2002 Macomb County Behavioral Risk Factor Survey

Study Contact

Steven J. Kuntz
Manager of Planning & Quality Assurance
Macomb County Health Department
43525 Elizabeth Road
Mt. Clemens, MI. 48043
Telephone (586) 469-5699
Fax (586) 469-5885
e-mail steve.kuntz@co.macomb.mi.us

Why do this study?

A consortium of groups, including the Macomb County Health Department and other community groups, are engaging in a process to identify the health and social needs of Macomb County. The goal is to use community resources more efficiently and more effectively by identifying areas of greater need, so that resource allocation and effort can be directed to optimize the overall quality of life and health in the county.

The consortium seeks to identify and prioritize health problems in order to develop a community health plan. In order to do this, data are being examined from a variety of sources, such as Census, hospital, and health department records. However, some information that will be valuable in assessing needs and planning for the future is not available from such institutional sources. The additional information required is rooted in the personal experiences of individual residents as they experience ebbs and flows of the economy, shifts in the demand for labor of various types, in the geographic and social distribution of assets and health, and in lifestyle and health maintenance decisions. Information as to the prevalence of such experiences and behaviors is not catalogued in any institutional reference; it rests with individual residents and it is from them directly that such information must be obtained in order to complete the mission of the coalition. Acquisition of this information is one of the most important contributions made by Macomb County Health Department.

In the spring of 2002, the coalition awarded a contract to ORC Macro to conduct a telephone survey in the summer of the same year. In consultation with the county representatives, ORC Macro staff constructed a survey based on a previously used instrument, which was modeled after the Behavioral Risk Factor Survey (BRFS) of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). A very similar instrument was used three years ago to measure health risk information in Macomb County.

The following report presents findings of the 2002 Macomb BRFS survey. These findings will be used by the coalition, and many of the individual contributing agencies as they continue to address the needs of the community, assess the effectiveness of their programs, and engage in planning for Macomb County's future.

Sampling

ORC Macro, a private survey research company, conducted the Behavioral Risk Factor Survey of Macomb (Macomb BRFS) using Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviews (CATI). The study was designed as a cross-sectional survey of adults and households in the county.

The sampling design of the 2002 Macomb BRFS focused on producing estimates of prevalence and indicators of various health related behaviors for specific subgroups of the county's adult population with a rough precision target of ±5% at 95% confidence. Specifically, estimates with this level of precision were required for young males (males aged 18 to 24 years), middle aged men and women (men and women aged 40 and over), the elderly (persons aged 65 years and older, and low income households (those with household incomes of less than $20K). This study had a target sample size of 1,000 interviews overall.

Given the population distribution of Macomb County, a sample of persons obtained via random selection of persons within randomly contacted households would not meet the precision targets for all subgroups. Specifically, the young males, the elderly, and the low-income households would not be sampled in sufficient numbers. To address this, a screening based approach was devised. Here a target of 600 interviews was set for a general population study, which would randomly select persons within households. The remaining 400 interviews were allocated to a screening study. Households contacted as part of the screening study were only retained if they contained an elder or a young male, and selection probabilities were adjusted to increase the chance of selecting young males, the rarest of the subgroups.

To randomly sample households across the county, ORC Macro developed a random digit-dial (RDD) sample based on a list-assisted frame. ORC Macro generated RDD sample in-house using the Genesys system. Genesys holds the contract with the CDC to provide sample for the BRFS in all states and territories where it is conducted. ORC Macro currently uses Genesys sample for each of the fourteen states in which it conducts the BRFS, as well as numerous other BRFS-based health studies, and has generated Genesys sample in-house for hundreds of RDD surveys over 12 years.

Genesys maintains an up-to-date list of all current operating telephone exchanges (three-digit prefixes) within any given area code. These exchanges were assigned to the geographic area of interest, Macomb County, by plurality. That is, an exchange was assigned to the county if more numbers within that exchange ring into households in Macomb County than into any other single county. As many exchanges are not exclusive to one county, this method does result in some households not in Macomb County being included in the sample. Respondents were asked a screening question to confirm their county of residence, as described below, so that these households were excluded from the survey.

Once the appropriate telephone exchanges were identified, they were combined with all four-digit numbers from 0000 to 9999 to constitute the set of possible working telephone numbers in the county, both residential and non-residential. The set of possible telephone numbers was then arranged in ascending order by exchange and four-digit suffix, and divided into "blocks" of 100 numbers each, based on the first two digits of the suffix. The Genesys system was then used to filter out known non-residential numbers and pre-dials the balance of numbers to identify non-working, fax, and modem numbers.

Once a household was contacted, geographic eligibility was determined, with only households in Macomb County retained. The final stage of sampling involved the use of a household roster to randomly select an adult respondent. In the general population study, interviewers first ask how many adults in the household are aged 18 and older, then ask the respondents to list the males and

females in the household. For households in the screening study, a more detailed set of questions determined the number of youth and elders by gender. In both studies, the CATI system automatically selected the respondent to be interviewed, in the general study with equal probabilities, and in the screening study with adjusted probabilities.

Interviewing Protocol

Interviewing for the study took place between July 3, 2002 and September 4, 2002. At least six attempts were made to reach each household, with four additional attempts once a respondent was selected. Attempts were rotated over weekday day, weekday evening and weekend hours with at least two attempts made during each period. Approximately 20% of attempts were made during weekday hours, with the remainder of attempts occurring on weekday evenings and weekends.

Unless contact with a household occupant was made, telephone numbers were called a minimum of 6 times across time blocks of the day and days of the week. If contact with the household occurred on any of the call attempts, then interviewers continued to try to contact the household another four times, or until the record resulted in a completed interview or refusal.

Supervisory staff or ORC Macro's Non-response Conversion Staff (NCS) made refusal conversion attempts in the case of all initial refusals, except where the initial refusal was adamant or strongly indicated little likelihood of a successful conversion. ORC Macro selects NSC interviewers based on experience and performance. All NCS team members have a minimum of six months of public health-related telephone interviewing experience, receive extensive training on interviewing uncooperative respondents, and are paid a salary premium.

The subset of uncooperative cases was handled on an individual basis, customizing procedures for each case. Whenever a respondent refused to be interviewed or terminated an interview in progress, the interviewer attempted to obtain information as to why the respondent refused or terminated the interview. During weekly non-response workshops, interviewing staff compiled these cases and reviewed effective strategies for non-response avoidance and conversion. In most cases, one NCS or supervisor attempt was made after a selected respondent's initial refusal for outright refusals, and one interviewer attempt followed by one NCS or supervisor attempt for an unqualified refusal in which no respondent has been selected.

Weighting and Data Analysis

ORC Macro weighted the final dataset to correct for unequal probabilities of selection and to adjust the distribution of survey respondents with respect to age and gender to that of the Macomb County population of adults. Initially, the dataset was weighted by the inverse of the selection probabilities within each of the two studies. The selection probability accounted for the differential telephone sampling rates, and the selection of persons within households. This initial weight was then adjusted to account for household eligibility, both in terms of geography and inclusion in the screening study. The weight for each study was post-stratified independently to match population counts for Macomb county by age and gender, using data from the 2000 census.

As each study consisted of an independent sample, the post-stratified weight for each study was adjusted to allow for the combination of respondents from each sample into a single analytic file. The adjustment, designed to minimize overall variance, was based on the effective sample size for each sample. As a final step, the weights were scaled so that the sum of the weights equaled the number of completed interviews.

The final analytic file contained 1,005 interviews, with 581 of these interviews obtained from the general population study, and 424 interviews obtained from the screening study. The overall margin of sampling error for this file is 4.4%[1]. For the elder and young male subgroups, the study yielded 441 and 116 interviews, respectively, giving a sampling error margin of ±5.9 for elders and ±12.5% for young males.

Given that the combined analytic file was not the product of a simple random sample, the sampling design must be accounted for when computing precision levels, standard errors, and statistical tests.

ORC Macro used SAS 8.2 to manage, transform, and analyze the data. All results presented in this report are based on the weighted sample, with statistical tests and confidence intervals based on design-appropriate variances. To every extent possible, ORC Macro has endeavored to code, categorize, and report results consistently with the procedures adopted by the Michigan Department of Community Health in its reporting of the Michigan Behavioral Risk Factor Survey and previous reporting for Macomb County BRFS. This is intended to enable direct comparison of the prevalence rates and findings of the Macomb BRFS to those for the state as a whole. Specifically, this means that in calculating the percentages of individuals "at risk" because of a particular health behavior or condition, individuals who refused to answer a question or who responded that they did not know the answer were excluded from the computation of the percentage. This was also done for the responses to the demographic questions. That is, the percentages reported are based on the valid responses to the questions where "don't know" and "refused" are treated as invalid responses.

Following the format of the Michigan Behavioral Risk Factor Survey reports, the percentages of respondents giving each of the answers or who fall into various response or risk categories are reported by categories of respondents based on sex, age, race, education, and income. The income categories represent that of the respondents' entire households, whereas each of the other variables refers to the characteristics of the respondents. To facilitate comparisons to the

---

1 This error margin is computed using the effective sample size, which accounts for the departures from a simple random sample used in this study. The effective sample size is computed obtained by dividing the sample size by the design effect, a factor that accounts for weighting, stratification, and household clustering. The design effect due to weighting for this study was 2.04. Among elders, the design effect due to weighting was 1.60, and among young males, 1.90

statewide rates, we have grouped individuals within categories of these demographic variables and report them in the same way as is done in the Michigan Behavioral Risk Factor Survey reports with two notable exceptions. Whereas that series of reports aggregates all individuals with household incomes of $35,000 or more into a single category, we have elected to separate these individuals into two categories, those with incomes of $35,000 to $49,999 and those with incomes of $50,000 or more.

Decisions as to differences among categories of respondents are based on the test statistic F, with categorical variables coded into a 0/1 dichotomous variable. A significance level of .05 was used in all tests, implying that prevalence rates will be judged to be different from each if the chance of observing the amount of difference found by sampling error alone is less than one in twenty (i.e., if the probability of observing an or F value as large as that found would be expected to occur in less than five percent of all samples as a result of sampling error alone when the categories did not really differ in fact). This will be noted as being a "statistically significant difference."

Statistical significance is partly a reflection of sample size. That is, with very large samples, almost all differences in the rates of various categories of respondents will be statistically significant even if the differences in the actual percentages are rather small. The same magnitude of difference in the rates would probably not be statistically significant if the sample sizes are relatively small. With relatively small samples, substantial differences in the rates among various categories of respondents will typically be required before they can be judged to be anything more than just sampling error. Thus, when the sample sizes are smaller, there is a greater chance of failing to note a substantively important difference among categories because the magnitude of the difference is not great enough to be statistically significant.

Small numbers of respondents are also an issue when analyzing data due to concerns about the variability of the data, that is, a difference in the responses of only a few individuals can result in a large difference in percentage of the total for that group. Small numbers of respondents in a group generally occur in one of two ways: 1) There are very few respondents in the total sample who have a particular characteristic under analysis, or 2) The logic of the survey limits the number of respondents receiving a particular question, thereby reducing the number of respondents in each analytical unit for that item. Where counts are less than 50 respondents per subgroup, caution should be used in drawing conclusions from the data, even where significant results are shown.

In some portions of the report, we estimate the actual numbers of individuals or households in the population of the county who do some particular behavior or have a particular condition. Estimates of population totals are computed as the sum of the final, adjusted weight prior to scaling to case counts. We have used the 2000 U.S. Census figures for the adult population of the county.

Results Overview

ORC Macro completed a total of 1,005 interviews with adults (age 18 or older) in Macomb County, Michigan, according to the protocol described in the previous section. The interviews varied in length, depending on how much respondents had to say in response to various questions, from 10 to 70 minutes. The average interview lasted 21.6 minutes. The average number of call attempts to each selected telephone number with which an interview was completed was 4.4. Telephone numbers that consistently resulted in "no answers" were discarded as being probable non-working numbers after a minimum of 6 call attempts. If any calls to a number resulted in contact indicating that the number probably belonged to a household, interviewers continued to try to reach the respondent up to 10 total attempts over the study period.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Unweighted and Weighted Samples Compared To 2000 Census Estimates for Macomb County

Characteristics	2000 Census Estimates	Sample % Distribution	
		Unweighted	Weighted
TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS	309,203	1,005	1,005
TOTAL NUMBER OF ADULTS	598,365	1,005	1,005
Gender			
Male	48.2%	57.21%	48.09%
Female	51.8%	42.79%	51.91%
Age			
18 to 24	10.7%	11.74%	10.22%
25 to 29	9.7%	3.98%	7.27%
30 to 39	20.7%	12.14%	22.25%
40 to 49	20.1%	13.23%	21.08%
50 to 59	15.8%	11.24%	15.47%
60 to 64	5.2%	4.38%	5.76%
65 to 79	12.7%	33.73%	13.69%
80+	5.3%	8.36%	3.74%
Race			
White	92.7%	93.57%	91.65%
African American	2.7%	2.11%	3.29%
Other	4.6%	4.32%	5.06%
Education			
Less than HS	17%	9.85%	7.57%
HS Graduate	32.8%	37.21%	35.81%
Some College	32.6%	30.05%	31.04%
College Graduate	17.6%	22.39%	25.35%

Table 2: Perceived Health Status, by Demographic Characteristics						
Characteristic	N	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Overall	1002	20.09%	36.99%	28.16%	8.61%	6.16%
Gender						
A Male	572	23.12%	37.91%	26.74%	8.61%	3.63%
B Female	430	17.29%	36.15%	29.47%	8.60%	8.50%
Age						
C 18 to 24	118	14.24%	46.34%	29.70%	2.70%	7.02%
D 25 to 34	98	29.57%	34.36%	29.23%	5.01%	1.83%
E 35 to 44	125	25.26%	48.07%	17.17%	5.01%	5.49%
F 45 to 54	137	19.03%	33.21%	26.95%	10.21%	10.60%
G 55 to 64	91	12.62%	33.42%	38.84%	11.09%	4.04%
H 65 to 74	254	16.64%	28.24%	32.84%	11.58%	10.71%
I 75 +	167	8.08%	22.27%	36.03%	25.91%	7.71%
Race						
J White	929	20.79%	38.26%	27.54%	8.35%	5.07%
K Other	63	12.49%	22.51%	34.53%	11.83%	18.65%
Education						
L Less than HS	99	9.24%	24.11%	36.75%	16.18%	13.72%
M HS Graduate	373	16.47%	29.33%	34.61%	12.87%	6.73%
N Some College	301	18.21%	41.40%	28.62%	5.70%	6.07%
O College Graduate	224	30.82%	46.32%	16.19%	3.41%	3.26%
Income						
P Less than $10,000	23	2.67%	13.65%	23.21%	30.46%	30.01%
Q $10,000-$19,999	111	2.17%	38.77%	27.27%	24.17%	7.62%
R $20,000-$34,999	213	11.66%	29.73%	31.59%	11.83%	15.18%
S $35,000-$49,999	167	22.07%	39.97%	29.41%	5.82%	2.73%
T $50,000 or more	283	29.57%	45.24%	21.10%	2.25%	1.83%

Table 3: Average Number of Days Health Not Good in Past Month, by Perceived Health Status				
Characteristic	N	**Physical Health Not Good**	**Mental Health Not Good**	**Unable to do Usual Activities**
Overall	979	3.34	4.31	3.97
Perceived Health Status				
A Excellent	177	0.37^{BCDE}	1.6^{BCDE}	0.99^{DE}
B Very good	350	0.91^{CDE}	3.05^{CDE}	1^{CDE}
C Good	281	2.7^{DE}	5.33^{E}	2.86^{DE}
D Fair	111	9.79^{E}	6.91	6.22^{E}
E Poor	57	21.91	12.84	17.06

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences ($p < .05$) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

	Characteristic	Sad 0 Days	Sad 1 to 3 Days	**Sad 4+ Days**	Worried 0 Days	Worried 1 to 3 Days	**Worried 4+ Days**
	Overall	54.31%	21.85%	23.84%	39.82%	25.12%	35.06%
	Gender						
A	Male	61.70%	20.14%	18.17%[B]	44.77%	26.89%	28.33%[B]
B	Female	47.35%	23.46%	29.18%	35.12%	23.43%	41.46%
	Age						
C	18 to 24	28.61%	37.20%	34.19%[H]	15.53%	22.84%	61.63%[DEFGHI]
D	25 to 34	55.14%	23.37%	21.48%	41.85%	24.05%	34.09%[HI]
E	35 to 44	50.51%	21.89%	27.61%[H]	30.86%	28.99%	40.15%[HI]
F	45 to 54	56.06%	14.91%	29.03%[H]	36.16%	29.22%	34.62%[HI]
G	55 to 64	59.59%	23.38%	17.03%	46.50%	24.68%	28.81%
H	65 to 74	71.94%	16.74%	11.32%[I]	62.36%	18.88%	18.76%
I	75 +	60.02%	18.88%	21.10%	66.73%	17.44%	15.82%
	Race						
J	White	54.95%	21.66%	23.39%	39.82%	25.52%	34.66%
K	Other	47.55%	23.76%	28.68%	41.61%	17.92%	40.47%
	Education						
L	Less than HS	45.01%	15.85%	39.14%[O]	42.91%	6.17%	50.92%
M	HS Graduate	54.81%	18.87%	26.32%[O]	39.06%	25.02%	35.93%
N	Some College	48.27%	25.60%	26.13%[O]	36.22%	28.87%	34.91%
O	College Graduate	63.85%	23.45%	12.70%	44.21%	26.32%	29.47%
	Income						
P	Less than $10,000	7.41%	43.32%	49.27%[T]	14.44%	12.22%	73.34%[QRST]
Q	$10,000-$19,999	31.34%	27.09%	41.57%[ST]	35.08%	23.12%	41.79%
R	$20,000-$34,999	45.91%	17.80%	36.29%[ST]	34.17%	23.60%	42.23%
S	$35,000-$49,999	58.16%	21.34%	20.50%	38.72%	24.08%	37.20%
T	$50,000 or more	60.22%	24.18%	15.60%	42.03%	28.13%	29.83%

Table 5: Percent Distribution of Numbers of Days Felt Sad or Depressed; Worried or Anxious in Past 30 Days, by Demographic Characteristics

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 6: Average Spiritual Health Index Scores, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristic	N	Average Spiritual Health Score
	Overall	986	2.29
	Gender		
A	Male	560	2.19^{B}
B	Female	426	2.38
	Age		
C	18 to 24	118	2.03^{DGHI}
D	25 to 34	95	2.31
E	35 to 44	123	2.25^{HI}
F	45 to 54	136	2.23^{HI}
G	55 to 64	87	2.35
H	65 to 74	252	2.47
I	75 +	164	2.49
	Race		
J	White	915	2.29
K	Other	63	2.3
	Education		
L	Less than HS	98	2.19
M	HS Graduate	370	2.28
N	Some College	297	2.32
O	College Graduate	218	2.29
	Income		
P	Less than $10,000	23	2.13
Q	$10,000-$19,999	110	2.26
R	$20,000-$34,999	213	2.2
S	$35,000-$49,999	167	2.31
T	$50,000 or more	281	2.28

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 7: Percent of Respondents Who Have Ever Been Told They Have High Blood Pressure/Hypertension, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Ever Told Have High Blood Pressure	95% CI	Taking Medication	95% CI
	Overall	1000	28.58%	± 3.9	72.31%	± 7.9
	Gender					
A	Male	571	31.73%	± 4.7	67.98%	± 9.0
B	Female	429	25.67%	± 6.0	77.25%	± 13.6
	Age					
C	18 to 24	118	2.91%^{EFGHI}	± 3.7	.^{EFGHI}	
D	25 to 34	98	8.76%^{EFGHI}	± 5.2	19.9%^{EFGHI}	± 22.3
E	35 to 44	125	24.6%^{FHI}	± 9.3	57.11%^{GHI}	± 21.6
F	45 to 54	135	42.5%^{H}	± 11.6	65.29%^{HI}	± 21.1
G	55 to 64	92	31.03%^{HI}	± 10.3	87.84%	± 12.2
H	65 to 74	256	57.36%	± 7.9	88.18%^{I}	± 6.0
I	75 +	166	50.36%	± 9.3	96.92%	± 3.7
	Race					
J	White	927	29.35%	± 4.1	72.07%	± 8.3
K	Other	64	20.85%	± 11.7	77.96%	± 22.7
	Education					
L	Less than HS	98	37.27%	± 14.3	86.05%	± 15.4
M	HS Graduate	373	31.27%	± 7.0	63.37%	± 14.4
N	Some College	301	29.36%	± 7.0	75.37%	± 11.7
O	College Graduate	224	20.84%	± 6.6	77.96%	± 15.1
	Income					
P	Less than $10,000	23	41.43%	± 31.0	72.33%	± 31.2
Q	$10,000-$19,999	112	37.08%	± 12.7	79.25%	± 16.1
R	$20,000-$34,999	213	29.51%	± 8.8	76.50%	± 14.1
S	$35,000-$49,999	168	24.70%	± 7.7	67.94%	± 17.2
T	$50,000 or more	283	24.15%	± 6.3	71.56%	± 12.7

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant difference (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

14

Table 8: Percentage of Respondents Who Have Ever Had Blood Cholesterol Checked; Checked in Past Year; Ever Told Cholesterol High, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Ever Checked	95% CI	Checked in Past Year	95% CI	Told Cholesterol High	95% CI
	Overall	961	93.08%	± 2.7	70.93%	± 4.4	32.44%	± 4.2
	Gender							
A	Male	544	92.46%	± 3.2	67.17%	± 5.2	32.95%	± 4.9
B	Female	417	93.65%	± 4.4	74.33%	± 7.1	31.99%	± 6.8
	Age							
C	18 to 24	101	78.86%[FGHI]	± 16.8	54.07%[GHI]	± 16.6	0.9%[DEFGHI]	± 1.0
D	25 to 34	90	86.94%[FGHI]	± 8.2	59.31%[GHI]	± 11.9	13.52%[EFGHI]	± 8.2
E	35 to 44	121	92.65%[GHI]	± 5.2	70.7%[GHI]	± 8.8	28.09%[GH]	± 9.0
F	45 to 54	134	96.04%[GH]	± 3.2	63.83%[GHI]	± 12.0	39.11%[G]	± 12.1
G	55 to 64	89	100.00%	± 0	83.86%	± 9.3	61.17%[HI]	± 12.1
H	65 to 74	253	99.78%	± .3	86.45%[I]	± 5.4	46.60%	± 7.9
I	75 +	162	98.45%	± 1.9	93.86%	± 3.9	38.25%	± 8.9
	Race							
J	White	895	94.76%[K]	± 2.0	72.17%	± 4.4	32.74%	± 4.4
K	Other	59	74.16%	± 20.5	56.26%	± 19.7	29.04%	± 16.6
	Education							
L	Less than HS	90	90.38%	± 9.7	79.74%	± 11.7	44.04%	± 15.4
M	HS Graduate	360	93.64%	± 5.1	69.91%	± 8.4	37.37%	± 7.8
N	Some College	289	91.74%	± 5.2	72.27%	± 7.3	27.95%	± 6.8
O	College Graduate	218	94.63%	± 3.9	68.14%	± 8.3	27.27%	± 7.5
	Income							
P	Less than $10,000	22	72.65%	± 32.5	38.74%	± 28.7	44.01%	± 31.3
Q	$10,000-$19,999	106	92.42%	± 10.2	73.67%	± 15.0	36.90%	± 13.2
R	$20,000-$34,999	204	92.47%	± 6.0	75.64%	± 9.5	28.84%	± 8.9
S	$35,000-$49,999	161	92.87%	± 5.4	77.16%	± 8.5	26.46%	± 8.3
T	$50,000 or more	269	95.22%	± 3.3	69.61%	± 7.0	32.68%	± 7.1

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 9: Percentage of Respondents Who Have Ever Been Told They Have Diabetes; Had Asthma in Past Year; Told They Had Cardiovascular Disease (Heart Attack, Angina or Coronary Heart Disease, Stroke); Were Ever Told They Have Arthritis, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Ever Told Have Diabetes	95% CI	Had Asthma in Past Year	95% CI	Ever Told Had Cardiovascular Disease	95% CI	Ever Told Have Arthritis	95% CI
	Overall	1000	6.19%	± 1.6	7.93%	± 2.3	5.88%	± 1.6	29.06%	± 4.0
	Gender									
A	Male	573	7.68%	± 2.4	5.89%	± 2.3	5.16%	± 1.8	23%[B]	± 4.1
B	Female	427	4.82%	± 2.1	9.83%	± 3.9	6.56%	± 2.7	34.69%	± 6.7
	Age									
C	18 to 24	118	1.18%[FGHI]	± 1.5	11.31%	± 7.9	0.73%[GHI]	± .9	6.32%[EFGHI]	± 6.4
D	25 to 34	98	0.87%[FGHI]	± 1.3	7.76%	± 6.0	1.83%[HI]	± 2.7	8.01%[EFGHI]	± 5.5
E	35 to 44	125	2.87%[GHI]	± 2.6	5.86%	± 4.8	0.35%[GHI]	± .5	19.27%[FGHI]	± 8.8
F	45 to 54	137	7.49%[H]	± 5.5	10.41%	± 7.0	4.73%[HI]	± 4.4	37.49%[HI]	± 11.6
G	55 to 64	92	9.22%[H]	± 5.5	4.05%	± 4.1	7.94%[HI]	± 5.4	48.30%	± 12.4
H	65 to 74	255	16.80%	± 4.9	8.07%	± 4.0	16.39%	± 6.2	52.69%	± 7.9
I	75 +	165	14.58%	± 7.4	11.63%	± 7.6	26.64%	± 9.0	59.00%	± 8.9
	Race									
J	White	927	6.17%	± 1.7	7.41%	± 2.3	5.81%	± 1.6	29.45%	± 4.2
K	Other	64	6.15%	± 5.7	14.30%	± 12.0	7.17%	± 7.8	25.41%	± 13.5
	Education									
L	Less than HS	98	8.13%	± 6.3	9.82%	± 9.6	17.09%	± 11.8	41.88%[O]	± 14.3
M	HS Graduate	373	7.89%	± 3.0	7.46%	± 3.5	4.68%	± 2.0	31.8%[O]	± 7.3
N	Some College	301	5.43%	± 2.4	8.65%	± 4.5	6.47%	± 3.2	31.7%[O]	± 7.3
O	College Graduate	224	4.20%	± 3.1	7.22%	± 4.5	3.69%	± 2.0	18.16%	± 6.5
	Income									
P	Less than $10,000	22	12.63%	± 14.2	7.48%	± 9.5	2.46%[QR]	± 2.8	52.01%	± 32.8
Q	$10,000-$19,999	111	11.45%[T]	± 6.8	11.77%	± 9.3	16.59%[ST]	± 8.5	39.05%[T]	± 12.8
R	$20,000-$34,999	213	9.98%[T]	± 4.8	6.05%	± 4.2	9.65%[ST]	± 4.4	33.49%[T]	± 9.3
S	$35,000-$49,999	168	6.57%	± 4.0	10.01%	± 6.4	2.22%	± 2.8	30.91%[T]	± 9.2
T	$50,000 or more	283	2.95%	± 1.8	5.45%	± 3.4	2.86%	± 2.3	19.14%	± 5.9

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 9a: Percentage of Respondents Who Have had Heart Attack, Angina and Stroke in Past Year, by demographic characteristic

	Characteristics	N	Had heart attack	95% CI	N	Had Angina	95% CI	N	Had Stroke	95% CI
	Overall	998	1.8	± .8	999	3.9	± 1.3	1002	1.6	± 1.0
	Gender									
A	Male	572	2.4	± 1.4	572	3.3	± 1.4	573	.9	± .6
B	Female	426	1.2	± 1.0	427	4.4	± 2.1	429	2.3	± 1.9
	Age									
C	18 to 24	118	0	.	118	.5	± .7	118	.2	± .4
D	25 to 34	98	0	.	98	0	.	98	1.8	± 2.7
E	35 to 44	125	0	.	124	0	.	125	.4	± .5
F	45 to 54	137	1.5	± 1.7	137	3.7	± 3.9	137	3.1	± 3.5
G	55 to 64	91	3.8	± 3.8	90	5.9	± 4.7	92	.1	± .2
H	65 to 74	255	5.3	± 3.3	256	12.0	± 5.9	255	3.1	± 2.0
I	75 +	164	6.7	± 6.6	166	16.9	± 7.2	167	4.5	± 3.7
	Race									
J	White	925	1.9	± .9	926	4.1	± 1.4	929	1.3	± .8
K	Other	64	.3	± .5	64	1.4	± 1.7	64	6.1	± 7.1
	Education									
L	Less than HS	99	4.2	± 5.1	97	11.0	± 10.7	99	6.1	± 7.2
M	HS Graduate	370	2.2	± 1.4	373	3.0	± 1.6	373	1.4	± 1.1
N	Some College	301	1.0	± 1.0	300	4.3	± 2.1	301	1.7	± 1.9
O	College Graduate	224	1.4	± 1.4	225	2.6	± 1.8	225	.6	± .7
	Income									
P	Less than $10,000	23	.9	± 1.4	23	.9	± 1.4	23	2.5	± 2.8
Q	$10,000-$19,999	111	6.9	± 6.3	109	10.4	± 6.1	112	1.7	± 1.9
R	$20,000-$34,999	209	2.6	± 2.2	213	6.9	± 3.8	212	2.6	± 2.1
S	$35,000-$49,999	168	.2	± .3	167	.2	± .2	168	1.9	± 2.6
T	$50,000 or more	284	.8	± .9	284	2.5	± 2.2	284	1.4	± 1.6

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 10: Percentage of Respondents Who Report Having Other Health Limitations, by Demographic Characteristics					
	Characteristics	N	**Yes**	No	95% CI
	Overall	1000	17.81%	82.19%	± 3.5
	Gender				
A	Male	573	14.84%	85.16%	± 3.5
B	Female	427	20.57%	79.43%	± 5.8
	Age				
C	18 to 24	118	5.82%^{EFGHI}	94.18%	± 5.0
D	25 to 34	98	9.84%^{FHI}	90.16%	± 7.3
E	35 to 44	125	18.95%	81.05%	± 8.9
F	45 to 54	137	22.12%	77.88%	± 9.3
G	55 to 64	92	22.10%	77.90%	± 9.9
H	65 to 74	255	21.80%	78.20%	± 6.6
I	75 +	165	28.16%	71.84%	± 9.3
	Race				
J	White	927	18.59%	81.41%	± 3.7
K	Other	64	10.06%	89.94%	± 7.9
	Education				
L	Less than HS	99	30.26%	69.74%	± 13.8
M	HS Graduate	374	17.27%	82.73%	± 5.8
N	Some College	299	20.27%	79.73%	± 6.5
O	College Graduate	225	11.87%	88.13%	± 5.9
	Income				
P	Less than $10,000	23	53.99%ST	46.01%	± 33.0
Q	$10,000-$19,999	112	25.64%^{T}	74.36%	± 11.8
R	$20,000-$34,999	213	23.45%^{T}	76.55%	± 9.1
S	$35,000-$49,999	168	14.74%	85.26%	± 6.9
T	$50,000 or more	284	9.34%	90.66%	± 4.5

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

	Characteristics	N	Employer Provided	Government Sponsored	Self Purchased	Other	**None**	95% CI
	Table 11: Percentage Distribution of Insurance Coverage by Source, by Demographic Characteristics							
	Overall	991	64.80%	16.86%	4.72%	2.35%	11.27%	± 3.1
	Gender							
A	Male	566	69.27%	12.39%	5.70%	2.63%	10.01%	± 3.1
B	Female	425	60.67%	21.00%	3.82%	2.09%	12.43%	± 5.1
	Age							
C	18 to 24	113	60.27%	2.46%	3.65%	0.50%	33.11%^{EFGHI}	± 15.2
D	25 to 34	98	71.31%	3.61%	2.61%	0.91%	21.55%^{EFGHI}	± 9.8
E	35 to 44	124	81.20%	6.00%	4.21%	1.79%	6.81%^{H}	± 4.4
F	45 to 54	136	76.27%	11.11%	2.00%	2.81%	7.82%^{H}	± 5.3
G	55 to 64	92	74.46%	7.18%	6.88%	5.73%	5.75%	± 5.8
H	65 to 74	254	20.24%	66.20%	11.05%	1.95%	0.56%	± .7
I	75 +	163	20.71%	65.47%	7.15%	3.79%	2.89%	± 2.8
	Race							
J	White	918	65.88%	17.54%	4.59%	2.50%	9.49%^{K}	± 2.7
K	Other	64	54.43%	9.07%	6.25%	0.89%	29.36%	± 18.6
	Education							
L	Less than HS	98	38.15%	34.87%	8.39%	1.97%	16.62%^{O}	± 10.5
M	HS Graduate	369	59.48%	18.62%	5.72%	3.11%	13.08%^{O}	± 6.0
N	Some College	297	64.80%	16.24%	3.77%	0.69%	14.5%^{O}	± 6.0
O	College Graduate	224	80.08%	9.96%	3.35%	3.42%	3.18%	± 2.3
	Income							
P	Less than $10,000	23	9.09%	36.03%	.	0.78%	54.09%^{QRST}	± 31.6
Q	$10,000-$19,999	112	26.19%	44.09%	8.25%	6.44%	15.03%	± 13.3
R	$20,000-$34,999	211	48.59%	27.29%	4.77%	3.48%	15.87%ST	± 7.1
S	$35,000-$49,999	166	71.38%	9.51%	6.34%	2.21%	10.55%	± 5.9
T	$50,000 or more	279	88.46%	3.40%	3.03%	1.23%	3.89%	± 2.7

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 12: Percentage of Respondents Who Have Had Medical Check-up in Past Year; Were Asked About Mental Health at Last Check-up; Have Untreated Health Problems; Had Dental Check-up in Past Year, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Had Medical Check-Up in Past Year	95% CI	Asked About Mental Health at Last Check-up	Has Untreated Health Problems	Had Dental Check-Up in Past Year	95% CI
	Overall	986	75.91%	± 3.9	35.75%	16.13%	78.76%	± 3.5
	Gender							
A	Male	562	68.4%[B]	± 5.1	31.11%[B]	14.03%	74.93%[B]	± 4.6
B	Female	424	82.87%	± 5.7	39.95%	18.07%	82.31%	± 5.1
	Age							
C	18 to 24	113	64.19%[GHI]	± 15.7	34.51%	13.09%	82.78%[I]	± 9.5
D	25 to 34	93	60.33%[GHI]	± 11.1	40.57%	20.37%[GHI]	71.21%[F]	± 10.8
E	35 to 44	123	72.61%[GHI]	± 8.3	41.75%	20.51%[GHI]	82.98%[I]	± 7.1
F	45 to 54	136	74.26%[GHI]	± 8.9	35.17%	24.78%[GHI]	84.38%[I]	± 7.0
G	55 to 64	91	88.93%	± 7.7	31.73%	6.17%	79.20%	± 9.6
H	65 to 74	254	95.72%	± 2.4	27.97%	5.36%	77.00%	± 7.0
I	75 +	165	94.30%	± 2.9	24.89%	8.77%	66.58%	± 9.3
	Race							
J	White	914	75.28%	± 4.0	35.21%	16.10%	78.20%	± 3.6
K	Other	63	81.29%	± 16.8	42.96%	17.78%	84.91%	± 12.7
	Education							
L	Less than HS	96	80.47%	± 11.8	35.02%	22.1%[O]	69.96%[O]	± 12.9
M	HS Graduate	363	74.40%	± 7.1	36.72%	16.03%[O]	71.8%[O]	± 6.7
N	Some College	301	76.32%	± 6.6	33.01%	22.48%[O]	80.06%[O]	± 6.2
O	College Graduate	223	76.11%	± 7.4	37.97%	6.81%	89.57%	± 4.6
	Income							
P	Less than $10,000	23	52.23%	± 33.0	60.35%	53.88%[ST]	60.06%	± 29.6
Q	$10,000-$19,999	111	81.28%	± 11.9	27.83%	27.06%[T]	55.44%[RST]	± 14.5
R	$20,000-$34,999	206	80.01%	± 8.2	33.31%	29.81%[ST]	72.55%[T]	± 8.6
S	$35,000-$49,999	167	77.07%	± 8.2	35.67%	11.16%	82.96%	± 6.7
T	$50,000 or more	279	72.17%	± 6.6	39.93%	6.28%	87.30%	± 4.8

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

New Table 13: Percentage of Females Age 40 Years or Older Who Have Ever Had A Mammogram; Had Appropriately Timed Mammogram, Had Mammogram in Past 2 years; by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Ever Had Mammogram	95% CI	Had Appropriately Timed Mammogram	95% CI	Had Mammogram in Past 2 Years
	Overall	353	92.48%	± 5.0	65.22%	± 8.5	80.37%
	Gender						
A	Male	0	.		.		.
B	Female	353	92.48%	± 5.0	65.22%	± 8.5	80.37%
	Age						
C	40 to 49	42	90.43%	± 10.3	72.60%	± 14.6	84.22%
D	50 to 59	30	90.38%	± 11.3	51.92%	± 21.0	71.15%
E	60 to 69	89	95.93%	± 4.6	67.16%	± 16.3	81.21%
F	70 to 79	135	97.50%	± 2.7	73.10%	± 9.4	87.81%
G	80 +	57	88.23%	± 12.0	67.03%	± 15.1	77.13%
	Race						
I	White	340	92.11%[J]	± 5.3	64.02%[J]	± 8.7	79.83%
J	Other	12	100.00%	± 0	93.59%	± 7.2	95.56%
	Education						
K	Less than HS	41	99.14%[L]	± 1.3	57.07%	± 25.1	83.36%
L	HS Graduate	176	88.06%[N]	± 9.2	58.23%	± 13.1	70.49%
M	Some College	90	93.53%	± 7.4	72.13%	± 13.5	87.64%
N	College Graduate	45	100.00%	± 0	78.52%	± 17.1	95.28%
	Income						
O	Less than $10,000	12	69.06%	± 38.3	23.87%[PQRS]	± 25.2	46.87%
P	$10,000-$19,999	72	97.44%	± 2.6	63.71%	± 17.6	79.09%
Q	$20,000-$34,999	86	91.80%	± 10.3	65.13%	± 17.3	86.49%
R	$35,000-$49,999	49	90.73%	± 9.9	70.63%	± 16.8	77.44%
S	$50,000 or more	37	99.62%	± .6	82.69%	± 13.7	94.60%

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

New Table 14: Percentage of Females 20-39 Years Old Who Have Ever Had Clinical Breast Exam (CBE); Had CBE in Past Year; Had CBE in Past Three Years, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	**Ever Had CBE**	**95% CI**	Had CBE in Past Year	95% CI	**Had CBE in Past Three Years**	95% CI
	Overall	68	89.56%	± 10.3	67.45%	± 13.2	87.71%	± 10.7
	Gender							
A	Male	0	.		.		.	
B	Female	68	89.56%	± 10.3	67.45%	± 13.2	87.71%	± 10.7
	Age							
C	20 to 29	27	82.22%	± 18.6	48.11%	± 21.3	82.22%	± 18.6
D	30 to 39	41	95.12%	± 7.2	82.11%	± 13.9	91.87%	± 9.6
	Race							
F	White	55	95.12%	± 6.0	70.52%	± 13.8	92.77%	± 7.8
G	Other	12	67.74%	± 33.5	58.70%	± 34.0	67.74%	± 33.5
	Education							
H	Less than HS	5	59.14%	± 47.6	44.36%	± 46.3	59.14%	± 47.6
I	HS Graduate	17	85.60%	± 20.1	64.76%	± 28.8	85.60%	± 20.1
J	Some College	25	89.33%	± 12.9	62.18%	± 20.1	84.46%	± 16.3
K	College Graduate	21	100.00%	± 0	81.72%	± 19.1	100.00%	± 0
	Income							
L	Less than $10,000	2	19.44%[NOP]	± 32.0	19.44%	± 32.0	19.44%[NOP]	± 32.0
M	$10,000-$19,999	6	70.43%	± 37.8	50.71%	± 44.3	70.43%	± 37.8
N	$20,000-$34,999	17	88.62%	± 16.2	69.01%	± 26.9	88.62%	± 16.2
O	$35,000-$49,999	16	93.51%	± 9.6	57.05%	± 26.9	93.51%	± 9.6
P	$50,000 or more	23	100.00%	± 0	84.00%	± 15.4	94.99%	± 7.4

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

New Table 15: Percentage of Females 40 Years Old or Older Who Have Ever Had Clinical Breast Exam (CBE); Had Appropriately Timed CBE; Had Appropriate Breast Screening, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Ever Had CBE	95% CI	Had Appropriately Timed CBE	95% CI	Had Appropriate Breast Screening	95% CI
	Overall	350	90.48%	± 6.3	72.08%	± 7.7	58.93%	± 8.5
	Gender							
A	Male	0	.		.		.	
B	Female	350	90.48%	± 6.3	72.08%	± 7.7	58.93%	± 8.5
	Age							
C	40 to 49	42	98.45%^{G}	± 2.3	83.85%^{G}	± 10.7	72.6%^{G}	± 14.6
D	50 to 59	30	80.77%	± 20.3	67.31%	± 21.7	48.08%	± 20.1
E	60 to 69	89	94.76%^{G}	± 6.0	68.73%	± 15.1	54.42%	± 16.4
F	70 to 79	132	95.17%^{G}	± 3.1	71.11%^{G}	± 9.7	63.99%^{G}	± 10.5
G	80 +	57	68.00%	± 13.9	48.19%	± 15.4	38.42%	± 14.9
	Race							
H	White	337	90.05%^{I}	± 6.6	71.22%^{I}	± 8.1	57.65%^{I}	± 8.8
I	Other	12	99.18%	± 1.3	88.89%	± 12.3	88.89%	± 12.3
	Education							
J	Less than HS	40	90.61%	± 9.3	55.98%	± 24.5	43.00%	± 25.0
K	HS Graduate	174	85.55%	± 12.2	66.92%	± 12.9	52.84%	± 12.9
L	Some College	90	96.12%	± 2.9	79.48%	± 10.2	65.97%	± 14.2
M	College Graduate	45	95.33%	± 6.1	82.87%	± 14.8	73.32%	± 18.1
	Income							
N	Less than $10,000	12	98.45%	± 2.4	48.81%	± 41.8	17.87%^{OPQR}	± 20.7
O	$10,000-$19,999	71	91.06%	± 5.7	65.14%	± 17.2	53.59%	± 17.7
P	$20,000-$34,999	84	93.77%	± 6.3	72.56%	± 14.0	55.82%	± 18.1
Q	$35,000-$49,999	49	92.18%	± 8.8	74.78%	± 16.4	70.22%	± 16.8
R	$50,000 or more	37	94.60%	± 7.5	85.40%	± 12.7	77.67%	± 16.0

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 16: Percentage of Women Who Have Ever Done Breast Self-Examination; How often; by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Ever Done Self Breast Exam	95% CI	BSE Once Per Month	95% CI	BSE Every 2-3 Months	95% CI
	Overall	418	78.72%	± 6.5	69.64%	± 7.0	18.66%	± 6.1
	Gender							
A	Male	0	.	.	.		.	
B	Female	418	78.72%	± 6.5	69.64%	± 7.0	18.66%	± 6.1
	Age							
C	18 to 24	15	42.86%[DEFGHI]	± 26.5	55.56%	± 35.5	44.44%	± 35.5
D	25 to 34	39	75.47%[E]	± 14.6	69.34%	± 17.8	17.65%	± 14.7
E	35 to 44	39	93.28%[GI]	± 7.3	73.87%	± 14.6	19.82%	± 12.9
F	45 to 54	31	83.84%	± 18.7	63.86%	± 20.4	24.10%	± 19.5
G	55 to 64	33	75.09%	± 16	66.83%	± 19.7	13.82%	± 14.5
H	65 to 74	151	85.96%	± 6.1	72.63%	± 9.7	14.88%	± 7.5
I	75 +	106	79.35%	± 9.7	80.30%	± 8.3	3.28%	± 3.2
	Race							
J	White	390	81.53%	± 6.3	69.83%	± 7.2	17.81%	± 6.1
K	Other	26	58.53%	± 25.6	68.91%	± 28.1	26.37%	± 27.2
	Education							
L	Less than HS	45	79.66%	± 21.3	69.32%	± 24.1	7.71%	± 8.5
M	HS Graduate	192	71.85%	± 11.7	71.65%	± 10.7	18.31%	± 9.9
N	Some College	112	83.64%	± 9.3	64.36%	± 13.6	23.19%	± 12.1
O	College Graduate	67	84.42%	± 12.1	74.39%	± 13.4	16.30%	± 12.0
	Income							
P	Less than $10,000	15	69.96%	± 36.7	79.30%	± 23.5	10.02%	± 14.7
Q	$10,000-$19,999	77	74.11%	± 18.0	75.52%	± 15.8	21.02%	± 15.6
R	$20,000-$34,999	102	76.54%	± 13.5	62.98%	± 15.9	21.44%	± 13.8
S	$35,000-$49,999	64	79.02%	± 12.6	73.40%	± 14.1	13.96%	± 11.3
T	$50,000 or more	60	89.60%	± 8.3	66.89%	± 15.0	21.88%	± 13.6

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

	Characteristics	N	**Appropriately Timed Last Pap Test**	**95% CI**	Too Long Since Last Pap Test
	Overall	410	87.05%	± 5.1	12.95%
	Gender				
A	Male	0	.		.
B	Female	410	87.05%	± 5.1	12.95%
	Age				
C	18 to 24	14	100%[FGHI]	± 0	.
D	25 to 34	39	100%[FGHI]	± 0	.
E	35 to 44	38	100%[FGHI]	± 0	.
F	45 to 54	31	70.71%	± 22.0	29.29%
G	55 to 64	33	75.09%	± 17.5	24.91%
H	65 to 74	148	80.53%	± 7.9	19.47%
I	75 +	103	71.24%	± 10.8	28.76%
	Race				
J	White	385	85.71%[K]	± 5.7	14.29%
K	Other	24	98.24%	± 2.3	1.76%
	Education				
L	Less than HS	46	82.36%	± 16.7	17.64%
M	HS Graduate	187	75.34%[NO]	± 11.1	24.66%
N	Some College	111	96.42%	± 2.5	3.58%
O	College Graduate	66	96.75%	± 3.3	3.25%
	Income				
P	Less than $10,000	14	82.62%	± 21.5	17.38%
Q	$10,000-$19,999	77	80.53%	± 12.9	19.47%
R	$20,000-$34,999	97	88.88%	± 8.8	11.12%
S	$35,000-$49,999	64	86.29%	± 10.6	13.71%
T	$50,000 or more	59	94.38%	± 6.2	5.62%

Table 17: Percentage of Women Who Had Appropriately Timed Last Pap Test, by Demographic Characteristics

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

x

Table 18: Percentage of Males Who Have Ever Had PSA Test; Ever Had DRE; Had DRE in Past Year, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Ever Had PSA Test	95% CI	N	Ever Had DRE	95% CI	Had DRE Past Year (If Ever Had)	95% CI
	Overall	330	61.57%	± 6.9	262	83.93%	± 5.9	64.08%	± 7.8
	Gender								
A	Male	330	61.57%	± 6..9	262	83.93%	± 5.9	64.08%	± 7.8
	Age								
B	40 to 44	35	33.66%^{DEF}	± 16.8	0	.		.	
C	45 to 54	98	53.02%^{DEF}	± 11.4	52*	81.95%	± 13.9	54.03%	± 16.8
D	55 to 64	55	75.05%	± 13.0	57	83.22%	± 11.3	73.51%	± 13.6
E	65 to 74	90	88.45%	± 7.3	100	81.30%	± 9.2	64.00%	± 12.5
F	75 +	52	89.54%	± 9.5	53	93.43%	± 5.9	63.23%	± 18.4
	Race								
G	White	311	62.44%	± 7.0	246	84.44%	± 6.0	65.32%	± 7.9
H	Other	15	42.31%	± 33.3	13	80.97%	± 22.4	38.71%	± 35.4
	Education								
I	Less than HS	32	60.48%	± 23.1	32	80.94%	± 18.9	41.91%	± 21.2
J	HS Graduate	92	58.59%	± 12.9	76	76.76%^{L}	± 11.2	68.74%	± 15.1
K	Some College	102	60.83%	± 12.8	84	81.70%	± 12.3	62.20%	± 13.4
L	College Graduate	103	64.47%	± 11.8	69	95.89%	± 4.4	70.28%	± 13.3
	Income								
M	Less than $10,000	5	10.46%^{NOPQ}	± 15.7	2	63.18%	± 50.0	.^{NOPQ}	
N	$10,000-$19,999	25	64.40%	± 22.0	23	84.81%	± 13.0	20.94%^{OPQ}	± 20.4
O	$20,000-$34,999	64	63.15%	± 15.4	63	85.60%	± 9.8	63.85%	± 15.0
P	$35,000-$49,999	61	70.44%	± 15.2	48	87.62%	± 11.4	61.27%	± 18.1
Q	$50,000 or more	113	57.47%	± 11.1	71	82.33%	± 12.6	70.04%	± 13.7

*asked of men age 50 and older

Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 19: Percentage of Respondents 50 Years of Age or Older Who Have Ever Had Blood Stool Test; Had Blood Stool Test in Past Year; Ever Had Proctoscopic Exam, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Ever Had Home Blood Stool Test	95% CI	Had Blood Stool Test in Past Year	95% CI	Ever Had Proctoscopic Exam or Sigmoidoscopy	95% CI
	Overall	574	54.40%	± 6.2	50.78%	± 9.1	49.30%	± 6.3
	Gender							
A	Male	267	50.39%	± 7.3	51.04%	± 10.6	53.55%	± 7.4
B	Female	307	57.42%	± 9.4	50.62%	± 13.3	46.10%	± 9.4
	Age							
C	50 to 54	65	43.20%	± 18.3	38.57%	± 28.4	30.24%^{EF}	± 14.0
D	55 to 64	92	54.38%	± 12.3	49.57%	± 17.6	46.64%^{F}	± 12.5
E	65 to 74	255	59.05%	± 7.7	57.05%	± 10.4	58.65%	± 8.0
F	75 +	162	61.31%	± 8.9	53.81%	± 13.3	63.96%	± 9.0
	Race							
G	White	546	55.15%	± 6.4	50.64%	± 9.3	49.02%	± 6.5
H	Other	23	40.93%	± 26.5	51.81%	± 42.8	59.53%	± 26.6
	Education							
I	Less than HS	74	56.40%	± 16.3	48.22%	± 23.8	59.82%	± 16.5
J	HS Graduate	237	52.54%	± 10.5	51.87%	± 16.1	41.94%	± 9.9
K	Some College	155	50.74%	± 11.0	41.92%	± 13.8	48.87%	± 11.0
L	College Graduate	106	61.44%	± 13.0	59.11%	± 18.7	59.04%	± 13.7
	Income							
M	Less than $10,000	12	0%^{NOPQ}	.	0%	.	66.56%	± 34.5
N	$10,000-$19,999	90	60.91%	± 13.6	45.75%	± 20.0	53.12%	± 14.6
O	$20,000-$34,999	143	50.66%	± 12.4	57.76%	± 17.0	50.59%	± 12.6
P	$35,000-$49,999	83	51.01%	± 14.5	58.22%	± 18.2	50.03%	± 14.4
Q	$50,000 or more	95	53.48%	± 13.9	46.29%	± 18.9	46.64%	± 13.8

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 20: Percentage of All Respondents Who Had Influenza Shot in Past Year;
Ever Had Pneumonia Vaccination, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Had Flu Shot Past Year	95% CI	Ever Had Pneumonia Shot	95% CI
	Overall	1000	27.29%	± 3.4	17.97%	± 2.7
	Gender					
A	Male	571	27.60%	± 4.3	16.65%	± 3.4
B	Female	429	27.00%	± 5.3	19.19%	± 4.2
	Age					
C	18 to 24	116	9.04%^{FGHI}	± 5.8	17.07%^{DEHI}	± 12.4
D	25 to 34	98	9.02%^{FGHI}	± 5.8	2.95%^{FGHI}	± 2.9
E	35 to 44	125	14.37%^{FGHI}	± 7.0	3.45%^{GHI}	± 3.4
F	45 to 54	137	27.16%^{HI}	± 9.2	9.91%^{HI}	± 5.6
G	55 to 64	92	34.42%^{HI}	± 11.2	12.97%^{HI}	± 6.7
H	65 to 74	255	66.97%	± 7.6	63.76%	± 7.7
I	75 +	166	72.34%	± 8.4	65.06%	± 9.1
	Race					
J	White	928	28.16%	± 3.6	17.85%	± 2.7
K	Other	64	17.87%	± 10.4	18.18%	± 14.1
	Education					
L	Less than HS	97	40.57%	± 13.8	30.53%^{NO}	± 12.6
M	HS Graduate	373	26.55%	± 5.6	23.18%^{NO}	± 5.4
N	Some College	301	26.58%	± 6.2	14.40%	± 3.9
O	College Graduate	225	25.37%	± 6.9	11.58%	± 4.3
	Income					
P	Less than $10,000	23	15.23%	± 14.6	25.54%	± 22.6
Q	$10,000-$19,999	112	33.67%^{T}	± 11.6	35.66%ST	± 12.9
R	$20,000-$34,999	213	26.26%	± 7.0	25.65%ST	± 7.8
S	$35,000-$49,999	168	31.45%^{T}	± 8.9	13.75%^{T}	± 5.3
T	$50,000 or more	282	19.03%	± 5.2	6.63%	± 2.6

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 20a: Percentage of Respondents 65 Years or Older Who Have Had Flu Shot in Past Year; Ever Had Pneomonia Shot, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Had Flu Shot Past Year	95% CI	Ever Had Pneumonia Shot	95% CI
	Overall	421	69.02%	± 5.8	64.26%	± 5.9
	Gender					
A	Male	154	74.49%	± 8.1	57.90%	± 9.8
B	Female	267	65.59%	± 7.7	68.18%	± 7.3
	Age					
C	65 to 74	255	66.97%	± 7.7	63.76%	± 7.7
D	75 +	166	72.34%	± 8.4	65.06%	± 9.2
	Race					
E	White	404	68.93%	± 5.9	64.33%	± 6.0
F	Other	14	74.98%	± 28.7	56.60%	± 34.3
	Education					
G	Less than HS	61	62.15%	± 17.7	64.63%	± 15.8
H	HS Graduate	185	70.34%	± 7.9	65.81%	± 8.5
I	Some College	109	76.75%	± 9.2	64.46%	± 11.0
J	College Graduate	64	61.22%	± 16.0	59.74%	± 16.7
	Income					
K	Less than $10,000	8	91.58%	± 12.5	83.15%	± 20.0
L	$10,000-$19,999	82	68.24%	± 11.8	62.79%	± 13.7
M	$20,000-$34,999	116	67.98%	± 11.9	63.42%	± 11.5
N	$35,000-$49,999	50	62.66%	± 17.6	51.06%	± 17.7
O	$50,000 or more	34	67.20%	± 23.9	78.23%	± 16.3

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

	Characteristics	N	Underweight	Acceptable Range	**Overweight**	**95% CI**
	Table 21: Percentage Distribution of Weight Status, by Demographic Characteristics					
	Overall	959	5.89%	56.35%	37.76%	± 4.3
	Gender					
A	Male	564	5.19%	51.48%	43.34%[B]	± 5.1
B	Female	395	6.60%	61.22%	32.18%	± 6.8
	Age					
C	18 to 24	116	10.64%	70.44%	18.92%[DEFGH]	± 11.5
D	25 to 34	93	10.10%	52.18%	37.72%	± 11.2
E	35 to 44	121	2.62%	53.63%	43.75%[I]	± 10.1
F	45 to 54	132	5.40%	54.60%	40.00%	± 10.6
G	55 to 64	88	2.28%	58.52%	39.20%	± 12.1
H	65 to 74	239	4.84%	51.90%	43.26%[I]	± 8.1
I	75 +	160	7.79%	63.31%	28.90%	± 8.7
	Race					
J	White	889	6.18%	55.74%	38.08%	± 4.5
K	Other	61	0.35%	65.03%	34.62%	± 16.0
	Education					
L	Less than HS	95	15.99%	40.22%	43.79%	± 14.8
M	HS Graduate	361	6.57%	56.37%	37.06%	± 7.2
N	Some College	283	4.43%	57.02%	38.55%	± 8.1
O	College Graduate	218	3.68%	60.12%	36.20%	± 8.1
	Income					
P	Less than $10,000	21	16.62%	43.96%	39.41%	± 30.7
Q	$10,000-$19,999	108	2.92%	57.86%	39.22%	± 14.3
R	$20,000-$34,999	210	8.07%	52.43%	39.50%	± 9.8
S	$35,000-$49,999	160	3.40%	60.62%	35.98%	± 9.2
T	$50,000 or more	278	4.63%	54.62%	40.76%	± 7.4

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

	Characteristics	N	**No Activity**	95% CI	Sedentary	95% CI	**Not Regular Sustained**	95% CI
	Overall	1003	15.83%	± 3.2	53.47%	± 4.6	78.68%	± 3.7
	Gender							
A	Male	575	12.21%[B]	± 3.2	51.11%	± 5.4	78.19%	± 4.5
B	Female	428	19.18%	± 5.3	55.70%	± 7.4	79.14%	± 5.8
	Age							
C	18 to 24	118	4.44%[EFGHI]	± 3.4	30.15%[EFGHI]	± 13.5	67.32%[EG]	± 15.3
D	25 to 34	98	9.1%[GHI]	± 6.4	40.7%[EGHI]	± 11.8	73.25%[G]	± 11.1
E	35 to 44	125	13.81%[I]	± 8.0	59.06%[G]	± 10.0	85.41%[HI]	± 6.5
F	45 to 54	137	19.44%	± 8.8	52.89%[G]	± 10.9	77.74%[G]	± 8.8
G	55 to 64	92	21.55%	± 9.9	74.93%[HI]	± 11.5	91.84%[HI]	± 6.9
H	65 to 74	256	22.04%	± 6.9	57.38%	± 8.0	74.56%	± 6.6
I	75 +	166	28.85%	± 8.1	59.43%	± 9.4	71.80%	± 8.0
	Race							
J	White	930	14.76%	± 3.1	53.44%	± 4.7	78.63%	± 3.8
K	Other	64	28.48%	± 16.1	57.25%	± 19.6	82.59%	± 14.4
	Education							
L	Less than HS	99	23.64%[O]	± 11.3	66.37%[NO]	± 14.1	75.41%	± 13.0
M	HS Graduate	373	23.18%[O]	± 6.2	61.22%[NO]	± 7.8	80.22%	± 6.3
N	Some College	302	15.17%[O]	± 6.1	49.36%	± 8.4	78.19%	± 6.8
O	College Graduate	225	3.93%	± 2.5	44.60%	± 8.7	78.01%	± 7.0
	Income							
P	Less than $10,000	23	21.90%	± 20.0	61.69%	± 37.8	96.81%[QRST]	± 4.8
Q	$10,000-$19,999	111	30.93%[ST]	± 12.7	61.44%[T]	± 15.1	75.34%	± 14.4
R	$20,000-$34,999	213	27.96%[T]	± 9.7	74.38%[ST]	± 8.4	85.55%	± 7.0
S	$35,000-$49,999	168	15.84%[T]	± 7.6	54.61%[T]	± 10.3	78.57%	± 7.8
T	$50,000 or more	284	4.23%	± 2.6	40.84%	± 7.7	77.23%	± 6.5

Table 22: Percentage Who Engaged in No Physical Exercise in Past Month; Were Sedentary; Were Regular Sustained Exercisers, by Demographic Characteristics

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 23: Percentage Distribution of Current Status Regarding Cigarette Smoking, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Never	Former	**Current**	95% CI	Quit Ratio
	Overall	1002	43.09%	28.50%	28.41%	± 4.0	50.07%
	Gender						
A	Male	575	40.33%	32.47%	27.20%	± 4.7	54.42%
B	Female	427	45.67%	24.78%	29.55%	± 6.5	45.61%
	Age						
C	18 to 24	118	57.84%	11.27%	30.89%[HI]	± 13.5	26.73%
D	25 to 34	98	35.23%	18.30%	46.47%[EGHI]	± 11.3	28.25%
E	35 to 44	125	52.95%	20.71%	26.34%[HI]	± 8.5	44.02%
F	45 to 54	137	31.55%	35.20%	33.25%[HI]	± 10.4	51.42%
G	55 to 64	91	36.87%	40.25%	22.89%[I]	± 10.2	63.75%
H	65 to 74	256	41.71%	44.45%	13.84%[I]	± 5.8	76.26%
I	75 +	166	52.41%	43.60%	3.99%	± 2.7	91.62%
	Race						
J	White	929	41.50%	29.34%	29.15%	± 4.2	50.16%
K	Other	64	61.47%	17.21%	21.32%	± 14.3	44.67%
	Education						
L	Less than HS	99	20.00%	38.20%	41.81%[O]	± 15.2	47.74%
M	HS Graduate	372	40.08%	27.82%	32.11%[O]	± 7.4	46.42%
N	Some College	302	41.38%	31.56%	27.07%	± 6.8	53.83%
O	College Graduate	225	56.48%	22.53%	21.00%	± 7.1	51.76%
	Income						
P	Less than $10,000	23	54.30%	3.92%	41.78%	± 31.2	8.57%
Q	$10,000-$19,999	112	43.30%	25.59%	31.12%	± 13.9	45.12%
R	$20,000-$34,999	212	39.23%	26.11%	34.66%	± 9.8	42.97%
S	$35,000-$49,999	168	41.21%	28.95%	29.85%	± 8.8	49.24%
T	$50,000 or more	284	46.02%	28.57%	25.41%	± 6.5	52.92%

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 25: Percentage of Respondents Who Use Smokeless Tobacco and Average Number of Hours Per Day Exposed to Second Hand Smoke, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Uses Smokeless Tobacco	95% CI	N Number of people exposed to Second-Hand Smoke	None	One	Two or more
	Overall	1004	2.54%	± 1.4	424	69.50%	10.44%	20.07%
	Gender							
A	Male	575	3.87%	± 2.1	211	68.32%	12.23%	19.44%
B	Female	429	1.31%	± 1.6	213	70.46%	8.96%	20.58%
	Age							
C	18 to 24	118	0.24%^{E}	± .4	62	49.32%	14.73%	35.95%^{HI}
D	25 to 34	98	4.88%	± 4.9	34	51.26%	13.18%	35.56%^{FHI}
E	35 to 44	125	5.33%^{GHI}	± 4.2	60	74.21%	11.13%	14.66%
F	45 to 54	137	1.63%	± 1.8	45	84.38%	3.84%	11.78%
G	55 to 64	92	.		29	61.99%	14.91%	23.10%
H	65 to 74	256	0.51%	± .6	102	81.24%	8.43%	10.33%
I	75 +	167	0.64%	± .9	86	91.56%	2.74%	5.70%
	Race							
J	White	931	2.42%	± 1.4	390	73.15%	10.90%	15.95%^{K}
K	Other	64	4.10%	± 6.0	32	45.27%	4.31%	50.42%
	Education							
L	Less than HS	99	3.57%	± 4.9	28	84.11%	14.26%	1.62%^{MNO}
M	HS Graduate	374	1.07%	± 1.2	161	63.78%	10.49%	25.73%^{O}
N	Some College	302	2.09%	± 2.3	119	62.52%	11.67%	25.81%^{O}
O	College Graduate	225	4.89%	± 3.8	116	79.94%	8.87%	11.19%
	Income							
P	Less than $10,000	23	.^{T}		12	34.25%	10.32%	55.44%
Q	$10,000-$19,999	112	0.32%^{T}	± .5	53	62.43%	2.03%	35.54%
R	$20,000-$34,999	213	3.19%	± 3.7	75	67.96%	3.90%	28.14%
S	$35,000-$49,999	168	2.50%	± 2.6	61	75.32%	11.28%	13.40%
T	$50,000 or more	284	3.46%	± 2.7	130	69.64%	14.15%	16.21%

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

	Table 26: Percentage Distribution of Current Drinking Status, by Demographic Characteristics						
	Characteristics	N	Abstainer	Light	Moderate	**Heavy**	95% CI
	Overall	991	37.79%	28.62%	25.10%	8.48%	± 2.4
	Gender						
A	Male	563	30.00%	26.25%	30.20%	13.55%[B]	± 3.8
B	Female	428	44.93%	30.80%	20.43%	3.84%	± 2.8
	Age						
C	18 to 24	114	25.01%	26.96%	37.21%	10.82%	± 7.0
D	25 to 34	98	29.74%	28.05%	34.41%	7.80%	± 5.6
E	35 to 44	125	32.34%	28.77%	28.72%	10.17%	± 5.9
F	45 to 54	135	34.74%	29.83%	24.77%	10.66%	± 7.2
G	55 to 64	91	46.09%	38.09%	10.83%	4.98%	± 3.8
H	65 to 74	250	55.59%	24.58%	14.26%	5.58%	± 3.4
I	75 +	166	60.85%	17.29%	14.44%	7.42%	± 5.6
	Race						
J	White	918	36.42%	29.57%	25.54%	8.47%	± 2.5
K	Other	64	54.18%	17.25%	19.59%	8.97%	± 9.0
	Education						
L	Less than HS	99	53.30%	23.83%	4.96%	17.91%	± 11.3
M	HS Graduate	367	44.19%	21.71%	24.78%	9.31%	± 4.5
N	Some College	295	37.70%	28.83%	26.66%	6.81%	± 3.1
O	College Graduate	225	24.17%	39.77%	29.90%	6.15%	± 4.2
	Income						
P	Less than $10,000	23	43.34%	14.08%	24.78%	17.80%	± 22.6
Q	$10,000-$19,999	111	52.18%	27.38%	14.48%	5.97%	± 6.2
R	$20,000-$34,999	211	52.11%	21.84%	16.12%	9.93%	± 5.5
S	$35,000-$49,999	165	37.89%	27.66%	26.77%	7.68%	± 4.8
T	$50,000 or more	280	23.32%	34.18%	32.37%	10.13%	± 4.3

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 27: Percentage of Respondents Who Drove After Having Too Much To Drink and Binge Drinking At Least Once in Past Month, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Drove After Drinking	95% CI	Binge Drinking	95% CI
	Overall	998	2.54%	± 1.4	21.01%	± 3.6
	Gender					
A	Male	570	2.87%	± 1.6	28.46%[B]	± 4.8
B	Female	428	2.22%	± 2.3	14.10%	± 5.3
	Age					
C	18 to 24	118	8.01%	± 8.7	49.91%[EFGHI]	± 15.2
D	25 to 34	97	4.66%	± 4.6	33.72%[FGHI]	± 10.4
E	35 to 44	125	1.96%	± 1.9	23.22%[FGHI]	± 8.1
F	45 to 54	136	1.09%	± 1.4	12.71%[I]	± 6.3
G	55 to 64	90	0.95%	± 1.2	7.95%	± 4.8
H	65 to 74	254	0.51%	± .6	6.68%	± 3.2
I	75 +	178	0.38%	± .6	3.34%	± 3.2
	Race					
J	White	927	2.62%	± 1.6	20.84%	± 3.7
K	Other	64	1.15%	± 1.7	19.20%	± 16.9
	Education					
L	Less than HS	98	1.28%	± 1.9	17.67%	± 11.4
M	HS Graduate	372	1.07%	± 1.1	21.76%	± 6.6
N	Some College	300	4.30%	± 3.6	22.98%	± 6.5
O	College Graduate	224	2.84%	± 3.0	18.25%	± 6.8
	Income					
P	Less than $10,000	23	.[QST]		30.66%	± 35.2
Q	$10,000-$19,999	112	.[ST]		16.61%	± 12.6
R	$20,000-$34,999	212	1.60%	± 1.9	18.79%	± 7.5
S	$35,000-$49,999	168	5.24%	± 4.5	22.06%	± 8.3
T	$50,000 or more	284	1.95%	± 1.5	23.82%	± 6.1

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

	Characteristics	N	Always	95% CI	Nearly Always	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	95% CI
	Table 28: Percentage Distribution of Seatbelt Use, by Demographic Characteristics								
	Overall	1002	85.68%	± 3.3	7.23%	2.26%	1.60%	3.20%	± 2.2
	Gender								
A	Male	575	80.79%[B]	± 4.0	8.79%	3.29%	2.56%	4.57%	± 3.0
B	Female	427	90.22%	± 5.2	5.79%	1.31%	0.70%	1.93%	± 3.3
	Age								
C	18 to 24	118	72.07%	± 14.9	11.01%	3.37%	1.22%	12.33%	± 13.3
D	25 to 34	98	90.34%	± 5.8	5.75%	1.16%	0.44%	2.31%	± 3.3
E	35 to 44	125	87.84%	± 5.8	7.05%	1.82%	1.86%	1.44%	± 3.8
F	45 to 54	137	81.67%	± 10.8	9.46%	2.44%	3.72%	2.71%	± 5.5
G	55 to 64	92	88.22%	± 6.9	4.50%	2.90%	1.46%	2.91%	± 5.8
H	65 to 74	256	88.89%	± 4.7	7.43%	1.04%	0.51%	2.13%	± 2.6
I	75 +	165	85.92%	± 7.9	5.40%	5.63%	1.13%	1.56%	± 6.8
	Race								
J	White	929	86.05%	± 3.3	7.51%	2.33%	1.60%	2.49%	± 2.0
K	Other	64	80.85%	± 16.0	4.79%	1.43%	1.70%	11.23%	± 15.0
	Education								
L	Less than HS	99	76.85%	± 11.7	5.69%	3.36%	5.54%	8.56%	± 11.0
M	HS Graduate	373	85.34%	± 6.8	7.20%	2.22%	1.91%	3.34%	± 4.8
N	Some College	302	84.79%	± 5.4	8.52%	2.41%	0.98%	3.30%	± 3.0
O	College Graduate	224	89.80%	± 4.3	6.22%	1.84%	0.74%	1.31%	± 2.6
	Income								
P	Less than $10,000	23	70.36%	± 32.6	.	5.60%	0.82%	23.22%	± 32.6
Q	$10,000-$19,999	112	83.76%	± 11.6	12.30%	3.64%	.	0.3%[R]	± 4.7
R	$20,000-$34,999	211	87.53%	± 5.5	3.99%	2.89%	1.49%	3.97%	± 4.7
S	$35,000-$49,999	168	89.67%	± 4.7	5.84%	1.45%	0.25%	2.79%	± 3.1
T	$50,000 or more	284	87.50%	± 4.4	4.50%	2.30%	3.29%	2.41%	± 3.7

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 30: Condom Use; Perceived Chance of HIV Infection; STD Treatment; Other Risk Behaviors; and Changed Sexual Behavior by Demographic Characteristics

Characteristics	N	Overall	Number of Sexual Partners in Past Year	
			1 to 15	16 or more
Used Condom During Last Intercourse	508	21.25%	21.13%	.12%
Perceived Chance of Getting HIV/AIDs	515			
High		0.8%	0.80%	0%
Medium		1.14%	1.14%	0%
Low		13.03%	12.91%	0.12%
None		85.03%	83.87%	1.16%
Treated for STD in Past Year	514	1.48%	1.48%	0%
Engaged in Other HIV Risk Behavior	515	3.61%	3.57%	0.04%
Knowledge of HIV Changed Sexual Behavior in Past Year	511	7.52	7.46	0.06

Table 32: Comparison of Prevalence Rates for Selected Risk Factors Between Macomb County (2002) and Michigan (2000)

	% of Population		
Type	Michigan	Macomb County	Difference
Safety Belt Non-Use	28.0% +/- 2.0 (1997)	14.3% +/- 3.3	**13.7**
Overweight	37.1% +/- 2.1	37.8% +/- 4.3	0.7
No Leisure Activity	23.3% +/- 1.8	15.38% +/- 3.2	**7.92**
Smoke	24.0% +/- 1.8	28.4% +/- 4.0	4.4
High Blood Pressure (of those ever checked)	25.5% +/-1.8 (1999)	28.6% +/- 3.9	3.1
High Cholesterol	32.1% +/- 2.3 (1999)	32.44% +/- 4.2	0.34
Alcohol Consumption			
Heavy Drinker	5.3% +/- 1.0 (1999)	8.5% +/- 2.4%	3.2
Binge Drink	19.1% +/- 1.8 (1999)	21.0% +/- 3.7%	1.9
Drinking and Driving	3.3% +/- 1.8 (1999)	2.5% +/- 1.4%	0.8
Women's Cancer Screening			
No Mammogram (40+ yr. Olds)	8.8% +/- 2.1	7.5% +/- 5.0%	1.3
Appropriate Mammogram (40+ Yr. Olds)	69.1% +/- 3.5	68.9% +/- 8.3%	0.2
Appropriate Breast Exam	79.6% +/- 2.4	70.4% +/- 6.9%	9.2
Pap Test within 3 Years	86.2% +/- 2.1	87.1% +/- 5.1%	0.9
Men's Cancer Screening			
Had PSA Test	58.5% +/- 5.8 (1999)	61.6% +/- 6.9%	3.1

**Table 33: Comparison of Prevalence Rates for Selected Risk Factors
By Gender by Age Group**

		% of Population							
		18-34 Years Old			35-54 Years Old			55+ Years Old	
Type	**Total**	Men	Women	**Total**	Men	Women	**Total**	Men	Women
Safety Belt Nonuse	**16.1%**	21.9%	11.2%	**14.8%**	16.6%	12.6%	**12.0%**	21.5%	5.7%
Overweight	**30.8%**	37.1%	25.0%	**42.2%**	46.2%	36.4%	**38.3%**	44.2%	34.3%
No Leisure Activity	**7.5%**	8.5%	6.6%	**16.2%**	11.7%	21.9%	**23.3%**	17.1%	27.5%
Smoke	**41.0%**	36.9%	44.4%	**29.3%**	29.7%	28.8%	**15.5%**	12.3%	17.6%
High Blood Pressure	**6.7%**	11.5%	2.6%	**32.2%**	33.4%	30.7%	**44.6%**	51.1%	40.4%
High Cholesterol	**9.3%**	15.5%	3.9%	**32.9%**	33.6%	32.1%	**51.0%**	49.0%	52.4%
Heavy Drinker	**8.9%**	13.7%	4.8%	**10.4%**	15.2%	4.4%	**5.7%**	10.7%	2.5%
Binge Drink	**39.5%**	45.3%	34.5%	**18.8%**	26.4%	9.1%	**6.5%**	14.3%	1.5%
Drinking and Driving	**5.9%**	5.3%	6.4%	**1.6%**	2.1%	1.0%	**0.7%**	1.7%	.

Table 34: Percent of Respondents Who Are At-Risk on Various Risk Factors, by Subjective Health Status and Mental Health Status

Type	Subjective Health Status		Mental Health Status	
	Good +	Not Good	**< 9 Bad Days/Month**	9+ Bad Days/Month
Safety Belt Nonuse	12.6%	24.0%	15.2%	11.4%
Smoke	28.4%	28.7%	25.1%	46.3%
Heavy Drinker	8.9%	6.1%	7.1%	16.3%
Male	14.3%	8.8%	11.56%*	30.9%
Female	3.7%	4.3%	2.3%	9.6%
Binge Drink	22.8%	11.1%	20.7%	25.3%
Male	31.11%*	9.9%	27.2%	40.3%
Female	14.6%	11.9%	13.7%	18.0%
Drinking and Driving	2.8%	0.9%	2.6%	2.7%
No Leisure Activity	11.4%	41.0%	12.1%	32.9%
Male 35-54	10.3%	26.1%	7.24%*	39.6%
Female 35-54	10.61%*	64.8%	13.38%*	46.0%
Overweight	35.0%	53.5%	36.5%	42.8%
Adults 35-54	38.28%*	64.6%	39.3%	52.9%
High Blood Pressure	25.4%	46.0%	28.6%	28.4%
Male	29.39%*	47.0%	31.4%	32.4%
Female	21.6%*	45.4%	25.6%	26.6%
High Cholesterol	31.7%	36.0%	33.7%	26.9%
Male	33.7%	26.6%	34.54%*	20.1%
Female	29.8%	42.6%	32.8%	29.8%

*significant at p<.05. Groups were compared horizontally-within health status groups.

Table 35: Average Number of Heart, Lifestyle or Injury Risk Factors by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Heart Risk	Lifestyle Diabetes	Injury
	Overall	1004	0.87	1.76	0.17
	Gender				
A	Male	575	0.89	1.85	0.22^{B}
B	Female	429	0.85	1.68	0.12
	Age				
C	18 to 24	118	0.35^{DEFGHI}	0.82^{DEFGHI}	0.36
D	25 to 34	98	0.67^{FGHI}	1.39^{EFGHI}	0.14
E	35 to 44	125	0.77^{FGH}	1.74^{GHI}	0.14
F	45 to 54	137	1.13	2.03	0.19
G	55 to 64	92	1.14	2.27^{I}	0.13
H	65 to 74	256	1.16^{I}	2.26^{I}	0.12
I	75 +	167	0.92	1.87	0.14
	Race				
J	White	931	0.89	1.79	0.17
K	Other	64	0.64	1.55	0.2
	Education				
L	Less than HS	99	1.18^{NO}	2.23^{NO}	0.24
M	HS Graduate	374	0.98^{O}	1.95^{NO}	0.16
N	Some College	302	0.82	1.67	0.19
O	College Graduate	225	0.67	1.47	0.13
	Income				
P	Less than $10,000	23	1.16	2.17	0.3
Q	$10,000-$19,999	112	1.02	2.07	0.16
R	$20,000-$34,999	213	0.91	2.04^{ST}	0.14
S	$35,000-$49,999	168	0.79	1.67	0.16
T	$50,000 or more	284	0.81	1.59	0.14

Heart Risk- high blood pressure, high blood cholesterol, and current smoker

Lifestyle Risk - Heart Risk score plus overweight, no physical activity, and has diabetes

Injury - Do not always use seatbelt, driving while drunk

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.

Table 37: Percentage Who Are Very Sure and Not Sure at All Whom To Call for Various Types of Assistance for the Elderly, by Relation to Elderly

How sure whom to call for assistance	Elderly Respondent (n = 414)		Has Elderly Spouse (n = 278)	
	Very Sure	Not At All	Very Sure	Not At All
Meals	60.1%	26.3%	54.4%	28.0%
Transportation	68.6%	16.7%	56.4%	26.8%
Personal Care	59.8%	25.1%	51.8%	29.5%
Temporary Nursing At Home	52.8%	25.5%	46.8%	31.2%
Respite Care	NA	NA	39.8%	32.7%
Alternative Housing	NA	NA	49.3%	32.1%

Table 38: Percentage Who Have Taken Later-Life Planning Actions, by Demographic Characteristics

	Characteristics	N	Financial Plan	Will	Discussed Wishes	POA/Advanced Directive
	Overall	976	38.05%	36.91%	56.47%	27.39%
	Gender					
A	Male	563	42.02%	32.93%	46.71%^{B}	23.18%^{B}
B	Female	413	34.30%	40.60%	65.47%	31.29%
	Age					
C	18 to 24	115	10.07%^{DEFGHI}	3.54%^{DEFGHI}	18.68%^{DEFGHI}	1.66%^{DEFGHI}
D	25 to 34	98	38.24%^{H}	15.76%^{FGHI}	48.75%^{GHI}	9.45%^{EGHI}
E	35 to 44	125	40.90%	25.79%^{GHI}	50.43%^{GHI}	21.74%^{GHI}
F	45 to 54	136	35.64%^{H}	38.73%^{HI}	56.37%^{GHI}	18.11%^{GHI}
G	55 to 64	88	42.60%	52.84%^{HI}	76.24%	46.2%^{I}
H	65 to 74	244	52.35%	75.82%^{I}	79.48%	59.35%^{I}
I	75 +	159	43.87%	89.12%	81.54%	74.39%
	Race					
J	White	905	38.62%	38.92%^{K}	57.88%	28.73%^{K}
K	Other	63	31.81%	16.70%	40.57%	13.45%
	Education					
L	Less than HS	96	14.94%^{MNO}	36.67%	48.24%	33.68%
M	HS Graduate	364	30.13%^{O}	37.59%	55.90%	29.26%
N	Some College	292	39.32%^{O}	30.40%	53.83%	22.61%
O	College Graduate	220	54.58%	43.63%	63.14%	28.73%
	Income					
P	Less than $10,000	23	15.16%ST	7.72%^{QRST}	29.99%	13.35%^{QR}
Q	$10,000-$19,999	110	15.18%^{RST}	46.76%^{S}	53.17%	41.48%ST
R	$20,000-$34,999	211	28.78%^{T}	33.71%	56.40%	30.61%
S	$35,000-$49,999	166	36.39%^{T}	30.23%	52.67%	20.46%
T	$50,000 or more	280	49.76%	36.35%	61.75%	24.49%

*Significance testing was performed for the outcome of interest (the bold column label). Significant differences (p<.05) are noted within groups by showing the comparison groups letter in superscript.