advertisements in the past 30 days are:
 - on shop windows or inside shops where tobacco is sold – 60.9%
 - newspapers or magazines – 50.9%
 - at sports events – 12.8% (lowest rate among 12 studied counties)
 - at cultural events – 8.2%

Residents were also asked whether they recall seeing tobacco advertisements the last time they visited a convenience store, supermarket, or gas station (not necessarily in the past 30 days) – 87.5% reported recalling tobacco ads at these locations. Recollection of exposure to tobacco advertisements among St. Lawrence County residents is at levels similar to regional averages and is not consistently correlated with any of age, gender, education level, income level, or smoking status. However, in some instances, younger residents and nonsmokers are more likely to recall the advertisements than older residents and current smokers. (Tables 50-55, Pages 31-33)

21. More than three out of four adult residents of St. Lawrence County (77.9%) report that they **recall seeing adults smoking on screen** when they watched movies in a movie theatre or on video, DVD, cable, or satellite at least once during the past 30 days. This rate is similar to the regional average of 78.4%, and it is significantly correlated with age – approximately 90% of the residents between the ages of 18 and 24 recall seeing adults smoking on screen, while those residents from lower household income levels are less likely than those from higher household income levels to recall seeing adults smoking on screen. (Table 56, Page 34)

Tobacco Advertising Findings - Opinions:

22. St. Lawrence County adults tend to **believe that tobacco advertising should be at least restricted if not entirely eliminated** - both in stores and in magazines - over 70% agree with restricting or eliminating entirely in both of these advertisement locations. These rates are not significantly different from regional averages. Current smokers are significantly less likely to approve of restricting the advertising in stores and magazines than nonsmokers, however, in each of these locations more than 50% *of the current smokers* support either restricting or eliminating tobacco advertising entirely. (Tables 58-59, Pages 35-36)
23. St. Lawrence County adults tend to **agree that tobacco advertising contributes to the number of youth that experiment with smoking** (66.9% agree, similar to regional average of 67.5%, with almost half of the *current smokers* (46.9%) agreeing with this notion), **tobacco ads target children** (69.6% agree, similar to regional average of 65.9%, 55.3% of *current smokers* agree), by **sponsoring community events the tobacco industry targets youth** (65.6% agree, significantly higher than the regional average of 60.5%, 52.7% of *current smokers* agree), **movies rated G, PG, PG-13 should not show actors smoking** (79.3% agree, significantly higher than the regional average of 70.7%, 71.3% of *current smokers* agree). (Tables 57 and 62-64, Pages 35 and 37)
24. When asked if one would request **magazines/periodicals that are available free of tobacco advertising**, St. Lawrence County residents are more likely to respond “Yes” than “No” (42.1% vs. 31.5%). Younger residents (under age 35) are significantly more likely to indicate that they would request tobacco-ad-free magazines than those ages 35 or older.

Nonsmokers are more likely than smokers to report that they would request these versions of magazines; however, almost one in three *current smokers* indicated that they would request tobacco-ad-free magazines when available. (Table 60, Page 36)

25. St. Lawrence County residents overwhelmingly support (85.5% support) the notion of **eliminating tobacco ads in the magazines that are available in school classrooms and libraries** – with 78.0% of the *current smokers* indicating they would support this type of school policy. (Table 61, Page 36)

Tobacco Policies at Schools Findings:

26. Three in four St. Lawrence County adults (74.8%) report that they are aware of the **current rules and procedures related to the tobacco policy prohibiting tobacco use at the school district** in which they reside. Senior citizens are the least likely to report this familiarity (47.5%), and smokers are more likely than nonsmokers to be familiar (86.2% vs. 71.1%). (Table 65, Page 38)
27. St. Lawrence County adults tend to agree that the **rules and procedures regarding tobacco use on school property in the school district that they reside are enforced for all visitors** – 75.4% agree while 8.5% disagree. (Table 66, Page 38)

Indoor Secondhand Smoke Exposure Findings:

28. An overwhelming majority of St. Lawrence County respondents (currently 92.3%) consider **exposure to secondhand smoke to be harmful**; among this, 77.7% indicated they believe it is *very harmful*. This 92.3% rate is not significantly different from the regional average of 91.6%. Over 80% of the *current smokers* (84.2%) consider exposure to secondhand smoke to be at least somewhat harmful. (Table 67, Page 39)
29. The likelihood of *not* allowing **smoking in one’s home or vehicle** in St. Lawrence County is similar to regional averages. More than two out of every three (71.4%) St. Lawrence County adults (regional average of 71.4%) report that they do not allow smoking in their homes; similarly, 70.9% indicate that they do not allow smoking in their vehicles (regional average of 70.3%). Residents with a 4+ year college education and those who are nonsmokers are most likely to not allow smoking in their home or vehicle. Note that over 30% of *current smokers* do not allow smoking in their homes, while approximately 25% of the *smokers* do not allow smoking in their vehicles. (Tables 68-69, Pages 39-40)
30. Approximately one in nine (11.5%) currently employed St. Lawrence County residents had been **exposed to smoking in his or her work area or work vehicle** in the past seven days, not significantly different from the regional average of 13.4%. Only 3.0% of the residents reported seeing someone smoking inside public places in their community other than bars, a rate very low among Central and Northern New York counties. (Tables 71-73 and 77, Pages 40-42)
31. Slightly less than half of the surveyed St. Lawrence County adults report visiting a bar at least once in the past month. However, one in four persons who had visited a bar in the past month (24.9%) had seen people **smoking in the bar**, a rate significantly lower than the regional average of 39.1%. (Table 70, Page 40)
32. Approximately 20% of the St. Lawrence County residents report to rent their homes, a rate significantly lower than the regional average of 27.8%. Only one in six of these renters (16.1%) report that there is a **policy that prohibits indoor smoking in his or her building** (regional average of 23.3% have a policy). Nonsmokers are almost seven times more likely as smokers to have a policy in their buildings (22.2% vs. 3.2%). Only 24.2% of the St. Lawrence County renters report that they are in favor of a/the policy that prohibits smoking in their buildings, with the regional average similarly at 27.2% in favor. Interestingly, 16.7% of the current smokers report to favor this type of policy. (Tables 74-76, Pages 41-42)

Outdoor Secondhand Smoke Exposure Findings:

33. Among the six types of **public outdoor locations** that were investigated (public outdoor events like auto shows, festivals, or concerts; public beaches; public parks; public playgrounds; public building entryways; and grounds of hospitals or medical facilities), public building entryways and medical facilities are by far the most frequently visited by St. Lawrence County residents (96.9% report visiting public building entryways in the past year, while 88.4% report visiting medical facility grounds in the past year). (Tables 78, 81, 84, 87, 90, and 93; Pages 43-48) **Visitation rates** are summarized in the following table:

Type of Location	% who have visited in past 12 months
Public building entryway	96.9%
Grounds of a hospital or medical facility	88.4%
Public outdoor event	68.4%
Public park	62.4%
Public beach	48.3%
Public playground	47.0%

34. Among those residents who had attended these six types of **public outdoor locations, exposure to secondhand smoke** was reported most frequently by those passing through public building entryways, and by visitors at public outdoor events like auto shows, festivals, or concerts, with over 50% of the persons who reported visiting these two types of locations reporting that they are exposed to secondhand smoke at least sometimes when visiting. (Tables 79, 82, 85, 88, 91, and 94; Pages 43-48) Secondhand smoke exposure rates are summarized below:

Type of Location	% exposed among those who have visited in past 12 months
Public building entryway	55.8%
Public outdoor event	55.6%
Grounds of a hospital or medical facility	32.4%
Public park	28.8%
Public beach	22.8%
Public playground	15.1%

35. There appears to be an extremely high level of **support among St. Lawrence County residents for reducing secondhand smoke exposure at public outdoor locations**, with over 75% of the residents supporting either restricting or completely eliminating cigarette smoking at each of the six types of locations studied. In general, the level of support among St. Lawrence County residents for restricting outdoor smoking is higher than in neighboring counties, with four of the six types of locations having support of smoking restriction rates among county residents at levels that are significantly higher than regional averages. (Tables 80, 83, 86, 89, 92, and 95; Pages 43-48) Restricting smoking at public outdoor location results are summarized below:

Type of Location	% all residents who support either restricting or eliminating smoking at each type of location (% in parentheses is the eliminate smoking entirely responses)
Public playground	89.6% (65.2%)
Grounds of a hospital or medical facility	87.0% (58.2%)
Public building entryway	84.6% (54.2%)
Public park	82.2% (42.8%)
Public beach	80.2% (36.7%)
Public outdoor event	77.9% (32.1%)

36. 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*. Over 65% of the *St. Lawrence County current cigarette smokers* believe that smoking should be restricted or not allowed at all at each of the six studied types of locations. Of note, 83.2% of the *St. Lawrence County current cigarette smokers* believe that smoking should be restricted or not allowed at public playgrounds, and similarly, 76.0% of the *St. Lawrence County current cigarette smokers* believe that smoking should be restricted or not allowed on the grounds of medical facilities or hospitals. (Tables 80, 83, 86, 89, 92, and 95; Pages 43-48)

Perceived Reduced Harm of Tobacco Findings:

37. More than one in three current smokers in St. Lawrence County (37.6%) reported that he or she had **switched to low tar or nicotine cigarettes to reduce his or her health risk**. This rate is typical among regional counties; the average rate among current smokers is 32.3%. (Table 96, Page 49)
38. **Smokeless tobacco perceived as a safer alternative to regular cigarettes** was studied among St. Lawrence County residents. Few residents of St. Lawrence County agree that using smokeless tobacco is safer than smoking regular cigarettes (9.4%). However, this rate is significantly higher than the regional average of 6.1%, and much higher among smokers than nonsmokers (14.7% vs. 7.5%). (Table 97, Page 49)

Results and Analysis: Tobacco Issue Findings in St. Lawrence County –With Comparisons to Current Regional Results and Investigation for Socio-demographic Correlations

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

- Tobacco Use
- Tobacco Cessation
- Spreading the Message About the Dangers of Tobacco
- Tobacco Advertising – Recollection of Exposure
- Tobacco Advertising – Opinions
- Tobacco Policies at Schools
- Indoor Secondhand Smoke Exposure
- Outdoor Secondhand Smoke Exposure
- Perceived Reduced Harm of Tobacco

The results for each survey question are presented in this section of the report with the following organizational structure:

- (1) The results of the current study in St. Lawrence County (December 2006), both raw frequencies and weighted percentages, are presented in a table.
- (2) Regional results are provided, reporting the minimum, maximum, and average value for each survey question among twelve Central and Northern New York counties that participated in similar community tobacco studies in 2006 (Broome, Cayuga, Cortland, Herkimer, Jefferson, Madison, Oneida, Onondaga, Oswego, St. Lawrence, Tioga, and Tompkins Counties). This table provides information for an analysis of the magnitude of each result found in St. Lawrence County. Statistically significant results when St. Lawrence County differs from the regional average are highlighted throughout.
- (3) The St. Lawrence County results for most 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 (total of over 300 cross-tabulations). Statistically significant correlations are highlighted throughout.

Technical Comments for Interpretation of the Presented Results

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

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 ± 4 to ± 5 percentage points. Therefore, when a percentage is observed in one of the following tables, the appropriate interpretation is that we are 95% confident that if *all* St. Lawrence County adult residents were surveyed (rather than just the 398 that were actually surveyed), the percentage that would result for all residents would be within ± 4 to ± 5 percentage points of the sample percentage that has been calculated and reported. For example, in the first table included in this section (Table 6, on Page 16), one can observe that 47.1% of our sample of 398 St. Lawrence County adults reported that they had smoked at least 100 cigarettes in their entire life. With this sample result, we 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 42.6% and 51.6% of the population of approximately 85,000 adults in St. Lawrence County have smoked at least 100 cigarettes in their entire life (using a margin of error of $\pm 4.5\%$). This resulting interval (42.6%-51.6%) is known as a 95% Confidence Interval. The consumer of this report should use this pattern, or approach, when attempting to generalize any of these survey findings to the entire adult population of St. Lawrence County.

The preceding example used a margin of error of $\pm 4.5\%$. However, the margin of error when using the sample results in this study to construct a confidence interval to estimate a population percentage will not always be $\pm 4.5\%$. 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. 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 St. Lawrence County adults who validly answered the survey question. The sample size will not always be $n=398$ since individuals have a right to omit any question. Also, some survey

questions were only posed after screening questions, such as questions asked only to former smokers. In general, the smaller the sample size is, the larger the margin of error will be.

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 larger the 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 age and gender distribution does not parallel the age and gender distribution 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 age and gender distribution 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 398 sampled individuals

For this St. Lawrence County study, the design effect (Deff) equals 1.290.

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 has been provided for the reader to determine the correct margin of error to use whenever constructing a confidence interval using this sample data.

Table 4 - Approximate Margin of Error for Varying Sample Sizes and Sample Percentages								
Varying Sample Sizes (n=...):								
Varying Sample %'s (p=...):	50	100	150	200	250	300	350	400
5%	6.9%	4.9%	4.0%	3.4%	3.1%	2.8%	2.6%	2.4%
10%	9.4%	6.7%	5.5%	4.7%	4.2%	3.9%	3.6%	3.3%
15%	11.2%	7.9%	6.5%	5.6%	5.0%	4.6%	4.2%	4.0%
20%	12.6%	8.9%	7.3%	6.3%	5.6%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%
25%	13.6%	9.6%	7.9%	6.8%	6.1%	5.6%	5.2%	4.8%
30%	14.4%	10.2%	8.3%	7.2%	6.5%	5.9%	5.5%	5.1%
35%	15.0%	10.6%	8.7%	7.5%	6.7%	6.1%	5.7%	5.3%
40%	15.4%	10.9%	8.9%	7.7%	6.9%	6.3%	5.8%	5.5%
45%	15.7%	11.1%	9.0%	7.8%	7.0%	6.4%	5.9%	5.5%
50%	15.7%	11.1%	9.1%	7.9%	7.0%	6.4%	5.9%	5.6%
55%	15.7%	11.1%	9.0%	7.8%	7.0%	6.4%	5.9%	5.5%
60%	15.4%	10.9%	8.9%	7.7%	6.9%	6.3%	5.8%	5.5%
65%	15.0%	10.6%	8.7%	7.5%	6.7%	6.1%	5.7%	5.3%
70%	14.4%	10.2%	8.3%	7.2%	6.5%	5.9%	5.5%	5.1%
75%	13.6%	9.6%	7.9%	6.8%	6.1%	5.6%	5.2%	4.8%
80%	12.6%	8.9%	7.3%	6.3%	5.6%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%
85%	11.2%	7.9%	6.5%	5.6%	5.0%	4.6%	4.2%	4.0%
90%	9.4%	6.7%	5.5%	4.7%	4.2%	3.9%	3.6%	3.3%
95%	6.9%	4.9%	4.0%	3.4%	3.1%	2.8%	2.6%	2.4%

Therefore, if n=300 persons validly answered a survey question (for example, a question such as “Have you heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition”), and p=35% responded with “Yes,” 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 adult population would be $\pm 6.1\%$. Finally, one could then state with 95% confidence that among *all St. Lawrence County adults*, $35\% \pm 6.1\%$, or in other words, between 28.9% and 41.1%, would report to have heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition. (The actual proportion within the sample for this study is included in Table 45 on Page 29, 54.0% of the interviewed residents had heard of the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition before the survey.)

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

The preceding technical discussion of statistical techniques has focused on the statistical inference referred to as *estimation* – construction of confidence intervals. To take full advantage of the data collected in this study, other statistical techniques are of value. Tests for significant differences between St. Lawrence County results and regional average results, and tests for significantly correlated factors with tobacco-related results, will also be presented.

The first table for each question in the survey presented in the following section of this report involves the analysis of the data collected in this study *as one collective group*. The results for each question on the survey, one question at a time, are summarized and described. The raw frequencies for each possible response to a question and the weighted percentages for each possible response are provided. Another table is provided for each survey question that includes the minimum, maximum, and average values found among the twelve Central and Northern New York counties that have been studied by *Joel LaLone Consulting* during 2006. The research question that is being investigated in these comparisons is “Is St. Lawrence County statistically significantly different from the typical result for the region regarding some tobacco-related attributes?”

Regarding the results that have been provided for eleven neighboring Central and Northern New York counties, the reader should be aware of the following factors. The eleven comparative counties in Central and Northern New York are Broome, Cayuga, Cortland, Herkimer, Jefferson, Madison, Oneida, Onondaga, Oswego, Tioga, and Tompkins Counties. *Joel LaLone Consulting* completed community tobacco surveys for each of these eleven tobacco community partnerships during June-December 2006. The methodology, survey instruments, and sample sizes utilized were virtually identical to that which was used in the current St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition study. All twelve counties were studied with random sample sizes of approximately n=400, with the exception of Onondaga County, which had a sample size of n=500 adults. Consequently, considering the results that are observed in the following tables when comparing St. Lawrence County to the eleven neighboring counties, with the similar methodologies and weighting procedures that have been applied, valid comparisons may be made among the counties.

The statistical techniques that will be applied to identify statistically significant relationships or differences, referred to as tests of significance, will depend upon the structure of each variable (survey question) and will include Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient r , the Independent Two Sample t-Test, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), a z-test for Binomial Proportions, and the χ^2 Test for Independence. A test or correlation that results with $p < 0.05$ will be considered statistically significant.

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 St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition December 2006 community tobacco study is based on a *sample* of 398 adult residents, as opposed to obtaining information from every single adult resident in a county, there must be a method of determining whether an observed relationship or difference in the *sample* survey data is likely to continue to hold true if *every* adult resident of the county were, in fact, interviewed. To make this determination, tests of statistical significance are standard practice in evaluating sample survey data. For example, if the *sample* data shows that St. Lawrence County residents appear to notice advertising or information about the dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking *on television* more commonly than those residents in neighboring counties (76.1% of St. Lawrence County residents had noticed advertising or information about the dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking *on television* in the past 30 days (Table 42), while the twelve-county average for having noticed advertising or information about the dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking *on television* in the past 30 days is 75.7%), the researcher would want to know if this greater exposure rate would still be present if they interviewed *every* St. Lawrence County adult rather than just the sample of 398 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=398 randomly selected adults from the approximately 85,000 adults in St. Lawrence County), then the results of these samples would *not* consistently show that St. Lawrence County adults recall seeing advertising or information about the dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking *on television* in the past 30 days more than those in neighboring counties; some samples might be higher and some lower than neighboring county rates. In this case, the researcher could not report *with high levels of confidence* that St. Lawrence County is statistically significantly different from the neighboring counties. Rather, the difference found between the one actually selected sample of size n=398 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 – *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 more likely to recall seeing advertising or information about the dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking *on television* in the past 30 days than those adults in neighboring counties. Furthermore, if *every* adult were interviewed, we are confident that this population exposure to advertising rate would be higher than the 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 is, in fact, statistically significantly different from some hypothesized value 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% ($p < 0.05$).

The same concept of statistical significance is applied when a researcher attempts to investigate for *relationships between* collected variables, which are investigated with the December 2006 St. Lawrence County data. The focus then becomes the identification of correlations between variables. For example, the researcher may be interested in determining which factors may or may not be significantly related to tobacco use among St. Lawrence County adults. A specific example related to the current study could be the question of whether smoking and gender are related; again, this is a quite natural question for the reader of this study that has not yet been investigated. Who are more likely to be cigarette smokers: males or females? Statistical tests of significance will be completed to determine whether comparisons among various subgroups of current St. Lawrence County residents reveal meaningful and useful relationships.

One should note the difference between the analyses that included all 398 sampled residents versus those that involved questions that were only asked of the smokers. With only 89 current cigarette smokers interviewed in St. Lawrence County, and then partitioning by levels of some other factor, sample sizes within specific factor/level combinations can become quite small. With these small sample sizes, extremely large sample differences must be found to be considered statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). For this reason, as well as to condense the voluminous amount of data and statistics that are included in these tables into a manageable and useful size, most of the categorical variables have been collapsed throughout the following analyses. For example, annual household income levels have been collapsed into the following three categories: Less than \$25,000, \$25,000-\$50,000, and Over \$50,000. Another caution to consider is that the statistics reported in the correlative tables (correlating with Gender, Age, etc.) are percentages of the sampled subgroups. To determine the sample size for each subgroup – to avoid over interpretation – the reader should refer to the preceding socio-demographic tables (Tables 2 and 3), or the summary table below, that provide counts, or sample sizes.

The following sample sizes were collected within each of the five key demographic variable subgroups:

Table 5 – Grouping Variables

Gender	n	Age Group	n	Education Level	n	Household Income	n	Smoking Status	n
Males	144	18-34	85	No College	179	Less than \$25,000	106	Smokers	89
Females	254	35-64	225	Some College	105	\$25,000-\$50,000	93	Nonsmokers	308
		65+	88	4+ Year Degree	73	More than \$50,000	76		

For example, in Table 8 of the results presented on page 16, one can observe that 35.8% of the St. Lawrence County residents *who reside in a household with an annual income of \$25,000 or less* are current cigarette smokers – a very high smoking rate. However, further inspection reveals that this 35.8% is from a total group of only 106 residents – a small sample size. Further, the other two household income groups have sample sizes of only 93 and 76. Again, findings should be considered with sample sizes in mind. The statistical tests of significance take into consideration these varying sample sizes. In fact, it is these small sample sizes that are the main contributing factor to the differences in current smoking rates illustrated in Table 8 for varying household income levels *not being statistically significantly different*.

At times when the sample sizes were extremely small, statistical tests for relationships (correlations) are not reported. For example, only 3 of the 398 interviewed adults were smokers who buy their cigarettes online, so correlating this result to other factors would be meaningless.

Organization of the Presented Statistics for this Study

Finally, the reader can observe highlighted results in each of the following tables by noting the **red statistic**. The **red statistics** highlight the key statistic for each question posed in the 2006 study – the key statistic that is used to:

1. investigate for a significant difference between the current St. Lawrence County result and the regional average; and
2. investigate for any correlations between the question result and any or all of the factors of Gender, Age, Education Level, Income Level, and/or Cigarette Smoking Status. (completed within the December 2006 St. Lawrence County data)

Statistically significant comparisons to regional averages, and relationships with other socio-demographic factors, have been highlighted in each table with **gray shading**. Recall that statistically significant means a difference or relationship that is large or strong enough to be 95% confident that it is not simply due to the random chance of sampling based upon the sizes of the selected sample. Any tests that result with $p < 0.05$ are shaded in the appropriate tables.

If the result for St. Lawrence County (the **red statistic**) is significantly different from the regional average, then the cell with the **red statistic** will be shaded in gray. If the result for St. Lawrence County (the **red statistic**) is significantly different among various subgroups, then the cells showing the results within each subgroup will be shaded in gray. Non-shaded cells indicate that there was not a significant relationship or difference.

To summarize, consider the following illustration. If the question “Have you ever heard of David Beckham?” was part of both the survey used in this study as well as the survey used in other studied counties, with the possible responses of “Yes” or “No”, then the hypothetical results would be presented as:

Have you ever heard of David Beckham?

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	288	70.4%
No	110	25.4%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	61.4%
Average	63.2%
Maximum	70.4%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	82.7%
Females	61.4%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	91.3%
35-64	51.0%
65+	43.1%

By Education	% Yes
No College	70.1%
Some Coll.	75.5%
4+ Years	73.4%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	76.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	75.3%
\$50,000+	67.3%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	40.6%
Nonsmokers	87.4%

The interpretation would be that the current rate of having heard of David Beckham among St. Lawrence County adults is 70.4%, with a margin of error of approximately $\pm 5.1\%$ (sample size of $n=398$, with $p=70.4\%$, refer to Table 4). This rate is significantly higher than the current regional average of 63.2%. Familiarity with David Beckham is significantly correlated with Gender, Age, and Smoking Status, but not significantly related to Education or Income level; with males, younger adults, and nonsmokers most likely to be familiar with David Beckham. (Hint for those who do not know who David Beckham is: the staff of *Joel LaLone Consulting* loves World Cup soccer!)

Helping the Practitioners Use this Evaluation Data – “Five Ways to Frame a Statistic”

In conclusion, before the quantitative results are presented for this St. Lawrence County study, the following suggestions are offered to the reader. When evaluating a program or activity for which data is collected, after a sample statistic is calculated, there are many approaches to frame the calculated statistic in a way that makes it more understandable and useful to the practitioner. Five typical ways to “frame a sample statistic” are to

1. compare the current statistic to past values to identify trends;
2. compare to some other control group or comparison group to better understand the relative size of the statistic;
3. cross-tabulate or correlate the outcomes for the variable of interest by some other possible related factors;
4. inspect the distribution within the possible responses to the survey question more deeply; and
5. compare to some established target, goal, or standard.

The data that has been provided in this report allows the practitioner to “frame a statistic” for survey questions by accomplishing each of options two through four from the list of suggestions above. When possible, all questions are compared to the twelve-county Central and Northern New York regional results (#2 above); cross-tabulations have been presented by Gender, Age, Education, Income, and Cigarette Use (#3 above), and comments have been made such as “residents are three times more likely to agree than disagree with the statement” (#4 above). The importance of the “response distribution inspection” approach in framing a statistic can be illustrated by the following example. A case in which 40% of the residents have a no-smoking policy in their homes and the other 60% allow smoking is a very different situation from one in which 40% have a no-smoking policy, only 10% allow smoking, and the remaining 50% respond with “Don’t Know.” With this further inspection of the response distribution, the 40% not allowing smoking in their homes could result in very different interpretations and suggestions for the practitioner for future programming. The first approach to framing a statistic that is listed above – comparing current statistics to past values to identify trends – cannot be accomplished at the current time in St. Lawrence County. This community tobacco study in St. Lawrence County is a first, establishing baseline data. In the future, should this type of study be completed again, statistics may be framed at that time by comparing the 2006 results to the results in the future study. The fifth approach to framing a statistic that is listed above – comparing to an established goal or target – is left to the readers of this report who are tobacco coalition leaders, those persons who establish and monitor program goals.

We now begin the presentation of the quantitative results of the 2006 St. Lawrence County Community Tobacco Study, including results for each of the following nine sets of questions:

- Tobacco Use
- Tobacco Cessation
- Spreading the Message About the Dangers of Tobacco
- Tobacco Advertising – Recalling Exposure
- Tobacco Advertising - Opinions
- Tobacco Policies at Schools
- Indoor Secondhand Smoke Exposure
- Outdoor Secondhand Smoke Exposure
- Perceived Reduced Harm of Tobacco

Tobacco Use Results

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

Table 6	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Yes	186	47.1%	Minimum	40.3%
No	211	52.9%	Average	47.2%
Don't Know	0	0.0%	Maximum	51.6%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	49.0%
Females	45.2%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	45.0%
35-64	46.7%
65+	52.9%

By Education	% Yes
No College	53.6%
Some Coll.	46.0%
4+ Years	54.0%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	61.3%
\$25,000-\$50,000	47.9%
\$50,000+	35.5%

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

Table 7	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Every day	76	21.7%
Some days	13	3.7%
Not at all	308	74.6%

Current cigarette smoking status among St. Lawrence County adult residents:

Table 8	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Current
Current	89	25.4%	Minimum	18.8%
Former	97	21.7%	Average	24.6%
Never	211	52.9%	Maximum	29.2%

By Gender	% Curr.
Males	29.0%
Females	21.8%

By Age	% Curr.
18-34	34.4%
35-64	23.9%
65+	11.8%

By Education	% Curr.
No College	33.3%
Some Coll.	23.2%
4+ Years	4.7%

By Income	% Curr.
<\$25,000	35.8%
\$25,000-\$50,000	24.0%
\$50,000+	14.5%

Among current cigarette smokers – On days that you smoke, what is the average number of cigarettes that you smoke? (small sample sizes)

Table 9	Year 2006	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	Mean Cig/day
Mean	14.17	Minimum	14.17
		Average	15.51
		Maximum	16.92

By Gender	Mean C/D
Males	15.15
Females	12.97

By Age	Mean C/D
18-34	11.43
35-64	17.48
65+	12.38

By Education	Mean C/D
No College	14.17
Some Coll.	14.54
4+ Years	18.56

By Income	Mean C/D
<\$25,000	14.11
\$25,000-\$50,000	14.33
\$50,000+	12.04

Do you now use smokeless tobacco?

Table 10

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	6	2.5%
No	391	97.5%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	0.3%
Average	2.0%
Maximum	3.2%

Do you now use cigars, cigarillos, or little cigars?

Table 11

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	4	1.4%
No	393	98.6%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	0.0%
Average	2.4%
Maximum	4.4%

Do you now use pipe tobacco?

Table 12

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	2	0.6%
No	395	99.4%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	0.3%
Average	0.8%
Maximum	1.4%

Do you now use Bidis (flavored cigarettes from India)?

Table 13

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	0	0.0%
No	397	100.0%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	0.0%
Average	0.2%
Maximum	0.9%

Do you now use Kreteks or clove cigarettes?

Table 14

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	0	0.0%
No	396	100.0%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	0.0%
Average	0.3%
Maximum	1.2%

Use of non-cigarette tobacco products – use at least one type.

Table 15		Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	
Yes		12	4.5%	Minimum	2.0%
No		385	95.5%	Average	4.2%
				Maximum	7.1%

By Gender	% Use
Males	9.0%
Females	0.0%

By Age	% Use
18-34	6.9%
35-64	4.6%
65+	0.0%

By Education	% Use
No College	2.7%
Some Coll.	6.2%
4+ Years	4.7%

By Income	% Use
<\$25,000	3.8%
\$25,000-\$50,000	9.4%
\$50,000+	2.6%

Overall tobacco use status among St. Lawrence County adult residents:

Table 16		Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties		
Cigs. Only		84	23.8%	28.3%	Minimum	20.2%
Other Tob. Only		7	2.9%		Average	26.6%
Both		5	1.6%		Maximum	30.6%
No tobacco		301	71.7%			

By Gender	% Use
Males	34.5%
Females	21.8%

By Age	% Use
18-34	38.9%
35-64	26.9%
65+	11.8%

By Education	% Use
No College	34.6%
Some Coll.	27.4%
4+ Years	9.4%

By Income	% Use
<\$25,000	38.7%
\$25,000-\$50,000	30.2%
\$50,000+	15.8%

ONLY CURRENT SMOKERS ASKED: 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?* (small sample sizes)

Table 17		Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 10 Counties	
Yes		68	82.2%	Minimum	33.6%
No		15	17.8%	Average	60.3%
Don't know		0	0.0%	Maximum	83.4%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	80.8
Females	85.4%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	84.4%
35-64	81.0%
65+	83.3%

By Education	% Yes
No College	80.3%
Some Coll.	84.0%
4+ Years	100.0%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	86.8%
\$25,000-\$50,000	79.2%
\$50,000+	60.0%

If yes, you have purchased cigarettes at an Indian enterprise, how often do you do so?

(small sample sizes)

Table 18

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
All of the time	33	38.8%
Sometimes	18	28.5%
Rarely	17	32.7%
Don't know	0	0.0%

2006 Regional Results - 10 Counties	% All Time
Minimum	26.7%
Average	39.4%
Maximum	67.8%

ONLY CURRENT SMOKERS ASKED: 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?* (small sample sizes)

(small sample sizes)

Table 19

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	3	2.7%
No	79	97.3%
Don't know	0	0.0%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	2.3%
Average	8.6%
Maximum	22.9%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	2.0%
Females	2.4%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	0.0%
35-64	4.8%
65+	0.0%

By Education	% Yes
No College	3.3%
Some Coll.	0.0%
4+ Years	25.0%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	2.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	8.7%
\$50,000+	0.0%

If yes, you have purchased cigarettes via the Internet, how often do you do so? (small sample sizes)

(small sample sizes)

Table 20

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
All of the time	0	0.0%
Sometimes	2	54.8%
Rarely	1	45.2%
Don't know	0	0.0%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% All Time
Minimum	0.0%
Average	19.0%
Maximum	69.7%

Tobacco Cessation Results

EVERYONE ASKED: During the past twelve months did any doctor, nurse, or health professional ask if you smoke?

Table 21

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	259	64.0%
No	105	26.3%
Did not see a HP	28	9.1%
Don't know	2	0.6%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	64.0%
Average	71.3%
Maximum	77.1%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	58.7%
Females	69.2%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	65.6%
35-64	66.3%
65+	54.4%

By Education	% Yes
No College	60.3%
Some Coll.	67.3%
4+ Years	67.7%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	63.7%
\$25,000-\$50,000	66.0%
\$50,000+	65.8%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	74.2%
Nonsmokers	60.9%

EVERYONE ASKED: Have you ever heard of the NYS Smokers' Quitline?

Table 22

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	200	51.3%
No	191	48.4%
Don't know	2	0.3%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	42.9%
Average	51.5%
Maximum	57.0%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	51.0%
Females	51.3%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	57.0%
35-64	53.8%
65+	33.8%

By Education	% Yes
No College	49.5%
Some Coll.	57.5%
4+ Years	45.3%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	57.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	45.8%
\$50,000+	52.6%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	66.0%
Nonsmokers	46.1%

If yes, you have heard of the NYS Smokers' Quitline, where did you hear of it? (small sample sizes)

Table 23

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Television	94	49.1%
Radio	30	21.2%
Posters/Billboard	3	1.4%
Movies	2	0.9%
Newspaper/Magazine	10	5.4%
Internet	3	1.8%
Doctor	17	6.8%
Hospital	4	1.9%
Word of Mouth	9	3.7%
Work	8	3.9%
Other	6	4.7%
Don't Know	19	9.3%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties		
Minimum	Average	Maximum
38.6%	46.7%	57.0%
8.6%	13.8%	21.2%
1.4%	4.4%	10.2%
0.0%	2.0%	5.9%
1.7%	5.5%	8.2%
0.0%	0.7%	1.8%
1.0%	3.8%	6.8%
0.0%	1.0%	4.2%
0.0%	2.7%	6.3%
0.0%	2.7%	4.5%
1.1%	8.4%	15.1%
6.1%	10.5%	16.4%

If yes, you have heard of the NYS Smokers' Quitline, have you ever called it? (small sample sizes)

Table 24

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	3	1.1%
No	196	98.5%
Don't know	1	0.3

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties		% Yes
Minimum		1.1%
Average		4.2%
Maximum		6.3%

Among the three St. Lawrence County residents who had called the quitline, two had called for themselves, the other had called for someone else.

ONLY CURRENT SMOKERS ASKED: During the past twelve months did any doctor, nurse, or health professional advise you to quit smoking? (small sample sizes)

Table 25

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	54	60.8%
No	24	32.1%
Did not see a HP	6	7.1%
Don't know	0	0.0%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties		% Yes
Minimum		58.5%
Average		65.6%
Maximum		76.6%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	54.7%
Females	69.0%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	48.9%
35-64	69.0%
65+	85.7%

By Education	% Yes
No College	63.3%
Some Coll.	52.0%
4+ Years	66.7%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	59.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	63.6%
\$50,000+	50.0%

If yes, you have been advised to quit, which of the following were advised? (small s.s.)

Table 26

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Recommended nicotine patch, nicotine gum, nasal spray, an inhaler, or pills such as Zyban.	26	45.0%
Suggest that you set a specific date to stop smoking.	9	13.8%
Suggest that you use a smoking cessation class, program, or counseling.	8	12.1%
Suggest that you call a telephone quitline.	12	22.4%
Provide you with materials to help you quit smoking on your own	9	11.5%
Schedule a follow-up visit to discuss progress.	7	11.8%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties		
Minimum	Average	Maximum
36.8%	49.2%	62.6%
12.3%	21.7%	36.5%
11.9%	18.7%	27.1%
5.7%	16.1%	29.7%
9.0%	19.9%	28.5%
8.6%	14.8%	23.2%

ONLY CURRENT SMOKERS ASKED: During the past twelve months have you stopped smoking for one day or longer because you were trying to quit smoking? (small ss)

Table 27

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	36	47.8%
No	42	52.2%
Don't know	0	0.0%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties		% Yes
Minimum		42.2%
Average		49.5%
Maximum		62.1%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	43.4%
Females	54.1%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	45.2%
35-64	63.4%
65+	28.6%

By Education	% Yes
No College	49.1%
Some Coll.	34.8%
4+ Years	33.3%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	48.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	52.2%
\$50,000+	33.3%

If yes, you have quit at least one day in the past year, how long did you remain tobacco free? (small sample sizes)

Table 28

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Less 1 mon.	25	69.2%
1-3 months	3	5.4%
3+ months	6	25.3%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties		% <1mo
Minimum		57.2%
Average		71.1%
Maximum		85.3%

By Gender	% <1mo
Males	72.7%
Females	65.0%

By Age	% <1mo
18-34	62.5%
35-64	71.4%
65+	100.0%

By Education	% <1mo
No College	73.1%
Some Coll.	77.8%
4+ Years	100.0%

By Income	% <1mo
<\$25,000	87.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	54.5%
\$50,000+	33.3%

How many times have you attempted to quit smoking in the past three years? (small sample sizes)

Table 29

	Year 2006
Mean	2.18

2006 Regional Results – 12 Counties

	Mean
Minimum	1.40
Average	6.61
Maximum	38.14

ONLY CURRENT SMOKERS ASKED: The last time you tried to quit smoking, which of the following methods or strategies to quit did you use? (small sample sizes)

Table 30

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Gradually cut back on cigarettes.	12	27.0%
Switch to chewing tobacco, cigars, or pipes.	2	7.7%
Switch to “lights”.	3	3.6%
Give up cigarettes all at once - “Cold Turkey”.	28	59.0%
Quit with a friend, relative, or acquaintance.	3	8.0%
Use nicotine patch, gum, or other NRT.	11	17.0%

2006 Regional Results – 12 Counties

Minimum	Average	Maximum
17.2%	30.7%	45.7%
0.0%	6.0%	15.4%
3.6%	11.6%	21.7%
57.1%	68.5%	86.6%
3.4%	12.6%	29.9%
17.0%	31.8%	52.9%

ONLY CURRENT SMOKERS ASKED: Would you like to quit smoking now? (small sample sizes)

Table 31

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	48	60.3%
No	28	32.8%
Don’t know	6	6.9%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties

	% Yes
Minimum	38.4%
Average	52.8%
Maximum	61.7%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	60.0%
Females	61.0%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	57.1%
35-64	65.1%
65+	42.9%

By Education	% Yes
No College	62.3%
Some Coll.	52.0%
4+ Years	100.0%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	60.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	73.9%
\$50,000+	40.0%

ONLY CURRENT SMOKERS ASKED: Are you aware of cessation services in your county? (small sample sizes)

Table 32		Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	
Yes		55	65.9%	Minimum	41.8%
No		22	32.8%	Average	54.2%
Don't know		1	1.3%	Maximum	70.5%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	57.4%
Females	76.3%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	55.3%
35-64	76.2%
65+	60.0%

By Education	% Yes
No College	63.2%
Some Coll.	70.8%
4+ Years	66.7%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	62.2%
\$25,000-\$50,000	65.2%
\$50,000+	100.0%

ONLY CURRENT SMOKERS ASKED: Would you be interested in learning more about available cessation services? (small sample sizes)

Table 33		Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	
Yes		25	30.6%	Minimum	19.4%
No		46	69.4%	Average	31.0%
Don't know		0	0.0%	Maximum	45.3%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	31.9%
Females	28.1%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	17.1%
35-64	43.6%
65+	20.0%

By Education	% Yes
No College	33.3%
Some Coll.	23.8%
4+ Years	66.7%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	33.3%
\$25,000-\$50,000	26.1%
\$50,000+	25.0%

AMONG CURRENT SMOKERS: Has the NYS law prohibiting smoking in all workplaces, including bars and restaurants, had an effect on your tobacco use? (small sample sizes)

Table 34		Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results – 12 Counties		
				Minimum	Average	Maximum
Law enacted has caused me to <u>plan</u> to quit.		3	2.9%	0.0%	3.9%	15.2%
Law enacted has caused me to <u>reduce the # cigarettes I smoke</u>		17	19.2%	17.8%	25.7%	38.0%
No effect.		61	78.8%	46.8%	70.4%	82.2%

ONLY FORMER SMOKERS ASKED: How long ago did you quit? (in years) (small sample sizes)

Table 35

	Year 2006
% quit in past 3 years	23.7%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	
	% Quit in Past 3 Years
Minimum	7.0%
Average	20.7%
Maximum	34.9%

ONLY FORMER SMOKERS WHO QUIT SMOKING IN THE PAST THREE YEARS ASKED: When you quit smoking, which of the following methods or strategies to quit did you use? (small sample sizes)

Table 36

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Gradually cut back on cigarettes.	4	16.8%
Switch to chewing tobacco, cigars, or pipes.	0	0.0%
Switch to "lights".	1	4.7%
Give up cigarettes all at once.	16	70.5%
Quit with a friend, relative, or acquaintance.	0	0.0%
Use nicotine patch, gum, or other NRT.	3	13.6%

2006 Regional Results – 12 Counties		
Minimum	Average	Maximum
0.0%	12.7%	26.2%
0.0%	2.3%	10.4%
0.0%	2.7%	14.5%
59.3%	72.7%	92.3%
0.0%	3.0%	19.0%
9.5%	21.4%	52.2%

AMONG FORMER SMOKERS: Has the NYS law prohibiting smoking in all workplaces, including bars and restaurants, had an effect on your tobacco use? (small sample sizes)

Table 37

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Law enacted has caused me to quit.	4	14.5%
No effect.	20	85.5%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	
	% Quit
Minimum	7.0%
Average	14.7%
Maximum	34.0%

Spreading the Message About the Dangers of Tobacco Results

During the past 7 days, on the average, how many hours/day did you watch television?

Table 38		Year 2006	2006 Regional Results – 12 Counties	Mean hr/day
Mean		3.36	Minimum	2.67
			Average	3.09
			Maximum	3.74

By Gender	Mean hr/d
Males	3.53
Females	3.18

By Age	Mean hr/d
18-34	3.02
35-64	3.10
65+	4.78

By Education	Mean hr/d
No College	3.57
Some Coll.	3.52
4+ Years	2.53

By Income	Mean hr/d
<\$25,000	4.11
\$25,000-\$50,000	3.19
\$50,000+	2.70

By Smoking	Mean hr/d
Smokers	4.05
Nonsmokers	3.12

During the past 7 days, on the average, how many hours/day did you listen to the radio?

Table 39		Year 2006	2006 Regional Results – 12 Counties	Mean hr/day
Mean		2.84	Minimum	2.53
			Average	2.90
			Maximum	3.32

By Gender	Mean hr/d
Males	2.80
Females	2.89

By Age	Mean hr/d
18-34	3.33
35-64	2.73
65+	2.19

By Education	Mean hr/d
No College	3.18
Some Coll.	2.53
4+ Years	2.77

By Income	Mean hr/d
<\$25,000	2.85
\$25,000-\$50,000	3.29
\$50,000+	2.63

By Smoking	Mean hr/d
Smokers	3.78
Nonsmokers	2.49

In the past 30 days, how often have you read a newspaper?

Table 40	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %		2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% at least Some
Every day	210	52.1%	85.9%	Minimum	76.2%
2-3 times/wk	71	17.8%		Average	82.7%
Once/week	41	9.6%		Maximum	86.9%
<1 per week	23	6.4%			
Never/rarely	49	14.1%			
Don't know	0	0.0%			

By Gender	% Some
Males	87.9%
Females	83.7%

By Age	% Some
18-34	76.3%
35-64	91.3%
65+	88.2%

By Education	% Some
No College	85.7%
Some Coll.	82.0%
4+ Years	96.9%

By Income	% Some
<\$25,000	87.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	90.7%
\$50,000+	88.2%

By Smoking	% Some
Smokers	79.0%
Nonsmokers	88.1%

In the past 30 days, how often have you read a penny saver or shopper?

Table 41

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Every issue	145	36.3%	70.3%
2-3 times/mo.	36	10.4%	
Once/month	63	16.0%	
<1 per month	30	7.6%	
Never/rarely	119	29.5%	
Don't know	1	0.2%	

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% at least Some
Minimum	39.0%
Average	61.6%
Maximum	70.6%

By Gender	% Some
Males	76.3%
Females	64.3%

By Age	% Some
18-34	62.6%
35-64	77.4%
65+	65.7%

By Education	% Some
No College	72.2%
Some Coll.	71.7%
4+ Years	71.9%

By Income	% Some
<\$25,000	71.2%
\$25,000-\$50,000	80.2%
\$50,000+	73.7%

By Smoking	% Some
Smokers	76.8%
Nonsmokers	67.9%

In the past 30 days, how often have you noticed advertising or information about the dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking on television?

Table 42

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Every day	145	37.4%	76.1%
2-3 times/wk	82	21.2%	
Once/week	38	11.0%	
<1 per week	23	6.6%	
Never/rarely	89	19.9%	
Don't know	19	4.0%	

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% at least Some
Minimum	69.2%
Average	75.7%
Maximum	84.2%

By Gender	% Some
Males	79.5%
Females	72.4%

By Age	% Some
18-34	84.0%
35-64	77.0%
65+	58.8%

By Education	% Some
No College	77.5%
Some Coll.	77.9%
4+ Years	76.6%

By Income	% Some
<\$25,000	75.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	83.3%
\$50,000+	81.6%

By Smoking	% Some
Smokers	82.0%
Nonsmokers	74.5%

In the past 30 days, how often have you noticed advertising or information about the dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking *on radio*?

Table 43

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Every day	51	15.9%	44.6%
2-3 times/wk	46	11.7%	
Once/week	27	7.6%	
<1 per week	38	9.5%	
Never/rarely	196	46.9%	
Don't know	37	8.5%	

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% at least Some
Minimum	31.1%
Average	41.5%
Maximum	47.2%

By Gender	% Some
Males	46.5%
Females	42.9%

By Age	% Some
18-34	58.0%
35-64	43.6%
65+	22.1%

By Education	% Some
No College	43.7%
Some Coll.	46.8%
4+ Years	45.3%

By Income	% Some
<\$25,000	49.1%
\$25,000-\$50,000	51.6%
\$50,000+	45.3%

By Smoking	% Some
Smokers	58.0%
Nonsmokers	39.9%

In the past 30 days, how often have you noticed advertising or information about the dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking *in newspapers*?

Table 44

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Every day	33	8.9%	40.9%
2-3 times/wk	36	10.0%	
Once/week	36	8.6%	
<1 per week	47	13.4%	
Never/rarely	218	53.9%	
Don't know	22	5.2%	

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% at least Some
Minimum	24.5%
Average	36.9%
Maximum	44.0%

By Gender	% Some
Males	58.0%
Females	39.9%

By Age	% Some
18-34	45.0%
35-64	43.3%
65+	26.9%

By Education	% Some
No College	38.1%
Some Coll.	42.7%
4+ Years	43.8%

By Income	% Some
<\$25,000	46.7%
\$25,000-\$50,000	48.8%
\$50,000+	40.8%

By Smoking	% Some
Smokers	49.0%
Nonsmokers	38.5%

Had you heard of the *St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition* and its services before this survey?

Table 45	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Yes	199	54.0%	Minimum	19.5%
No	197	46.0%	Average	39.7%
Don't know	0	0.0%	Maximum	62.5%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	52.0%
Females	55.6%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	71.2%
35-64	53.6%
65+	21.7%

By Education	% Yes
No College	53.0%
Some Coll.	60.2%
4+ Years	53.1%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	57.1%
\$25,000-\$50,000	62.5%
\$50,000+	61.8%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	64.0%
Nonsmokers	50.3%

If yes, you have heard of the *St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition*, from what source did you hear of it? (small sample sizes)

Table 46	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties		
			Minimum	Average	Maximum
Television	49	28.0%	17.3%	36.6%	75.1%
Radio	58	34.7%	10.7%	20.5%	34.7%
Newspaper	28	16.1%	3.9%	13.2%	24.9%
Word of Mouth	17	9.8%	6.1%	12.5%	19.7%
Billboard	6	4.6%	0.6%	4.6%	12.1%
Work	18	9.0%	0.0%	2.8%	9.1%
School	3	1.1%	0.0%	1.8%	5.8%
Other	19	9.7%	5.3%	12.8%	20.4%

Have you ever heard of “Reality Check”, a youth-oriented program designed to get youth actively involved in promoting anti-tobacco issues?

Table 47	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Yes	161	45.7%	Minimum	28.8%
No	234	54.3%	Average	38.3%
			Maximum	46.7%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	45.7%
Females	45.6%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	65.6%
35-64	43.4%
65+	14.5%

By Education	% Yes
No College	50.3%
Some Coll.	41.6%
4+ Years	46.9%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	53.8%
\$25,000-\$50,000	50.0%
\$50,000+	47.4%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	53.5%
Nonsmokers	42.9%

Have you recently seen advertising or information about the dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking that was sponsored by *St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition*?

Table 48

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	120	34.7%
No	227	57.5%
Don't know	30	7.9%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	13.1%
Average	24.2%
Maximum	41.5%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	30.7%
Females	38.8%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	47.7%
35-64	34.6%
65+	9.4%

By Education	% Yes
No College	39.9%
Some Coll.	30.2%
4+ Years	34.9%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	40.8%
\$25,000-\$50,000	32.2%
\$50,000+	44.4%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	47.4%
Nonsmokers	30.0%

Think of any news stories about smoking that you may have noticed on TV, radio, or in the newspapers in the past 30 days. In your opinion, how was smoking portrayed in these news stories?

Table 49

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Positively	20	4.3%
Negatively	245	61.7%
Neither	13	4.8%
Both	33	9.0%
Don't know	81	20.1%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Neg.
Minimum	55.5%
Average	61.5%
Maximum	69.2%

By Gender	% Neg.
Males	57.5%
Females	66.0%

By Age	% Neg.
18-34	59.5%
35-64	67.0%
65+	51.5%

By Education	% Neg.
No College	57.1%
Some Coll.	63.7%
4+ Years	81.3%

By Income	% Neg.
<\$25,000	58.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	66.3%
\$50,000+	73.7%

By Smoking	% Neg.
Smokers	53.5%
Nonsmokers	64.5%

Tobacco Advertising Results – Recalling Exposure

In the past 30 days, how often have you seen tobacco advertising (any and all types)?

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Every day	74	21.4%	79.5%
2-3 times/wk	81	23.0%	
Once/week	52	14.4%	
<1 per week	74	20.6%	
Never	60	14.4%	
Don't know	29	6.1%	

2006 Regional Results - 2 Counties	% at least Some
Minimum	75.0%
Average	77.3%
Maximum	79.5%

By Gender	% Some
Males	82.1%
Females	77.2%

By Age	% Some
18-34	92.4%
35-64	77.6%
65+	62.1%

By Education	% Some
No College	77.3%
Some Coll.	83.8%
4+ Years	83.9%

By Income	% Some
<\$25,000	76.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	82.8%
\$50,000+	84.1%

By Smoking	% Some
Smokers	81.6%
Nonsmokers	79.3%

In the past 30 days, how often have you noticed cigarettes or tobacco products being advertised or promoted *in newspapers or magazines*?

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Every day	27	7.2%	50.9%
2-3 times/wk	40	10.8%	
Once/week	51	14.6%	
<1 per week	70	18.3%	
Never	168	42.9%	
Don't know	31	6.2%	

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% at least Some
Minimum	42.6%
Average	49.0%
Maximum	55.7%

By Gender	% Some
Males	53.1%
Females	48.7%

By Age	% Some
18-34	64.3%
35-64	48.7%
65+	33.8%

By Education	% Some
No College	52.7%
Some Coll.	56.6%
4+ Years	43.8%

By Income	% Some
<\$25,000	50.9%
\$25,000-\$50,000	62.5%
\$50,000+	50.0%

By Smoking	% Some
Smokers	53.1%
Nonsmokers	50.3%

In the past 30 days, how often have you noticed cigarettes or tobacco products being advertised or promoted *on shop windows or inside shops where tobacco is sold?*

Table 52

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Every day	90	24.7%	60.9%
2-3 times/wk	73	22.2%	
Once/week	26	7.6%	
<1 per week	27	6.4%	
Never	130	30.9%	
Don't know	41	8.3%	

2006 Regional Results – 11 Counties	% at least Some
Minimum	58.3%
Average	62.2%
Maximum	69.3%

By Gender	% Some
Males	65.8%
Females	55.5%

By Age	% Some
18-34	78.6%
35-64	57.0%
65+	39.7%

By Education	% Some
No College	60.4%
Some Coll.	67.3%
4+ Years	53.8%

By Income	% Some
<\$25,000	64.2%
\$25,000-\$50,000	60.4%
\$50,000+	64.5%

By Smoking	% Some
Smokers	64.2%
Nonsmokers	59.7%

In the past 30 days, how often have you noticed cigarettes or tobacco products being advertised or promoted *at sports events?*

Table 53

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Every day	9	2.6%	12.8%
2-3 times/wk	4	1.3%	
Once/week	16	4.7%	
<1 per week	15	4.1%	
Never	244	64.7%	
Don't know	99	22.5%	

2006 Regional Results – 12 Counties	% at least Some
Minimum	12.8%
Average	17.1%
Maximum	21.6%

By Gender	% Some
Males	15.3%
Females	10.0%

By Age	% Some
18-34	18.3%
35-64	9.8%
65+	11.8%

By Education	% Some
No College	10.4%
Some Coll.	16.8%
4+ Years	14.1%

By Income	% Some
<\$25,000	13.2%
\$25,000-\$50,000	14.4%
\$50,000+	9.3%

By Smoking	% Some
Smokers	6.3%
Nonsmokers	14.8%

In the past 30 days, how often have you noticed cigarettes or tobacco products being advertised or promoted *at cultural events*?

Table 54

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Every day	6	1.2%	8.2%
2-3 times/wk	3	1.1%	
Once/week	9	2.3%	
<1 per week	14	3.6%	
Never	249	67.9%	
Don't know	106	23.9%	

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% at least Some
Minimum	7.2%
Average	10.9%
Maximum	15.1%

By Gender	% Some
Males	7.1%
Females	9.4%

By Age	% Some
18-34	9.5%
35-64	7.3%
65+	8.8%

By Education	% Some
No College	8.8%
Some Coll.	7.1%
4+ Years	7.8%

By Income	% Some
<\$25,000	8.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	8.3%
\$50,000+	6.6%

By Smoking	% Some
Smokers	2.1%
Nonsmokers	10.0%

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?

Table 55

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
All the time	179	48.2%	87.5%
Most of time	53	13.9%	
Some of time	57	15.1%	
Hardly ever	36	10.3%	
Never	27	6.2%	
Never go to these places.	5	1.0%	
Don't Know.	25	5.3%	

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% at least Some (S+M+A+H)
Minimum	84.4%
Average	86.7%
Maximum	88.3%

By Gender	% Some
Males	90.7%
Females	84.1%

By Age	% Some
18-34	94.4%
35-64	90.0%
65+	68.2%

By Education	% Some
No College	85.6%
Some Coll.	91.1%
4+ Years	86.2%

By Income	% Some
<\$25,000	88.7%
\$25,000-\$50,000	90.7%
\$50,000+	93.4%

By Smoking	% Some
Smokers	85.3%
Nonsmokers	88.1%

In the past 30 days, how often did you see adults smoking on screen when you watched movies in a movie theatre or on video, DVD, cable, or satellite?

Table 56

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Almost always	59	15.5%
Often	48	13.5%
Sometimes	87	26.8%
Rarely	88	22.0%
Never	40	9.9%
Didn't see movies	20	4.4%
Don't know	29	7.8%

77.9%

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% A+ O+S+R
Minimum	71.2%
Average	78.4%
Maximum	85.9%

By Gender	% A-R
Males	78.3%
Females	77.6%

By Age	% A-R
18-34	89.3%
35-64	75.5%
65+	62.9%

By Education	% A-R
No College	78.7%
Some Coll.	77.7%
4+ Years	79.7%

By Income	% A-R
<\$25,000	73.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	86.2%
\$50,000+	88.2%

By Smoking	% A-R
Smokers	83.0%
Nonsmokers	75.9%

Tobacco Advertising Results – Opinions

“Tobacco advertising contributes to the number of youth that experiment with smoking.”

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Strongly agree	101	27.5%	66.9%
Agree	151	39.4%	
Disagree	80	22.1%	
Strongly disagree	14	3.8%	
Don't know	30	7.2%	

2006 Regional Results - 3 Counties	% A or SA
Minimum	63.8%
Average	67.5%
Maximum	71.9%

By Gender	% A+SA
Males	67.4%
Females	66.7%

By Age	% A+SA
18-34	67.8%
35-64	67.6%
65+	64.6%

By Education	% A+SA
No College	64.2%
Some Coll.	65.8%
4+ Years	74.6%

By Income	% A+SA
<\$25,000	69.2%
\$25,000-\$50,000	69.1%
\$50,000+	70.7%

By Smoking	% A+SA
Smokers	46.9%
Nonsmokers	73.7%

Do you think advertising of tobacco products IN STORES should be: always allowed; allowed under some conditions/restrictions; or not allowed at all?

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Always allow	85	22.9%	
Allow w/restr.	104	30.1%	70.4%
Never allow	165	40.3%	
Don't know	27	6.8%	

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% At Least Restrict
Minimum	62.1%
Average	69.5%
Maximum	76.7%

By Gender	% R+N
Males	69.4%
Females	71.3%

By Age	% R+N
18-34	70.2%
35-64	71.2%
65+	68.2%

By Education	% R+N
No College	68.1%
Some Coll.	67.3%
4+ Years	78.1%

By Income	% R+N
<\$25,000	64.2%
\$25,000-\$50,000	76.0%
\$50,000+	75.0%

By Smoking	% R+N
Smokers	50.0%
Nonsmokers	76.9%

Do you think advertising of tobacco products IN ALL MAGAZINES should be: always allowed; allowed under some conditions/restrictions; or not allowed at all?

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Always allow	76	20.8%	
Allow w/restr.	93	25.7%	71.4%
Never allow	179	45.7%	
Don't know	32	7.8%	

2006 Regional Results - 2 Counties	% At Least Restrict
Minimum	64.2%
Average	67.8%
Maximum	71.4%

By Gender	% R+N
Males	67.5%
Females	75.1%

By Age	% R+N
18-34	72.8%
35-64	72.6%
65+	64.6%

By Education	% R+N
No College	64.3%
Some Coll.	76.8%
4+ Years	78.1%

By Income	% R+N
<\$25,000	70.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	70.1%
\$50,000+	70.7%

By Smoking	% R+N
Smokers	54.7%
Nonsmokers	76.8%

Think of the magazines/periodicals you subscribe to. If these magazines/periodicals were available FREE OF TOBACCO ADVERTISING, would you request the tobacco-ad-free version?

Table 60

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	151	42.1%
Probably	34	8.9%
No	118	31.5%
Don't know	66	17.5%

2006 Regional Results – 3 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	39.1%
Average	42.1%
Maximum	45.0%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	39.2%
Females	45.1%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	56.3%
35-64	37.0%
65+	31.8%

By Education	% Yes
No College	40.9%
Some Coll.	40.9%
4+ Years	47.6%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	41.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	46.3%
\$50,000+	37.3%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	28.4%
Nonsmokers	46.3%

Would you support a policy in public schools to eliminate tobacco ads in magazines in the classroom and library?

Table 61

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	313	85.5%
No	26	7.3%
Not Sure	28	7.3%

2006 Regional Results – 3 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	77.3%
Average	82.1%
Maximum	85.5%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	84.2%
Females	86.7%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	90.9%
35-64	84.8%
65+	78.5%

By Education	% Yes
No College	87.2%
Some Coll.	84.3%
4+ Years	88.7%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	84.2%
\$25,000-\$50,000	87.4%
\$50,000+	85.1%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	78.0%
Nonsmokers	87.8%

“I think tobacco ads target children.”

Table 62

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Strongly agree	110	27.3%	69.6%
Agree	151	42.3%	
Disagree	78	21.1%	
Strongly disagree	10	3.0%	
Don't know	27	6.4%	

2006 Regional Results - 2 Counties	% A or SA
Minimum	62.1%
Average	65.9%
Maximum	69.6%

By Gender	% A+SA
Males	65.1%
Females	74.2%

By Age	% A+SA
18-34	70.2%
35-64	70.1%
65+	67.7%

By Education	% A+SA
No College	65.9%
Some Coll.	70.3%
4+ Years	75.0%

By Income	% A+SA
<\$25,000	70.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	73.7%
\$50,000+	62.7%

By Smoking	% A+SA
Smokers	55.3%
Nonsmokers	74.1%

“Movies rated G, PG, and PG-13 should not show actors smoking”

Table 63

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Strongly agree	119	27.4%	79.3%
Agree	186	51.9%	
Disagree	37	12.0%	
Strongly disagree	7	2.1%	
Don't know	27	6.6%	

2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% A or SA
Minimum	64.7%
Average	70.7%
Maximum	79.3%

By Gender	% A+SA
Males	72.5%
Females	86.5%

By Age	% A+SA
18-34	77.6%
35-64	81.0%
65+	78.1%

By Education	% A+SA
No College	74.7%
Some Coll.	82.3%
4+ Years	84.6%

By Income	% A+SA
<\$25,000	83.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	79.2%
\$50,000+	76.3%

By Smoking	% A+SA
Smokers	71.3%
Nonsmokers	82.0%

Do you think that by sponsoring community events the tobacco industry targets youth?

Table 64

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	238	65.6%
No	85	22.5%
Not Sure	44	11.9%

2006 Regional Results - 2 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	55.3%
Average	60.5%
Maximum	65.6%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	62.8%
Females	68.7%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	71.9%
35-64	64.0%
65+	58.1%

By Education	% Yes
No College	63.3%
Some Coll.	64.5%
4+ Years	71.4%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	66.7%
\$25,000-\$50,000	65.6%
\$50,000+	69.7%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	52.7%
Nonsmokers	69.9%

Tobacco Policies at Schools Results

Are you aware of the rules and procedures of the school district in which you reside regarding a tobacco policy prohibiting tobacco use?

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Yes	261	74.8%	Minimum	Not collected in other counties
No	81	19.9%	Average	
Not Sure	22	5.3%	Maximum	

By Gender	% Yes
Males	76.2%
Females	73.3%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	85.0%
35-64	77.0%
65+	47.5%

By Education	% Yes
No College	72.9%
Some Coll.	77.5%
4+ Years	83.9%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	68.3%
\$25,000-\$50,000	78.9%
\$50,000+	85.1%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	86.2%
Nonsmokers	71.1%

“The rules and procedures regarding tobacco use on school property in the school district that you reside in are enforced for ALL VISITORS.”

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% A or SA
Strongly agree	111	31.8%	Minimum	Not collected in other counties
Agree	147	43.6%	Average	
Disagree	26	8.0%	Maximum	
Strongly disagree	2	0.5%		
Don't know	68	16.0%		

By Gender	% A+SA
Males	78.5%
Females	72.4%

By Age	% A+SA
18-34	81.0%
35-64	77.2%
65+	58.6%

By Education	% A+SA
No College	75.0%
Some Coll.	76.4%
4+ Years	82.3%

By Income	% A+SA
<\$25,000	70.4%
\$25,000-\$50,000	79.2%
\$50,000+	85.3%

By Smoking	% A+SA
Smokers	76.7%
Nonsmokers	75.2%

Indoor Secondhand Smoke Exposure Results

Do you think that breathing smoke from someone else’s cigarettes is...

Table 67

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	
Very harmful	293	77.7%	92.3%
Somewhat harmful	55	14.6%	
Not very harmful	8	1.7%	
Not harmful at all	6	2.0%	
Don't know	15	4.0%	

2006 Regional Results – 11 Counties	% Some + Very
Minimum	88.9%
Average	91.6%
Maximum	95.4%

By Gender	% S + V
Males	91.7%
Females	93.0%

By Age	% S + V
18-34	94.5%
35-64	91.5%
65+	90.6%

By Education	% S + V
No College	89.7%
Some Coll.	94.4%
4+ Years	100.0%

By Income	% S + V
<\$25,000	92.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	96.8%
\$50,000+	98.5%

By Smoking	% S + V
Smokers	84.2%
Nonsmokers	95.1%

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

Table 68

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Not all. anywhere	274	71.4%
All. some places	32	7.7%
Allow anywhere	67	19.7%
No rules	6	1.2%
Don't know	0	0.0%

2006 Regional Results – 11 Counties	% Not Allow
Minimum	67.5%
Average	71.4%
Maximum	83.6%

By Gender	% Not Allow
Males	67.4%
Females	75.5%

By Age	% Not Allow
18-34	72.7%
35-64	68.8%
65+	76.9%

By Education	% Not Allow
No College	68.6%
Some Coll.	71.3%
4+ Years	84.7%

By Income	% Not Allow
<\$25,000	69.3%
\$25,000-\$50,000	66.0%
\$50,000+	86.8%

By Smoking	% Not Allow
Smokers	34.4%
Nonsmokers	83.8%

Which statement best describes the rules about smoking *in your family vehicle*?

Table 69

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Not all. anywhere	282	70.9%
All. some places	24	6.9%
Allow anywhere	64	20.4%
No rules	7	1.5%
Don't know	1	0.2%

2006 Regional Results – 12 Counties	% Not Allow
Minimum	60.7%
Average	70.3%
Maximum	78.3%

By Gender	% Not Allow
Males	63.2%
Females	79.1%

By Age	% Not Allow
18-34	67.7%
35-64	69.3%
65+	82.8%

By Education	% Not Allow
No College	64.9%
Some Coll.	73.1%
4+ Years	88.3%

By Income	% Not Allow
<\$25,000	64.4%
\$25,000-\$50,000	74.5%
\$50,000+	82.6%

By Smoking	% Not Allow
Smokers	25.0%
Nonsmokers	86.6%

When you last went to a bar in your community in the past month, how often did you see people smoking?

Table 70

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Nearly every time	17	4.9%
Sometimes	12	5.2%
Rarely	4	1.2%
Never	116	33.2%
Don't know	3	0.8%
Didn't go to a bar	212	54.7%
<i>% Of Visitors who were exposed:</i>	---	24.9%

2006 Regional Results – 10 Counties	% of Visitors Exposed
Minimum	24.9%
Average	39.1%
Maximum	54.4%

Are you currently employed?

Table 71

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	225	57.1%
No	173	42.9%

2006 Regional Results – 11 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	56.7%
Average	61.2%
Maximum	68.8%

If yes, you are employed, while working at your job are you indoors most of the time?
(small sample sizes)

Table 72

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	182	80.8%
No	27	17.7%
Not Sure	3	1.5%

2006 Regional Results – 11 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	70.9%
Average	79.9%
Maximum	84.4%

If yes, you are employed, has anyone smoked in your work area or vehicle in past 7 days?
(small sample sizes)

Table 73

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	22	11.5%
No	187	87.3%
Not Sure	2	1.2%

2006 Regional Results – 11 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	8.9%
Average	13.4%
Maximum	17.1%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	13.0%
Females	10.8%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	15.9%
35-64	9.5%
65+	12.5%

By Education	% Yes
No College	13.0%
Some Coll.	14.7%
4+ Years	8.9%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	19.4%
\$25,000-\$50,000	20.0%
\$50,000+	3.7%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	22.0%
Nonsmokers	8.3%

Do you rent or own your home?

Table 74

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Rent	79	21.7%
Own	288	72.5%
Neither	11	5.8%

2006 Regional Results – 12 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	18.6%
Average	27.8%
Maximum	33.8%

If you rent your home, is there a policy that prohibits indoor smoking in your building?
(small sample sizes)

Table 75

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	17	16.1%
No	63	80.8%
Not Sure	2	3.1%

2006 Regional Results – 12 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	15.5%
Average	23.3%
Maximum	38.7%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	3.2%
Nonsmokers	22.2%

If you rent your home, are you in favor of a/the policy that prohibits indoor smoking in your building? (small sample sizes)

Table 76	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results – 12 Counties	% Yes
Yes	19	24.2%	Minimum	15.9%
No	43	56.5%	Average	27.2%
Not Sure	12	19.3%	Maximum	39.9%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	16.7%
Nonsmokers	28.6%

In the past seven days, have you seen anyone smoking in your community inside public places other than bars?

Table 77	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results – 11 Counties	% Yes
Yes	10	3.0%	Minimum	3.0%
No	352	95.7%	Average	6.8%
Not Sure	7	1.3%	Maximum	12.4%

Outdoor Secondhand Smoke Exposure Results

In the past year in your county, have you visited a *public outdoor event such as an auto show, musical festival, or concert?*

Table 78	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Yes	244	68.4%	Minimum	53.7%
No	129	31.6%	Average	70.2%
			Maximum	77.5%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	70.2%
Females	67.0%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	78.7%
35-64	69.5%
65+	43.5%

By Education	% Yes
No College	62.6%
Some Coll.	77.4%
4+ Years	75.0%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	62.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	79.8%
\$50,000+	76.5%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	68.8%
Nonsmokers	68.1%

If yes, you have visited a *public outdoor event such as an auto show, musical festival, or concert* in your county in the past year, how often were you exposed to secondhand smoke when visiting this type of location? (small sample sizes)

Table 79	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% At Least Some
All of the time	12	5.6%	Minimum	40.3%
Most of the time	29	12.9%	Average	52.0%
Some of the time	87	37.1%	Maximum	58.8%
Hardly ever	53	20.8%		
Never	54	20.0%		
Don't know	9	3.6%		

At a *public outdoor event such as an auto show, musical festival, or concert* in your county, do you think smoking should be allowed anywhere, restricted to certain areas, or not allowed at all?

Table 80	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Rest. Or Not All.
Allow anywhere	70	18.8%	Minimum	66.0%
Restrict to areas	179	45.8%	Average	72.6%
Not allow at all	130	32.1%	Maximum	79.8%
Don't know	16	3.4%		

By Gender	% R+N
Males	75.6%
Females	80.0%

By Age	% R+N
18-34	77.1%
35-64	79.8%
65+	73.1%

By Education	% R+N
No College	80.3%
Some Coll.	76.1%
4+ Years	81.3%

By Income	% R+N
<\$25,000	78.3%
\$25,000-\$50,000	84.4%
\$50,000+	82.9%

By Smoking	% R+N
Smokers	65.0%
Nonsmokers	82.3%

In the past year in your county, have you visited a *public beach*?

Table 81	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results – 10 Counties	% Yes
Yes	168	48.3%	Minimum	43.1%
No	206	51.7%	Average	55.2%
			Maximum	62.2%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	47.1%
Females	49.5%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	64.6%
35-64	47.1%
65+	19.4%

By Education	% Yes
No College	46.3%
Some Coll.	50.0%
4+ Years	62.7%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	43.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	55.8%
\$50,000+	63.2%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	48.4%
Nonsmokers	48.6%

If yes, you have visited a *public beach* in your county in the past year, how often were you exposed to secondhand smoke when visiting this type of location? (small sample sizes)

Table 82	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %		2006 Regional Results – 10 Counties	% At Least Some
All of the time	2	1.0%	22.8%	Minimum	22.8%
Most of the time	7	3.7%		Average	30.9%
Some of the time	29	18.1%		Maximum	37.6%
Hardly ever	40	24.7%			
Never	87	50.4%			
Don't know	3	2.0%			

At a *public beach* in your county, do you think smoking should be allowed anywhere, restricted to certain areas, or not allowed at all?

Table 83	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %		2006 Regional Results – 10 Counties	% Rest. Or Not All.
Allow anywhere	60	15.8%		Minimum	63.3%
Restrict to areas	164	43.5%	80.2%	Average	71.9%
Not allow at all	150	36.7%		Maximum	80.2%
Don't know	19	4.0%			

By Gender	% R+N
Males	79.5%
Females	81.0%

By Age	% R+N
18-34	82.4%
35-64	81.2%
65+	73.1%

By Education	% R+N
No College	81.9%
Some Coll.	83.0%
4+ Years	82.8%

By Income	% R+N
<\$25,000	76.4%
\$25,000-\$50,000	84.4%
\$50,000+	84.2%

By Smoking	% R+N
Smokers	67.0%
Nonsmokers	84.6%

In the past year in your county, have you visited a *public park*?

Table 84		Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	
Yes		224	62.4%	Minimum	62.4%
No		150	37.6%	Average	73.0%
				Maximum	83.8%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	61.8%
Females	62.9%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	74.0%
35-64	66.3%
65+	27.4%

By Education	% Yes
No College	58.3%
Some Coll.	61.7%
4+ Years	81.4%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	56.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	76.8%
\$50,000+	77.9%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	57.4%
Nonsmokers	63.8%

If yes, you have visited a *public park* in your county in the past year, how often were you exposed to secondhand smoke when visiting this type of location? (small sample sizes)

Table 85		Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	
All of the time		4	1.8%	Minimum	27.2%
Most of the time		13	7.2%	Average	34.3%
Some of the time		47	19.8%	Maximum	39.3%
Hardly ever		50	24.6%		
Never		103	44.1%		
Don't know		7	2.5%		

At a *public park* in your county, do you think smoking should be allowed anywhere, restricted to certain areas, or not allowed at all?

Table 86		Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	
Allow anywhere		51	14.1%	Minimum	66.7%
Restrict to areas		158	39.4%	Average	73.6%
Not allow at all		166	42.8%	Maximum	82.2%
Don't know		18	3.7%		

By Gender	% R+N
Males	80.1%
Females	84.1%

By Age	% R+N
18-34	81.1%
35-64	83.8%
65+	78.8%

By Education	% R+N
No College	82.0%
Some Coll.	85.7%
4+ Years	87.5%

By Income	% R+N
<\$25,000	81.1%
\$25,000-\$50,000	87.5%
\$50,000+	81.6%

By Smoking	% R+N
Smokers	68.0%
Nonsmokers	87.0%

In the past year in your county, have you visited a *public playground*?

Table 87	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results – 11 Counties	% Yes
Yes	174	47.0%	Minimum	47.0%
No	200	53.0%	Average	58.4%
			Maximum	67.4%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	45.5%
Females	48.4%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	57.0%
35-64	49.7%
65+	19.0%

By Education	% Yes
No College	45.1%
Some Coll.	49.1%
4+ Years	57.6%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	41.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	51.1%
\$50,000+	65.7%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	43.6%
Nonsmokers	47.9%

If yes, you have visited a *public playground* in your county in the past year, how often were you exposed to secondhand smoke when visiting this type of location? (small sample sizes)

Table 88	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results – 11 Counties	% At Least Some
All of the time	2	1.0%	Minimum	12.0%
Most of the time	3	1.5%	Average	17.6%
Some of the time	23	12.6%	Maximum	24.1%
Hardly ever	27	17.0%		
Never	118	67.5%		
Don't know	1	0.3%		

At a *public playground* in your county, do you think smoking should be allowed anywhere, restricted to certain areas, or not allowed at all?

Table 89	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results – 11 Counties	% Rest. Or Not All.
Allow anywhere	29	7.4%	Minimum	79.5%
Restrict to areas	94	24.4%	Average	85.1%
Not allow at all	256	65.2%	Maximum	89.6%
Don't know	14	3.0%		

By Gender	% R+N
Males	88.6%
Females	90.7%

By Age	% R+N
18-34	92.4%
35-64	89.4%
65+	84.8%

By Education	% R+N
No College	89.1%
Some Coll.	91.0%
4+ Years	98.5%

By Income	% R+N
<\$25,000	89.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	91.7%
\$50,000+	90.8%

By Smoking	% R+N
Smokers	83.2%
Nonsmokers	91.8%

In the past year in your county, have you visited an *area around public building entryways*?

Table 90	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Yes
Yes	360	96.9%	Minimum	90.9%
No	13	3.1%	Average	96.4%
			Maximum	98.3%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	95.3%
Females	98.4%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	100.0%
35-64	97.3%
65+	88.7%

By Education	% Yes
No College	96.6%
Some Coll.	98.1%
4+ Years	98.3%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	96.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	98.9%
\$50,000+	98.5%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	97.8%
Nonsmokers	96.8%

If yes, you have visited an *area around public building entryways* in your county in the past year, how often were you exposed to secondhand smoke when visiting this type of location? (small sample sizes)

Table 91	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% At Least Some
All of the time	48	13.7%	Minimum	49.7%
Most of the time	45	14.0%	Average	58.6%
Some of the time	99	28.1%	Maximum	68.1%
Hardly ever	53	14.1%		
Never	103	26.8%		
Don't know	12	3.3%		

At 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?

Table 92	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 12 Counties	% Rest. Or Not All.
Allow anywhere	43	11.8%	Minimum	75.4%
Restrict to areas	118	30.4%	Average	82.1%
Not allow at all	215	54.2%	Maximum	85.6%
Don't know	17	3.6%		

By Gender	% R+N
Males	81.5%
Females	87.6%

By Age	% R+N
18-34	90.1%
35-64	82.3%
65+	80.3%

By Education	% R+N
No College	85.2%
Some Coll.	87.5%
4+ Years	90.6%

By Income	% R+N
<\$25,000	84.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	89.6%
\$50,000+	88.2%

By Smoking	% R+N
Smokers	71.3%
Nonsmokers	89.1%

In the past year in your county, have you visited the *grounds of a hospital or medical facility* (including parking garages, parking lots, and outdoor employee break areas)?

Table 93	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results -9 Counties	% Yes
Yes	333	88.4%	Minimum	88.4%
No	41	11.6%	Average	91.2%
			Maximum	93.7%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	84.3%
Females	93.0%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	88.3%
35-64	88.2%
65+	88.7%

By Education	% Yes
No College	88.6%
Some Coll.	88.7%
4+ Years	96.7%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	90.1%
\$25,000-\$50,000	91.5%
\$50,000+	89.6%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	81.9%
Nonsmokers	90.8%

If yes, you have visited the *grounds of a hospital or medical facility* in your county in the past year, how often were you exposed to secondhand smoke when visiting this type of location? (small sample sizes)

Table 94	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results -9 Counties	% At Least Some
All of the time	26	8.8%	Minimum	32.4%
Most of the time	20	5.2%	Average	36.3%
Some of the time	59	18.4%	Maximum	42.7%
Hardly ever	43	12.5%		
Never	182	54.5%		
Don't know	3	0.6%		

At the *grounds of a hospital or medical facility* in your county, do you think smoking should be allowed anywhere, restricted to certain areas, or not allowed at all?

Table 95	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %	2006 Regional Results - 9 Counties	% Rest. Or Not All.
Allow anywhere	37	9.7%	Minimum	84.1%
Restrict to areas	110	28.8%	Average	86.0%
Not allow at all	230	58.2%	Maximum	88.5%
Don't know	15	3.3%		

By Gender	% R+N
Males	85.6%
Females	88.1%

By Age	% R+N
18-34	90.1%
35-64	86.3%
65+	83.1%

By Education	% R+N
No College	88.5%
Some Coll.	88.3%
4+ Years	95.3%

By Income	% R+N
<\$25,000	87.7%
\$25,000-\$50,000	89.6%
\$50,000+	89.5%

By Smoking	% R+N
Smokers	76.0%
Nonsmokers	90.8%

Perceived Reduced Harm of Tobacco Results

ONLY CURRENT SMOKERS ASKED: Did you ever use or switch to a low tar or nicotine cigarette *to reduce your health risk?* (small sample sizes)

Table 96

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Yes	30	37.6%
No	46	62.4%

2006 Regional Results – 11 Counties	% Yes
Minimum	24.7%
Average	32.3%
Maximum	43.1%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	43.2%
Females	31.7%

By Age	% Yes
18-34	28.9%
35-64	45.0%
65+	50.0%

By Education	% Yes
No College	45.5%
Some Coll.	15.4%
4+ Years	50.0%

By Income	% Yes
<\$25,000	50.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	28.6%
\$50,000+	22.2%

“Using smokeless tobacco (chewing tobacco, snuff, dip, etc.) is safer than smoking regular cigarettes.”

Table 97

	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted %
Strongly agree	10	2.2%
Agree	23	7.2%
Disagree	179	47.7%
Strongly disagree	125	33.4%
Don't know	37	9.5%

2006 Regional Results – 12 Counties	% A or SA
Minimum	3.8%
Average	6.1%
Maximum	10.8%

By Smoking	% Yes
Smokers	14.7%
Nonsmokers	7.5%

Concluding Comments

This report is a summary of the data collected in a community tobacco survey completed for the St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition in December 2006. 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 December of 2008. 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 2006. The only significant changes recommended for 2008 (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 Coalition.

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.

Hello, my name is _____ calling on behalf of the Department of Health. We are doing a survey about health-related issues. The survey should only take about 10 minutes, can you help us out tonight? If YES- great, thanks. If NO-try to arrange a CALL BACK time.

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.

ST. LAWRENCE

Our first few questions deal with secondhand smoke exposure.

- Do you think that breathing smoke from someone else's cigarettes is:

1_____ Very harmful to one's health	3_____ Not very harmful to one's health
2_____ Somewhat harmful to one's health	4_____ Not harmful at all to one's health

 5__ DK/NS

- Which statement best describes the rules about smoking **in your home**?

1_____ Smoking is <u>not</u> allowed <u>anywhere</u> inside the home	5_____ Don't know/Not sure
2_____ Smoking is allowed in <u>some places</u> or at some times	
3_____ Smoking is allowed <u>anywhere</u> inside the home	
4_____ There are <u>no rules</u> about smoking inside the home	

- Which statement best describes the rules about smoking **in your family vehicle** or vehicles?

1_____ Smoking is <u>never</u> allowed in any vehicle	5_____ Don't know/Not sure
2_____ Smoking is allowed <u>some times</u> or in some vehicles	
3_____ Smoking is <u>allowed</u> in all vehicles	
4_____ Do <u>not</u> have a family vehicle	

Next, I am going to read you a short list of outdoor locations, for each can you tell me whether you visited each in your county in the past year and how often were you exposed to secondhand smoke when visiting these locations

Locations:	IF YOU DID VISIT EACH OF THE TYPES OF LOCATIONS IN YOUR COUNTY IN THE PAST YEAR, how often were you exposed to secondhand smoke when visiting this location IN YOUR COUNTY ?						
	DID NOT VISIT	If you visited:					
		All of the time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Hardly ever	Never	DK
4. public outdoor community event such as an auto show, music festival or concert?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. public beach?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. public park?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. public playground?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. area around building entryways?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. on the grounds of a hospital or medical facility (including parking garages, parking lots, and outdoor employee break areas)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Now, at each of those locations, please tell me if you think smoking should be allowed anywhere; be restricted to certain areas; or not allowed at all. (Ask to ALL participants)

Locations:	At a _____, smoking should be ...?			
	Allowed anywhere	Restricted to certain areas	Not allowed at all	Not sure/Refused
10. public outdoor community event such as an auto show, music festival or concert	1	2	3	4
11. public beach?	1	2	3	4
12. public park?	1	2	3	4
13. public playground?	1	2	3	4
14. area around building entryways?	1	2	3	4
15. on the grounds of a hospital or medical facility	1	2	3	4

Great, we now have a few questions about *INDOOR* locations.

17. When you last went to a bar in your community in the past month, how often did you see people smoking?
 1 _____ Nearly every time 4 _____ Never
 2 _____ Sometimes 5 _____ Don't know/Not sure
 3 _____ Rarely 6 _____ Didn't go to a bar in the past month
18. Are you currently employed? 1 _____ Yes(go to #19) 2 _____ No(go to #21)
19. While working at your job, are you indoors most of the time? 1____ Yes 2____ No 3____DK/NS
20. In the past seven days, has anyone smoked in your work area or work vehicle?
 1____ Yes 2____ No 3____DK/NS
21. Do you rent or own your home? 1 _____ Rent 2 _____ Own 3 _____ Neither
22. (If RENT) Is there a policy that prohibits indoor smoking in your building? 1____ Yes 2____ No 3____DK/NS
23. (If RENT) "Would you be"/"Are you" in favor of a/the policy that prohibits indoor smoking in your building?
 1____ Yes 2____ No 3____DK/NS
24. In the past seven days, have you seen anyone smoking in your community inside public places other than bars? 1__Yes(**go to #25**) 2__No(**go to #26**) 3_____ DK/NS (**go to #26**)
25. **{If yes}** What type of location? _____

Our next few questions deal with awareness of advertising or information about the dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking....

During the past 7 days on average, how many hours a day did you: [PLEASE ENTER THE TIME TO NEAREST HALF HOUR]:

26. Watch television? _____ (hr/DAY)
27. Listen to the radio? _____ (hr/DAY)
28. In the past 30 days how often have you read a newspaper?
 1 _____ Every day 3 _____ Once per week 5 _____ Never or rarely
 2 _____ 2-3 times per week 4 _____ Less than once per week 6 _____ DK/NS
29. In the past 30 days how often have you read a penny saver or shopper?
 1 _____ Every issue 3 _____ Once per month 5 _____ Never or rarely
 2 _____ 2-3 times per month 4 _____ Less than once per month 6 _____ DK/NS

In the past 30 days, have you noticed advertising or information about the *dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking*....

Media Type:	Every Day	2-3 times per week	Once per week	Less than once per week	Never	NOp/DK/NA
30. on television?	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. on radio?	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. in newspapers?	1	2	3	4	5	6

33. Had you heard of "**St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition**" and its services before this survey?
 1__Yes (Go to #34) 2__No (Go to #35)
34. From what source did you hear about them? (**read choices, check all that apply**)
 1__television 3__newspaper 5__billboards 7__school
 2__radio 4__word of mouth 6__Work 8__other(_____)
35. Have you ever heard of "Reality Check", a youth-oriented program designed to get youth actively involved in promoting anti-tobacco issues?
 1__Yes 2__No
37. Have you recently seen advertising or information about the *dangers of tobacco or quitting smoking* that was sponsored by "**St. Lawrence County Tobacco Free Coalition**"? (**any ads? TV? Radio? NewsP?**)
 1 _____ Yes 2 _____ No 3 _____ Don't know/Not sure

38. I'd now like you to think of any news stories about smoking that you may have noticed on TV, radio, or in the newspapers, in the past 30 days. In your opinion, how was smoking portrayed in these news stories?
- 1____ Positively 3____ Neither positively or negatively
 2____ Negatively 4____ Both negative and positive
 5____ No opinion/Don't know/Not applicable

Our next question deals with perceived reduced harm of tobacco.

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

40. "Using smokeless tobacco, (chewing tobacco, snuff, dip, etc.), is safer than smoking regular cigarettes."
 1____ Strongly Agree 3____ Disagree 5____ Don't Know/Not Sure
 2____ Agree 4____ Strongly Disagree

43. During the past 12 months, did any doctor, nurse or health professional ask if you smoke? (**ASK CAREFULLY!!!**)
 1__Yes 2__No 3__ Did not see a health care professional in the past 12 months 4__DK/NS

44. Have you ever heard of the New York State Smokers' Quitline? 1__Yes 2__No 3__DK/NS
Go to: #45 #48 #48
Quit Line: 1-866-NY-QUITS 1-866-697-8487

45. **{If yes to #44} Where did you hear about the New York State Smokers' Quitline? (If multiple, ask which first, record only one)**
- | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1____ Television | 7____ Doctor/Health Prof. |
| 2____ Radio | 8____ Hospital |
| 3____ Posters/billboards | 9____ Word of Mouth |
| 4____ Movies | 10____ Work |
| 5____ Newspapers/magazines | 11____ Other _____ |
| 6____ Internet | 12____ Don't know/Not sure |

46. Have you ever called the New York St. Smokers' Quitline? 1__Yes 2__No 3__DK/NS
Go to: #47 #48 #48

47. Did you call for yourself, or for a friend or family member?
 1____ Called for self 2____ Called for someone else
 3____ Other [Please Specify] _____

The next set of questions involves exposure to tobacco advertising....

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

Event:	Every Day	2-3 times per week	Once per week	Less than once per week	Never	NO/DK/NA
48. how often do you see tobacco advertising? (any and all types)	1	2	3	4	5	6
50. in newspapers or magazines	1	2	3	4	5	6
51. on shop windows or inside shops where tobacco is sold?	1	2	3	4	5	6
52. at sports events?	1	2	3	4	5	6
53. at cultural events?	1	2	3	4	5	6

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

58. "Tobacco advertising contributes to the number of youth that experiment with smoking."
 1____ Strongly Agree 3____ Disagree 5____ Don't Know/Not Sure
 2____ Agree 4____ Strongly Disagree

60. 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?
 1____ All of the time 4____ Hardly ever
 2____ Most of the time 5____ Never
 3____ Some of the time 6____ I never go to these places.

61. Do you think advertising of tobacco products **IN STORES** should be: always allowed, allowed under some conditions, or not allowed at all?
 1____ Always allowed 3____ Not allowed at all
 2____ Allowed under some conditions 4____ No opinion/Don't know

Next Questions ONLY FOR FORMER SMOKERS: (YES to Q79 and NOT AT ALL to Q80)

81. How long ago did you quit? _____ (indicate whether weeks or months or years)

If Q81 < 3 years, then ask:

82. Has the New York State law prohibiting smoking in all workplaces, including bars and restaurants, had an effect on your tobacco use? Which of the following best describes the effect?

1. No effect on my tobacco use (law did not cause me to quit)
2. Law enacted has caused me to quit 3 Refused.

When you quit smoking, did you use any of the following methods or strategies to quit?

83. Stopping by gradually cutting back on cigarettes 1__Yes 2__No
84. Switching to chewing tobacco, cigars, or pipes. 1__Yes 2__No
85. Switching to "lights" in order to quit. 1__Yes 2__No
86. Giving up cigarettes all at once. 1__Yes 2__No
87. Quit with a friend, relative, or acquaintance. 1__Yes 2__No
88. The nicotine patch, nicotine gum, and/or other medication. 1__Yes 2__No
89. OTHER(specify): _____ 1__Yes 2__No

GO TO DEMOGRAPHICS (Q#123) AFTER THIS QUESTION.

Next Questions ONLY FOR CURRENT SMOKERS: (YES to Q79 AND ED or SD to Q80)

90. On the days that you smoke, what is the average number of cigarettes that you smoke?
_____ number of cigarettes/day (1 pack = 20 cigarettes)

91. In the past 12 months, has a doctor, nurse, or other health professional advised you to quit smoking?
1__Yes 2__No 3__Did not see a health care professional in the past 12 months 4__DK/NS
Go to: #94 #100 #100 #100

IF YES: When a doctor, nurse, or other health professional advised you to quit smoking, did he/she do any of the following? (ask all 6 of these)

94. Prescribe or recommend a nicotine patch, nicotine gum, nasal spray, an inhaler, or pills such as Zyban? 1__Yes 2__No
95. Suggest that you set a specific date to stop smoking? 1__Yes 2__No
96. Suggest that you use a smoking cessation class, program, or counseling? 1__Yes 2__No
97. Suggest you call a telephone quit line? 1__Yes 2__No
98. Provide you with booklets, videos, or other materials to help you quit smoking on your own? 1__Yes 2__No
99. Schedule a follow-up visit to discuss your progress? 1__Yes 2__No

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

- 1 Yes 2 No 3 Don't know/Not sure 4 Refused

101. If YES, how long did you remain tobacco free? _____ Days or Weeks or Months?

102. How many times have you attempted to quit smoking in the past three years? _____

If Q102 > 0: The last time you tried to quit smoking, did you use any of the following methods or strategies to quit?

103. Stopping by gradually cutting back on cigarettes 1__Yes 2__No
104. Switching to chewing tobacco, cigars, or pipes. 1__Yes 2__No
105. Switching to "lights" in order to quit. 1__Yes 2__No
106. Giving up cigarettes all at once. 1__Yes 2__No
107. Quit with a friend, relative, or acquaintance. 1__Yes 2__No
108. The nicotine patch, nicotine gum, and/or other medication. 1__Yes 2__No
109. OTHER(specify): _____ 1__Yes 2__No

110. Did you ever use or switch to a low tar or nicotine cigarette to reduce your health risk?
1 Yes 2 No 3 Don't know/Not sure 4 Refused

113. 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? 1__Yes 2__No
Go to: #114 #117
114. How often did you or they purchase cigarettes there?
 1___ All of the time 3___ Rarely 5___ DK/NS
 2___ Sometimes 4___ Never
117. 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? 1__Yes 2__No
Go to: #118 #119
118. How often did you or they purchase cigarettes there?
 1___ All of the time 3___ Rarely 5___ DK/NS
 2___ Sometimes 4___ Never
119. Has the New York State law prohibiting smoking in all workplaces, including bars and restaurants, had an effect on your tobacco use? Which of the following best describe the effects? **(CHOOSE ALL THAT APPLY)**
 1. Law enacted has caused me to plan (or consider more strongly) to quit
 2. Law enacted has caused me to reduce the # of cigarettes that I smoke
 3. No effect on my tobacco use (still smoking and law did not caused me to consider quitting)
 4. Refused.
120. Would you like to quit smoking now? 1__Yes 2__No 3__DK/NS
121. Are you aware of cessation services in the county? 1__Yes 2__No 3__DK/NS
122. Would you be interested in learning about available cessation services? 1__Yes 2__No
Quit Line: 1-866-NY-QUITS 1-866-697-8487

DEMOGRAPHICS

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.

123. What is your age (read intervals,...)?
 1___ 18-24 4___ 45-54 7___ 75-84
 2___ 25-34 5___ 55-64 8___ 85+
 3___ 35-44 6___ 65-74 9___ Refused
124. What is your current employment status? (check all that apply)
 1___ Employed for wages 5___ A homemaker
 2___ Self-employed 6___ A student
 3___ Out of work for more than 1 year 7___ Retired
 4___ Out of work for less than 1 year 8___ Unable to work 9___ DK/NS
125. What county do you work in? _____
126. How many children live in your household who are under 18 years old? _____
127. What is the highest level of school you completed or the highest degree you received? **(open-end, choose one)**
 1___ Never attended school or only attended kind. 7___ Some college, no degree
 2___ Grades 1 through 8 (Elementary) 8___ AA; technical or vocational school
 3___ Grades 9 through 12 (Some high school) 9___ AA; academic
 4___ Grade 12 (High school graduate) 10___ BA, BS (College graduate)
 5___ G.E.D 11___ At least some grad or prof school
 6___ Some technical or vocational school 12___ Graduate or professional degree
128. Which of the following best represents your race or ethnicity?
 1___ White 5___ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
 2___ Black or African American 6___ American Indian, Alaska Native
 3___ Hispanic or Latino 7___ Don't know/Not sure
 4___ Asian 8___ Other [Please specify] _____

129. What is your annual household income from all sources (stop me when I get to your interval)?
- | | | | | | |
|------|--------------------------------|------|--------------------------------|------|---------------------------------|
| 1___ | Less than \$10,000 | 4___ | \$20,000 to less than \$25,000 | 7___ | \$50,000 to less than \$75,000 |
| 2___ | \$10,000 to less than \$15,000 | 5___ | \$25,000 to less than \$35,000 | 8___ | \$75,000 to less than \$100,000 |
| 3___ | \$15,000 to less than \$20,000 | 6___ | \$35,000 to less than \$50,000 | 9___ | \$100,000 or more |

130. Are you currently covered by any kind of health insurance, that is, any policy or program that provides or pays for medical care?
- | | | | | | |
|------|-----|------|----|------|---------------------|
| 1___ | Yes | 2___ | No | 3___ | Don't know/Not sure |
|------|-----|------|----|------|---------------------|

Go to #131 #132 #132

132. What type of health care coverage do you use to pay for most of your medical care?
- | | | | |
|------|---------------------------------------|------|------------------------------|
| 1___ | Private insurance coverage | 5___ | Indian Health Service |
| 2___ | Medicare | 6___ | None |
| 3___ | Medicaid or Medical Assistance | 7___ | Other [Please specify] _____ |
| 4___ | Military, CHAMPUS, TriCare, or the VA | 8___ | Don't know/Not sure |

132. What is your gender? 1___ Male 2___ Female

Thank you for taking the time to help us study these important health issues. If you want more information regarding this survey contact <Community Partner Information>.