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***A. Introduction***

Full-time college students are a large segment of the young adult population in Vermont. They are also connected to each other in a very distinctive social environment that creates unique opportunities and pressures for using substances, as well as possibilities for prevention and early intervention. Alcohol use among college students, for example, has been shown to be influenced by campus norms and accompanying normative pressures, expectations of its effects, school-related stress, ready availability of alcohol, lax enforcement of drinking laws, and Greek system involvement – all of which are factors shaped by the campus environment and the college student experience (White and Hingston, 2013).

A number of intervention approaches have been used to prevent and reduce underage or excessive drinking on college campuses including normative interventions, harm reduction strategies, and brief motivational interviewing strategies, among others (Kilmer, Cronce, and Larimer, 2013; NIAAA, 2017). Similar approaches have been used for use of other substances such as marijuana (Elliott and Carey, 2012; Palfai et al., 2014). Despite these efforts, recent data on college student substance use from Monitoring the Future (MTF) reveal that nationally, 63% have used alcohol use in the past month, while 32% report engaging in binge drinking in the past 2 weeks. More than one-third (39%) report any marijuana use in the past year, 4.9% report daily marijuana use, and one-fifth (20%) report any use of illicit drugs other than marijuana in the past year. Annual misuse of prescription amphetamines such as Adderall also remains high (9.8%). Whereas rates of alcohol use, including binge drinking, have been found by MTF and other studies to be higher among college students than other young adults, prevalence rates for other substances have generally tended to be fairly similar or slightly lower for students (Schulenburg at al., 2017).

***B. Purpose of this Report***

The harmful consequences of excessive drinking among college students are well documented (White and Hingston, 2013). Likewise, college students are not immune from the recent epidemic of opioid misuse and overdose incidents (Daniels-Witt, et al., 2017; Korn and Kamp, 2017), and the negative effects of marijuana use among college students are also becoming better understood (Arria at al., 2015; Suerken at al., 2016). Understanding and effectively addressing substance use among college students in Vermont, including drawing attention and resources to this issue, can be facilitated by having reliable data on rates and patterns of use and related risk factors. Over the past few decades, a number of Vermont colleges have conducted periodic student surveys on substance use and other health-related behaviors. Most recently, the Vermont College Health Survey (CHS), coordinated by the Vermont Department of Health, was conducted in nine Vermont colleges in 2014 and again in 2016. A statewide report with the survey findings is available on the VDH website.[[1]](#footnote-1) Each participating college also received their own college-specific data.

The 2014 and 2016 Vermont Young Adult Surveys (YAS) provide an additional source of data on substance use among Vermont college students, as well as the young adult population in general. In each of these two years, Vermont residents aged 18 to 25 were invited to participate in this online survey regarding the use of alcohol and other substances. Findings from the survey are used by the Vermont Department of Health and its community partners to plan and evaluate their substance use prevention efforts.

Because the YAS is open to all age-eligible Vermont residents, respondents potentially represent students from all colleges in Vermont, rather than the subset of colleges that participated in the Vermont CHS. The YAS also provides the opportunity to compare full-time college students with other young adults who are not in college or are only part-time students. Additionally, whereas the CHS was based on somewhat different sets of colleges in 2014 and 2016, the strategy to recruit YAS participants was identical for the two years, thus facilitating comparisons between them. Accordingly, the data reported here include comparisons between findings from the 2014 and 2016 surveys, and between full-time college students and other young adults in Vermont aged 18 to 25. Although the data are statewide only and not available at the college level, they may still be helpful to colleges in Vermont for drawing attention to student substance use issues and for general prevention planning purposes, especially by colleges that did not participate in the CHS.

This report presents highlights of the survey findings with respect to full-time college students, including comparisons identified in the preceding paragraph. Also examined are differences in substance use prevalence rates among full-time college students with respect to their age group and sex. We chose to base comparisons on full-time college students rather than all students because they constitute a more homogeneous and readily identified subpopulation. Appendix A provides response distributions for all items of the survey, broken down by year and by full-time student status. A copy of the survey instrument is available online.2

***C. Methods***

The Vermont Young Adult Survey (YAS) was conducted in the spring of 2014 and again in the spring of 2016. Vermont residents between the inclusive ages of 18 and 25 were eligible to participate. The survey was accessible online and designed to be used with a variety of devices, including desktop and laptop computers, tablets, and smart phones. Respondents were recruited through Facebook ads,3 and incentives to participate in the survey were provided in the form of randomly drawn cash awards winner each week and one larger cash award randomly drawn at the conclusion of the survey period.

Because a scientific sampling design was not used, survey findings do not necessarily reflect the overall young adult population of Vermont, or of the full-time college student subpopulation. The data were, however, weighted by age group (18-20 vs. 21-25), sex, and county,4 in order to ensure that the sample characteristics match the Vermont population on these variables. Although survey respondents could differ in other ways from the overall young adult population of Vermont, the statewide YAS findings on key substance use behaviors match well with published Vermont-specific estimates from SAMHSA’s National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH), which does employ a scientific sampling design and adjustment for non-response bias. (See Appendix B for comparisons.)

***D. Sample Characteristics***

Demographic characteristics of the 2014 and 2016 YAS samples, broken down by full-time college students versus other young adults, are provided in Appendix A, Tables A3 and A45. As reflected in the tables, only age group, sex, employment status, and type of device used to complete the survey (in addition to student status) were ascertained in the 2014 survey. Additional demographic variables in the 2016 survey include sexual orientation, gender identity, race/ethnicity, maternal education, preferred spoken language, long-term disability status, and membership in the armed services.

As shown in the Table A4, many more females than males participated in the survey – this was true for both full-time students and other young adults. And as expected, a much higher percentage of full-time students were in the younger age category (18 to 20 years old) relative to other young adults.6

In addition to full-time students being younger than the other young adults, full-time students, compared to other young adults:

* were slightly more likely to be female (this difference was more pronounced in 2016)
* were slightly more likely to be gay or lesbian
* were much less likely to be employed full-time and more likely to be employed part-time
* were slightly more likely to identify their race/ethnicity as something other than white
* had mothers who were more highly educated
* were slightly less likely to identify English as their preferred spoken language
* were less likely to be disabled

The differences noted above are not surprising and most likely reflect actual differences between full-time students and other young adults in Vermont. They could all contribute in small ways to differences between full-time students and other young adults in substance use behaviors and risk factors.

One notable difference in the demographic characteristics of the samples between 2014 and 2016 was the higher levels of full-time employment in 2016. In addition, the data reveal a huge shift away from using desktop and laptop computers, and instead the use of smart phones, for accessing the survey.

***E. Highlights of Survey Findings***

**Prevalence rates for substance use behaviors**

Prevalence rates for any use of alcohol in the past 30 days, and binge drinking7 in the past 30 days, are shown in Figure 1. For both years, and despite the much larger percentage of full-time8 college students being underage compared to the other young adults, rates of any alcohol use and binge drinking were both significantly higher for college students compared to other young adults. The rates for any alcohol use were slightly lower in 2016 compared to 2014 for both college students and other young adults. For binge drinking, the differences between 2014 and 2016 were more pronounced, with the 2016 rates being significantly lower than 2014 for both groups.

Figure 1. Percent of young adults reporting any use of alcohol and binge drinking in the past 30 days, by student status and year.

Prevalence rates for any marijuana use in the past 30 days, and use of marijuana on 20 or more days within the past 30 days (also referred to as “daily or almost daily use”), are provided in Figure 2. Unlike the alcohol measures, the rates of both marijuana use behaviors were slightly higher in 2016 compared to 2014 – this was true for both students and other young adults, although only the difference between years for the “any use” measure among students approached statistical significance (p<.10).

The other notable feature in Figure 2 is the substantially and significantly lower percentages of full-time students who reported daily or almost daily use compared to other young adults. This was true for both years. This difference does not, however, mitigate the finding that sizeable percentages of both full-time students and other young adults reported using marijuana on a daily or almost daily basis. Based on the 2016 survey, almost 40 percent of students, and over 57 percent of other young adults, who used marijuana in the past 30 days reported using on 20 or more days (see Table A1).

Figure 2. Percent of young adults reporting any use of marijuana and use of marijuana 20 or more days in the past 30 days, by student status and year.

Prevalence rates for misuse during the past year of three prescription drug categories, pain relievers, sedatives, and stimulants, are shown in Figure 3. Misuse was defined as either using the drug without having been given a prescription for it, or using it at higher dosages or for different reasons than prescribed. In both years, misuse of prescription pain relievers was significantly lower among full-time college students compared to other young adults, while misuse of prescription stimulants, such as Adderall, was higher. Differences in the prevalence rates of sedative misuse were small and not significantly different.

Figure 3. Percent of young adults reporting misuse of prescription drug categories within the past year, by student status and year.

Regarding differences in rates of prescription drug misuse between the two years, sedative misuse was slightly higher in 2016 for both groups, and pain reliever misuse was slightly lower. The only statistically significant difference, however, between the two years was the higher rate of sedative use among full-time college students in 2016 compared to 2014. Rates of stimulant misuse did not differ between 2014 and 2016 for either group, although the already higher rate of stimulant misuse among full-time students in 2014 relative to other young adults was even more pronounced in 2016.

**Selected risk factors**

Ease of obtaining substances (i.e., availability), low perceived risk of harm from using substances, and perceived likelihood of enforcement and legal sanctions regarding substance use, are well-established risk factors for substance use and misuse. Across the measures used to assess these risk factors, the following differences were noted between full-time students and other young adults in one or both years (see Appendix A for details):

* a higher percentage of full-time students perceived that it was easy for underage persons to obtain alcohol from social sources, and also from stores, relative to other young adults
* a slightly higher percentage of students perceived that it was easy for persons their age to obtain marijuana
* a significantly lower percentage of full-time students perceived that it was easy for

persons their age to obtain prescription pain relievers without a prescription

* differences between full-time students and other young adults in perceived risk of harm from using substances were small, other than the somewhat lower percent of students who perceived no risk from smoking marijuana once or twice per week
* even though rates of alcohol use and binge drinking were found to be higher for full-time college students, students were nevertheless somewhat more likely than other young adults to expect that law enforcement would likely intervene in situations involving alcohol impaired driving and underage drinking parties

Among college students, notable differences in risk factors between 2014 and 2016 include:

* the percentage of students perceiving it was very easy or somewhat easy for underage persons to buy alcohol in stores was higher in 2016 (34%) than in 2014 (29%)
* the opposite pattern was found for obtaining alcohol from friends or family members (93% in 2014, 90% in 2016)
* a higher percentage of students perceived low risk of harm from marijuana use in 2016
* more students in 2016 also believed it was unlikely for persons their age using or possessing marijuana (if found by police) to be cited and fined

**Differences in full-time student substance use prevalence rates by age group and sex**

Difference in rates of use across demographic subgroups can be helpful in targeting prevention messages and other preventive interventions. This section examines how substance use prevalence rates among full-time students vary according to age group (18 to 20 versus 21 to 25) and sex (male versus female). It also compares the prevalence rates for these demographic subgroups in 2014 versus 2016.

Substance use prevalence rates broken down by age group and year are provided in Table 1. The only statistically significant differences between the age groups are for any alcohol use and binge drinking. For both measures, and in both years, the rates are lower among underage students as compared to students aged 21 to 25.

Table 1. Substance use prevalence rates by age group (full-time college students)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2014 | 2016 | 2014 to 2016 comparisons |
|  | 18-to-20 year olds (n=560)  | 21-to-25 year olds (n=417)  | Comp | 18-to-20 year olds (n=520)  | 21-to-25 year olds (n=446)  | Comp | 18-to-20 year olds | 21-to-25 year olds |
| Any alcohol use in past 30 days | 71.2 | 91.5 | ★★★ | 70.9 | 86.2 | ★★★ |  | ★★ |
| Any binge drinking1 in past 30 days | 59.7 | 69.6 | ★★★ | 51.7 | 60.8 | ★★ | ★★ | ★★ |
| Any marijuana use in past 30 days | 40.3 | 35.6 |  | 43.5 | 43.5 |  |  | ★★ |
| Used marijuana 20+ days in past 30 days | 13.7 | 15.1 |  | 17.4 | 16.4 |  |  |  |
| Any misuse of Rx pain reliever in past year | 5.4 | 7.0 |  | 4.3 | 4.7 |  |  |  |
| Any misuse of Rx sedatives in past year | 3.9 | 5.2 |  | 7.6 | 5.9 |  | ★★ |  |
| Any misuse of Rx stimulants in past year | 14.6 | 15.4 |  | 19.0 | 16.1 |  | ★ |  |

1Binge drinking is defined as having 5 or more drinks (if male) or 4 or more drinks (if female) on a single occasion.

 Note 1: The n’s shown for each column are the unweighted sample sizes, and may be lower for some measures.

 Note 2: Statistical tests are reported as follows: ★ (p<.10), ★★ (p<.05), ★★★ (p<.01)

With respect to differences between 2014 and 2016, rates for any alcohol use, binge drinking, and misuse of prescription pain relievers were at least marginally lower in 2016 for both age groups compared to 2014. On the other hand, rates of any marijuana use, daily or almost daily use of marijuana, and misuse of sedatives and stimulants were all at least marginally higher in 2016. Only a subset of the differences between 2014 and 2016 were statistically significant, however.

Similar information, this time broken down by sex, is presented in Table 2. Notable higher rates among males, compared to females, were observed in 2014 for binge drinking, marijuana use, and daily or almost daily marijuana use. In 2016, only the difference for daily or almost daily use of marijuana remained statistically significant. For any alcohol use, as well as misuse of various prescription drug categories, prevalence rates for males and females were similar and not statistically different.

Comparing rates in 2014 to 2016, the table shows statistically lower rates of binge drinking in 2016 for both females and males, a higher rate of any marijuana use by females in 2016, and a higher rate of prescription sedatives misuse by males in 2016, and a marginally higher rate of stimulant misuse by females in 2016.

Table 2. Substance use prevalence rates by sex (full-time college students)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2014 | 2016 | 2014 to 2016 comparisons |
|  | Males (n=265)  | Females (n=699)  | Comp | Males (n=259)  | Females (n=707)  | Comp | Males | Females |
| Any alcohol use in past 30 days | 78.6 | 78.4 |  | 75.3 | 77.4 |  |  |  |
| Any binge drinking1 in past 30 days | 67.0 | 60.2 | ★ | 57.1 | 53.2 |  | ★★ | ★★ |
| Any marijuana use in past 30 days | 43.8 | 33.3 | ★★★ | 45.0 | 42.2 |  |  | ★★★ |
| Used marijuana 20+ days in past 30 days | 18.9 | 9.7 | ★★★ | 23.2 | 11.8 | ★★★ |  |  |
| Any misuse of Rx pain reliever in past year | 6.2 | 5.9 |  | 4.9 | 4.1 |  |  |  |
| Any misuse of Rx sedatives in past year | 4.1 | 4.8 |  | 8.5 | 5.7 |  | ★★ |  |
| Any misuse of Rx stimulants in past year | 16.3 | 13.3 |  | 19.3 | 16.8 |  |  | ★ |

1Binge drinking is defined as having 5 or more drinks (if male) or 4 or more drinks (if female) on a single occasion.

 Note 1: The n’s shown for each column are the unweighted sample sizes, and may be lower for some measures.

 Note 2: Statistical tests are reported as follows: ★ (p<.10), ★★ (p<.05), ★★★ (p<.01)

**Open-ended comments entered by survey respondents**

At the end of each survey, participants were invited to enter comments about the survey or topics that were raised in the survey. Among full-time students, just over 15 percent of respondents entered comments in the 2014 survey administration, whereas 8.9 percent of respondents did so for the 2016 survey. Although speculative, the lower percent of respondents providing comments in the 2016 survey could be attributable to the large shift from desk top computers to smart phones as the devices used to participate.

A substantial portion of the comments received were articulate and lengthy (i.e., more than just a single phrase or sentence), reflecting what appear to be firmly held beliefs and perceptions regarding substance use issues. Although those who chose to provide comments may differ in important ways from the general pool of respondents, the sentiments expressed may still provide useful insights regarding the relative importance of substance use issues to full-time students in Vermont.

As displayed in Table 3, the specific comments entered were categorized into 19 more generic comments plus a “miscellaneous category” composed of a heterogeneous mix of viewpoints, anecdotes and observations that did not fall into any of the other categories. The majority of respondents provided comments that fit only one category, although the number of categories per respondent ranged from one to four.

For the 2014 survey, the most dominant theme, expressed by 22 percent of the respondents who offered a comment, was the perception that drug use, especially use of opioid drugs and heroin (which could include their availability and/or consequences), was a significant problem, either locally or in Vermont in general. Other more common comments reflected the belief that marijuana was not harmful and/or should be legalized, along with personal anecdotes or explanation for their item responses and positive comments about the survey itself.

For the 2016 survey, comments reflecting concern over the drug use problem were still common (13 percent of those who provided comments), but that was down substantially from the 22 percent that was obtained in the 2014 survey. This could be connected to the high level of publicity that the issues of opioid misuse and heroin use in Vermont were receiving in 2014.

Comments regarding marijuana not being harmful, on the other hand, remained a common theme in the 2016 survey. A higher percent of comments in the 2016 survey, compared to 2014, were personal anecdotes, and comments regarding some aspect of the survey that respondents did not like or found confusing were also relatively more common in 2016.

**Table 4.** Comments Provided by Full-time Students

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **2014** | **2016** |
| **Comments (Organized by General Category)** | Code | Number of Comments | Percent of All Respondents1 | Percent of Those Who Commented2 | Number of Comments | Percent of All Respondents3 | Percent of Those Who Commented4 |
| Comments on scope or seriousness of substance use in state or community |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of alcohol use (and/or availability) is a problem | 10 | 11 | 1.1 | 7.4 | 5 | 0.5 | 5.8 |
| Hard drug use, Rx drug misuse, multiple other drugs, addiction, availability, and/or drug-related crime, is a problem | 11 | 33 | 3.4 | 22.2 | 11 | 1.1 | 12.8 |
| Level of marijuana use (and/or availability) is a problem | 12 | 6 | 0.6 | 4.0 | 1 | 0.1 | 1.2 |
| Drinking and driving is a problem | 13 | 4 | 0.4 | 2.7 | 3 | 0.3 | 3.5 |
| The greatest alcohol and drug problems are in the urban areas (e.g. Burlington and Rutland) | 14 | 1 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Alcohol and/or drug use is common (and/or access is easy), but no problem was implied | 15 | 9 | 0.9 | 6.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Comments on need for different approaches and perspectives |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Enforcement/prevention efforts should focus on hard drugs rather than marijuana (and/or alcohol) | 20 | 11 | 1.1 | 7.4 | 2 | 0.2 | 2.3 |
| Marijuana should be legalized/is not harmful or a problem | 21 | 18 | 1.8 | 12.1 | 11 | 1.1 | 12.8 |
| Respondent uses marijuana for health and/or medical reasons | 50 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4 | 0.4 | 4.7 |
| Drinking age should be lowered | 22 | 5 | 0.5 | 3.4 | 3 | 0.3 | 3.5 |
| Do not support the "war on drugs" / focus should be on reducing harms, not imposing fines or incarceration | 23 | 3 | 0.3 | 2.0 | 2 | 0.2 | 2.3 |
| Comments on need for enhanced services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Need more/better drug treatment options/better access to treatment | 30 | 4 | 0.4 | 2.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Youth need more prevention education | 31 | 2 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 2 | 0.2 | 2.3 |
| Need enhanced enforcement and/or harsher punishment | 32 | 12 | 1.2 | 8.1 | 2 | 0.2 | 2.3 |
| Youth are bored/need more alternative activities | 33 | 1 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other comments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explanation of answer(s)/personal anecdote | 40 | 14 | 1.4 | 9.4 | 21 | 2.2 | 24.4 |
| Concerns about accuracy of the data (due to not reaching the right people or to dishonest responses) | 42 | 2 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Would like to change something about the survey/disliked some of the questions or found them to be confusing | 43 | 8 | 0.8 | 5.4 | 10 | 1.0 | 11.6 |
| Liked the survey/thanks for doing this research | 44 | 16 | 1.6 | 10.7 | 7 | 0.7 | 8.1 |
| Miscellaneous | 45 | 24 | 2.5 | 16.1 | 13 | 1.4 | 15.1 |

1N =977; 2N =149; 3N =966; 4N =86
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***Notes***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. | The VDH statewide report is available from:<http://www.healthvermont.gov/sites/default/files/documents/pdf/hsvr_collegehealth_2016.pdf>  |
| 2. | Printable copies of the Vermont Young Adult Surveys are available at:<http://www.pire.org/documents/Vermont_PFS_Eval/VT_PFS_YAS2014_Survey_Items.pdf> (for 2014)[http://www.pire.org/documents/Vermont\_PFS\_Eval/YAS questions 2016.pdf](http://www.pire.org/documents/Vermont_PFS_Eval/YAS%20questions%202016.pdf) (for 2016) |
| 3. | Although some respondents to the 2014 survey were recruited through mailed postcards (approximately 12 percent of the total 2014 sample), these respondents were excluded from all the tables in this report in order to make the 2014 sample more comparable to 2016. |
| 4. | County definitions were altered slightly to accommodate inclusion of three townships that were outside the primary county served by the one of the PFS grantees. All other PFS grantee service areas were defined by intact counties. The two smallest pairs of neighboring counties, however, were combined prior to calculation of the weights. |
| 5. | The distributions for the demographic variables are provided for both the weighted data (Table A3) and the raw unweighted data (Table A4). |
| 6. | Note that weighting the data forced the distributions of age group and sex to reflect their actual distributions in the population.  |
| 7. | Binge drinking is defined as having 5 or more drinks (if male) or 4 or more drinks (if female) on a single occasion.  |
| 8. | Unless otherwise indicated, the term ”students” as used through the remainder of this report will refer to full-time students. |

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A**

**Response Distributions for All Items**

By full-time student status and year

Table A1. Substance use prevalence rates, by full-time college student status and year

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2014** | **2016** | **2014 to 2016 Comps3** |
| **Substance category and specific behavior:** | Full-time college students (n=977)  | Other young adults (n=1886)  | Comp1 | Full-time college students (n=966)  | Other young adults (n=2095)  | Comp2 | Full-time college students  | Other young adults  |
| **Alcohol** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Any use in past 30 days | 78.8 | 72.7 | ★★★ | 76.4 | 71.1 | ★★ |  |  |
| Any binge drinking4 in past 30 days | 63.4 | 52.5 | ★★★ | 55.0 | 46.5 | ★★★ | ★★★ | ★★★ |
|  Binge drank 1-3 days | 45.6 | 54.6 | ★★★ | 54.4 | 58.6 |  | ★★ |  |
|  Binge drank 4-10 days | 46.8 | 33.6 | ★★★ | 41.2 | 31.9 | ★★★ |  |  |
|  Binge drank 11-19 days | 6.5 | 7.3 |  | 3.1 | 5.3 | ★ | ★★ |  |
|  Binge drank 20 or more days | 1.1 | 4.4 | ★★★ | 1.3 | 4.1 | ★★ |  |  |
| Drove after having too much to drink | 2.7 | 4.2 | ★ | 2.2 | 4.4 | ★★ |  |  |
| Any use in past 30 days (ages 18-20 only) | 71.2 | 53.3 | ★★★ | 70.9 | 50.4 | ★★★ |  |  |
|  Ways in which alcohol was obtained:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Bought at store | 8.7 | 7.3 |  | 9.1 | 6.9 |  |  |  |
|  Bought at restaurant or bar | 7.1 | 5.6 |  | 5.0 | 4.6 |  |  |  |
|  Parent or guardian provided it | 11.6 | 14.0 |  | 9.8 | 13.0 |  |  |  |
|  Other adult family member provided it | 10.4 | 10.0 |  | 6.7 | 8.4 |  | ★ |  |
|  Unrelated adult provided it | 70.9 | 59.9 | ★★ | 64.2 | 53.7 | ★★ | ★ |  |
|  Person under age 21 provided it | 34.4 | 15.9 | ★★★ | 28.0 | 11.8 | ★★★ |  |  |
|  It was available at a social gathering | 45.7 | 30.6 | ★★★ | 28.0 | 23.4 |  | ★★★ |  |
|  Took from parents’ or someone else’s home, or from a store | 5.2 | 11.7 | ★★★ | 2.3 | 7.2 | ★★★ | ★★ |  |
|  Got it in Canada | 4.9 | 7.8 |  | 7.2 | 4.7 |  |  |  |
|  Got it some other way | 14.0 | 12.9 |  | 8.0 | 9.3 |  | ★★ |  |
| **Marijuana** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Any use in past 30 days | 38.6 | 38.6 |  | 43.5 | 41.1 |  | ★ |  |
|  Used 1-3 days | 28.5 | 20.3 | ★★ | 31.3 | 21.9 | ★★★ |  |  |
|  Used 4-10 days | 23.4 | 15.8 | ★★ | 19.5 | 14.2 | ★★ |  |  |
|  Used 11-19 days | 11.0 | 8.2 |  | 9.6 | 6.6 |  |  |  |
|  Used 20 or more days | 37.2 | 55.7 | ★★★ | 39.7 | 57.3 | ★★★ |  |  |
|  Methods of use in past 30 days: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Smoked it |  |  |  | 95.8 | 95.9 |  |  |  |
|  Ate food that contained it |  |  |  | 24.7 | 22.0 |  |  |  |
|  Consumed it in tea or other drinks |  |  |  | 2.9 | 4.4 |  |  |  |
|  Inhaled it with a vaporizer |  |  |  | 26.0 | 22.6 |  |  |  |
|  Other method |  |  |  | 6.0 | 3.5 |  |  |  |
| Used marijuana as prescribed to treat a medical condition in past 30 days |  |  |  | 1.5 | 3.0 | ★ |  |  |
| Drove after using marijuana | 13.2 | 17.1 | ★★ | 16.1 | 17.3 |  |  |  |

|  | **2014** | **2016** | **2014 to 2016 Comps3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Substance category and specific behavior:** | Full-time college students (n=977)  | Other young adults (n=1886)  | Comp1 | Full-time college students (n=966)  | Other young adults (n=2095)  | Comp2 | Full-time college students  | Other young adults  |
| **Prescription Drugs** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Used drugs that had not been prescribed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Used pain relievers w/o Rx in past year | 4.5 | 7.1 | ★★ | 2.6 | 5.4 | ★★★ | ★ | ★ |
|  How obtained the last time used: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Obtained from friend/relative for free | 48.0 | 43.9 |  | 59.9 | 41.4 |  |  |  |
|  Bought from friend or relative | 14.5 | 22.2 |  | 6.1 | 17.0 |  |  |  |
|  Bought from drug dealer or stranger | 6.7 | 18.1 | ★ | 3.0 | 21.1 | ★★ |  |  |
|  Some other way or don’t remember | 30.9 | 15.8 | ★ | 31.1 | 20.5 |  |  |  |
| Used sedatives w/o Rx in past year | 3.9 | 3.8 |  | 6.4 | 5.2 |  | ★★ |  |
|  How obtained the last time used: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Obtained from friend/relative for free | 67.2 | 58.2 |  | 44.2 | 57.8 |  | ★ |  |
|  Bought from friend or relative | 18.6 | 21.4 |  | 34.0 | 20.4 |  |  |  |
|  Bought from drug dealer or stranger | 5.5 | 9.6 |  | 3.9 | 11.2 |  |  |  |
|  Some other way or don’t remember | 8.7 | 10.9 |  | 17.9 | 10.6 |  |  |  |
| Used stimulants w/o Rx in past year | 13.1 | 8.1 | ★★★ | 14.8 | 8.1 | ★★★ |  |  |
|  How obtained the last time used: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Obtained from friend/relative for free | 61.5 | 49.6 |  | 45.0 | 59.0 | ★★ | ★★ |  |
|  Bought from friend or relative | 28.8 | 33.3 |  | 46.8 | 25.4 | ★★★ | ★★ |  |
|  Bought from drug dealer or stranger | 2.5 | 10.0 | ★★ | 3.7 | 6.3 |  |  |  |
|  Some other way or don’t remember | 7.2 | 7.0 |  | 4.5 | 9.3 |  |  |  |
| Used methadone or buprenorphine w/o Rx in past year | 0.4 | 2.9 | ★★★ | 0.3 | 2.0 | ★★★ |  |  |
|  How obtained the last time used: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Obtained from friend/relative for free | 36.6 | 35.6 |  | 72.4 | 33.9 |  |  |  |
|  Bought from friend or relative | 33.5 | 36.3 |  | 0.0 | 25.0 | N/A | N/A |  |
|  Bought from drug dealer or stranger | 15.4 | 18.8 |  | 0.0 | 26.0 | N/A | N/A |  |
|  Some other way or don’t remember | 14.5 | 9.3 |  | 27.6 | 15.1 |  |  |  |
| Used drugs at higher dosages or for different purposes than prescribed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Used prescribed pain relievers at higher dosage or for different reason in past year | 3.1 | 3.9 |  | 2.2 | 3.0 |  |  |  |
| Used prescribed sedatives at higher dosage or for different reason in past year | 0.7 | 1.8 | ★★ | 1.1 | 1.9 |  |  |  |
| Used prescribed stimulants at higher dosage or for different reason in past year | 3.4 | 3.2 |  | 4.3 | 2.1 | ★★★ |  | ★ |
| Used drugs that had not been prescribed, or used at higher dosages or for different purposes than prescribed (i.e., misuse) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Any misuse of Rx pain reliever in past year | 6.0 | 8.7 | ★★ | 4.5 | 7.0 | ★★ |  |  |
| Any misuse of Rx sedatives in past year | 4.4 | 5.0 |  | 7.0 | 6.1 |  | ★★ |  |
| Any misuse of Rx stimulants in past year | 14.9 | 9.8 | ★★★ | 17.9 | 9.0 | ★★★ |  |  |
| Exposure to safe storage/disposal info |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recall seeing or hearing information about safe storage/disposal of Rx drugs in past year | 27.0 | 35.3 | ★★★ | 33.0 | 40.0 | ★★★ | ★★ | ★★ |
| **Heroin** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ever used heroin | 0.7 | 3.1 | ★★★ | 0.3 | 2.6 | ★★★ |  |  |

1Statistical test for difference between full-time college students and other young adults in 2014.

2Statistical test for difference between full-time college students and other young adults in 2016.

3Statistical test for differences between 2014 and 2016.

4Binge drinking is defined as having 5 or more drinks (if male) or 4 or more drinks (if female) on a single occasion.

Note 1: The n’s shown for each column are the unweighted sample sizes, and may be lower for some measures.

Note 2: Statistical tests are reported as follows: ★ (p<.10), ★★ (p<.05), ★★★ (p<.01)

Table A2. Substance use risk factor prevalence rates, by full-time college student status and year

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2014** | **2016** | **2014 to 2016 Comps3** |
| **Risk Factor:** | Full-time college students (n=977)  | Other young adults (n=1886)  | Comp1 | Full-time college students (n=966)  | Other young adults (n=2095)  | Comp2 | Full-time college students  | Other young adults  |
| **Perceived ease of obtaining substances** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very easy or somewhat easy for underage persons to buy alcohol in stores  | 29.1 | 25.5 | ★ | 34.1 | 26.0 | ★★★ | ★★ |  |
| Very easy or somewhat easy for underage persons to buy alcohol in bars and restaurants | 16.0 | 16.6 |  | 13.3 | 15.7 |  |  |  |
| Very easy or somewhat easy for underage persons to get alcohol from friends or family | 93.2 | 87.3 | ★★★ | 89.8 | 87.0 | ★ | ★★ |  |
| Very easy for underage persons to get alcohol from friends or family | 62.1 | 56.1 | ★★★ | 58.2 | 54.5 | ★ |  |  |
| Very easy or somewhat easy for persons the age of respondent to obtain marijuana | 86.1 | 81.5 | ★★★ | 85.6 | 83.5 |  |  |  |
| Very easy for persons the age of respondent to obtain marijuana | 52.5 | 49.1 |  | 53.1 | 52.1 |  |  |  |
| Very easy or somewhat easy for persons the age of respondent to obtain Rx pain relievers without a prescription | 32.8 | 43.2 | ★★★ | 30.0 | 40.3 | ★★★ |  |  |
| **Low perceived risk of harm from using substances** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No risk or slight risk from having five or more drinks once or twice a week | 28.7 | 26.5 |  | 26.8 | 27.0 |  |  |  |
| No risk or slight risk from smoking marijuana once or twice per week  | 73.2 | 74.7 |  | 79.5 | 78.3 |  | ★★★ | ★★ |
| No risk from smoking marijuana once or twice per week | 39.4 | 46.5 | ★★★ | 44.7 | 48.0 |  | ★★ |  |
| No risk or slight risk from using Rx pain relievers that were not prescribed a few times a year | 13.4 | 14.6 |  | 10.6 | 12.1 |  |  | ★★ |
| **Low perceived likelihood of law enforcement regarding substance use** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not very likely or not at all likely for person the age of respondent who was driving after having too much to drink to be stopped by police | 26.2 | 32.9 | ★★★ | 23.9 | 29.5 | ★★★ |  | ★★ |
| Not very likely or not at all likely for police to find out about and break up underage drinking parties | 34.9 | 41.7 | ★★★ | 36.4 | 40.6 | ★ |  |  |
| Not very likely or not at all likely for person respondent’s age found by police using or possessing marijuana to be cited and fined | 15.6 | 18.1 |  | 22.6 | 20.1 |  | ★★★ |  |

1Statistical test for difference between full-time college students and other young adults in 2014.

2Statistical test for difference between full-time college students and other young adults in 2016.

3Statistical test for differences between 2014 and 2016.

Note 1: The n’s shown for each column are the unweighted sample sizes, and may be lower for some measures.

Note 2: Statistical tests are reported as follows: ★ (p<.10), ★★ (p<.05), ★★★ (p<.01)

Table A3. Respondent demographics, by full-time college student status and year (weighted)

|  | **2014** | **2016** | **2014 to 2016 Comps3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristic:** | Full-time college students (n=977)  | Other young adults (n=1886)  | Comp1 | Full-time college students (n=966)  | Other young adults (n=2095)  | Comp2 | Full-time college students  | Other young adults  |
| **Age group** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 to 20 | 63.3 | 32.9 | ★★★ | 63.3 | 33.9 | ★★★ |  |  |
| 21 to 25 | 36.7 | 67.1 | ★★★ | 36.7 | 66.1 | ★★★ |  |  |
| **Sex**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 49.3 | 52.8 |  | 47.1 | 53.7 | ★★★ |  |  |
| Female | 50.7 | 47.2 |  | 52.9 | 46.3 | ★★★ |  |  |
| **Sexual Orientation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heterosexual |  |  |  | 77.0 | 80.0 |  |  |  |
| Gay or lesbian |  |  |  | 5.6 | 3.7 | ★ |  |  |
| Bisexual |  |  |  | 12.1 | 11.3 |  |  |  |
| Unsure or other |  |  |  | 5.3 | 5.0 |  |  |  |
| **Employment Status** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employed for wages (full-time) | 5.0 | 50.2 | ★★★ | 11.7 | 59.0 | ★★★ | ★★★ | ★★★ |
| Employed for wages (part-time) | 57.9 | 25.2 | ★★★ | 56.0 | 20.5 | ★★★ |  | ★★★ |
| Self-employed | 2.4 | 3.1 |  | 2.6 | 3.6 |  |  |  |
| Not employed and looking for work | 17.7 | 16.6 |  | 17.9 | 12.2 | ★★★ |  | ★★★ |
| Not employed and not looking for work | 17.0 | 4.8 | ★★★ | 11.7 | 4.8 | ★★★ | ★★★ |  |
| **Race/Ethnicity** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White |  |  |  | 89.8 | 91.7 |  |  |  |
| Black or African American |  |  |  | 1.1 | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino |  |  |  | 1.8 | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  |  | 2.0 | 1.0 | ★ |  |  |
| American Indian, Alaskan Native, or Native Hawaiian |  |  |  | 1.3 | 0.2 | ★★★ |  |  |
| Bi-racial or Multi-racial |  |  |  | 2.7 | 3.7 |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  | 1.3 | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| **Maternal Education** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Did not complete high school |  |  |  | 2.0 | 6.6 | ★★★ |  |  |
| Completed high school |  |  |  | 11.8 | 29.1 | ★★★ |  |  |
| Attended some college |  |  |  | 30.3 | 21.9 | ★★★ |  |  |
| Completed college |  |  |  | 33.6 | 31.6 |  |  |  |
| Completed graduate or professional school after college |  |  |  | 22.2 | 10.9 | ★★★ |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2014** | **2016** | **2014 to 2016 Comps3** |
| **Characteristic:** | Full-time college students (n=977)  | Other young adults (n=1886)  | Comp1 | Full-time college students (n=966)  | Other young adults (n=2095)  | Comp2 | Full-time college students  | Other young adults  |
| **Gender Identity** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  | 51.4 | 45.1 | ★★★ |  |  |
| Male |  |  |  | 46.0 | 53.0 | ★★★ |  |  |
| Transgender or other |  |  |  | 2.6 | 2.0 |  |  |  |
| **Preferred Spoken Language** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| English |  |  |  | 98.2 | 99.5 | ★★★ |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  | 1.8 | 0.5 |  |  |
| **Long-term Disability** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes |  |  |  | 6.5 | 9.4 | ★★ |  |  |
| No |  |  |  | 93.5 | 90.6 |  |  |
| **US Armed Services Member** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes |  |  |  | 2.9 | 3.7 |  |  |  |
| No |  |  |  | 97.1 | 96.3 |  |  |
| **Device Used to Complete Survey** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smart phone | 31.8 | 53.6 | ★★★ | 73.8 | 77.3 | ★ | ★★★ | ★★★ |
| Tablet | 2.8 | 6.3 | ★★★ | 2.2 | 5.7 | ★★★ |  |  |
| Laptop or desktop computer | 63.9 | 37.3 | ★★★ | 23.5 | 15.8 | ★★★ | ★★★ | ★★★ |
| Other | 1.5 | 2.8 | ★ | 0.5 | 1.2 | ★ | ★★ | ★★★ |

1Statistical test for difference between full-time college students and other young adults in 2014.

2Statistical test for difference between full-time college students and other young adults in 2016.

3Statistical test for differences between 2014 and 2016.

Note 1: The n’s shown for each column are the unweighted sample sizes, and may be lower for some measures.

Note 2: Statistical tests are reported as follows: ★ (p<.10), ★★ (p<.05), ★★★ (p<.01)

|  | **2014** | **2016** | **2014 to 2016 Comps3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristic:** | Full-time college students (n=977)  | Other young adults (n=1886)  | Comp1 | Full-time college students (n=966)  | Other young adults (n=2095)  | Comp2 | Full-time college students  | Other young adults  |
| **Age group** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 to 20 | 57.3 | 27.8 |  ★★★ | 53.8 | 25.2 | ★★★ |  | ★ |
| 21 to 25 | 42.7 | 72.2 |  ★★★ | 46.2 | 74.8 | ★★★ |  | ★ |
| **Sex**  |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Male | 27.5 | 29.2 |   | 26.8 | 30.1 | ★ |  |  |
| Female | 72.5 | 70.8 |   | 73.2 | 69.9 | ★ |  |  |
| **Sexual Orientation** |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Heterosexual |   |   |   | 76.4 | 77.9 |  |  |  |
| Gay or lesbian |   |   |   | 4.5 | 3.2 | ★ |  |  |
| Bisexual |   |   |   | 13.0 | 13.4 |  |  |  |
| Unsure or other |   |   |   | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |  |  |
| **Employment Status** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employed for wages (full-time) | 5.1 | 51.0 |  ★★★ | 12.0 | 59.2 | ★★★ | ★★★ |  ★★★ |
| Employed for wages (part-time) | 61.5 | 25.6 |  ★★★ | 58.3 | 21.1 | ★★★ |  | ★★★  |
| Self-employed | 2.2 | 2.9 |   | 2.0 | 3.7 | ★★ |  |   |
| Not employed and looking for work | 15.5 | 15.1 |   | 16.2 | 10.9 | ★★★ |  |  ★★★ |
| Not employed and not looking for work | 15.8 | 5.4 |  ★★★ | 11.5 | 5.1 | ★★★ | ★★★ |   |
| **Race/Ethnicity** |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |
| White |   |   |   | 89.7 | 92.2 | ★★ |   |   |
| Black or African American |   |   |   | 0.9 | 1.0 |  |   |   |
| Hispanic or Latino |   |   |   | 1.8 | 1.2 |  |   |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander |   |   |   | 1.9 | 1.0 | ★ |   |   |
| American Indian, Alaskan Native, or Native Hawaiian |   |   |   | 0.3 | 1.1 | ★★ |   |   |
| Bi-racial or Multi-racial |   |   |   | 4.0 | 2.5 | ★★ |   |   |
| Other |   |   |   | 1.3 | 0.9 |  |   |   |
| **Maternal Education** |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |
| Did not complete high school |   |   |   | 2.1 | 5.9 | ★★★ |   |   |
| Completed high school |   |   |   | 11.9 | 25.7 | ★★★ |   |   |
| Attended some college |   |   |   | 30.3 | 22.8 | ★★★ |   |   |
| Completed college |   |   |   | 34.3 | 34.8 |  |   |   |
| Completed graduate or professional school after college |   |   |   | 21.3 | 10.9 | ★★★ |   |   |

Table A4. Respondent demographics, by full-time college student status and year (unweighted)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2014** | **2016** | **2014 to 2016 Comps3** |
| **Characteristic:** | Full-time college students (n=977)  | Other young adults (n=1886)  | Comp1 | Full-time college students (n=966)  | Other young adults (n=2095)  | Comp2 | Full-time college students  | Other young adults  |
| **Gender Identity** |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Female |   |   |   | 71.0 | 68.0 | ★ |  |  |
| Male |   |   |   | 26.2 | 30.0 | ★★ |  |  |
| Transgender or other |   |   |   | 2.8 | 2.0 |  |  |  |
| **Preferred Spoken Language** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| English |   |   |   | 98.6 | 99.6 | ★★★ |  |  |
| Other |   |   |   | 1.4 | 0.4 |  |  |
| **Long-term Disability** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes |   |   |   | 6.5 | 9.5 | ★★★ |  |  |
| No |   |   |   | 93.5 | 90.5 |  |  |
| **US Armed Services Member** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes |   |   |   | 2.7 | 2.5 |  |  |  |
| No |   |   |   | 97.3 | 97.5 |  |  |
| **Device Used to Complete Survey** |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Smart phone | 34.3 | 54.9 |  ★★★ | 73.0 | 77.1 | ★★ | ★★★ | ★★★ |
| Tablet | 2.9 | 6.4 |  ★★★ | 2.5 | 5.5 | ★★★ |  |  |
| Laptop or desktop computer | 61.4 | 35.9 | ★★★  | 23.8 | 16.2 | ★★★ | ★★★ | ★★★ |
| Other | 1.5 | 2.8 | ★★  | 0.7 | 1.1 |  |  | ★★★ |

1Statistical test for difference between full-time college students and other young adults in 2014.

2Statistical test for difference between full-time college students and other young adults in 2016.

3Statistical test for differences between 2014 and 2016.

Note 1: The n’s shown for each column are the unweighted sample sizes, and may be lower for some measures.

Note 2: Statistical tests are reported as follows: ★ (p<.10), ★★ (p<.05), ★★★ (p<.01)

**Appendix B**

**Comparison of YAS and NSDUH Prevalence Estimates**

Every year, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) releases state-level estimates of substance use prevalence and related measures derived from the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH). The estimates are based on a two-year time frame (e.g., 2013/2014). Due to the rigorous sampling and estimation methods used, NSDUH estimates for Vermont provide a useful standard against which to compare the estimates derived from the YAS. The tables below show the prevalence rates for several key prevalence measures in the YAS that are also provided for Vermont by NSDUH. Estimates from both surveys are for the 18 to 25 age group. For the 2014 YAS, the most appropriate NSDUH estimates for comparison purposes are the means of the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 estimates. For comparison to the 2016 YAS, only the NSDUH 2015/2016 estimates were used, as the 2016/2017 estimates were not yet available at the time this report was prepared.

For all measures examined, the comparisons between YAS and NSDUH were reasonably close, although in most cases the YAS estimates were slightly higher. The relatively high NSDUH estimate for prescription pain reliever misuse in the 2015/2016 seems to be an outlier, given the notably higher value than obtained for previous years. Overall, the comparisons suggest that the YAS sample does not differ dramatically from the state’s young adult population on key substance use behaviors as estimated by NSDUH, and therefore increases confidence that the YAS sample is adequately representative of young adult residents in Vermont.

Table B1. Comparisons of YAS 2014 estimates of key measures with NSDUH estimates.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Substance Use Measure** | **YAS Estimate****(2014)** | **NSDUH Estimate****(Mean of 2013/2014 and 2014/2015)** |
| Any alcohol use in past 30 days | 74.9 | 71.1 |
| Any marijuana use in past 30 days | 38.6 | 32.8 |
| Any misuse of Rx pain reliever in past year | 7.7 | 7.61 |
| Binge drinking2 in past 30 days | 56.4 | 46.71 |

1Based on NSDUH 2013/2014 estimate only due to NSDUH question wording changes made in 2015

2Binge drinking is defined as having 5 or more drinks (if male) or 4 or more drinks (if female) on a single occasion.

Table B1. Comparisons of YAS 2016 estimates of key measures with NSDUH estimates.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Substance Use Measure** | **YAS Estimate****(2016)** | **NSDUH Estimate****(2015/2016)** |
| Any alcohol use in past 30 days | 72.9 | 69.0 |
| Any marijuana use in past 30 days | 41.9 | 38.2 |
| Any misuse of Rx pain reliever in past year | 6.2 | 9.7 |
| Binge drinking1 in past 30 days | 49.3 | 47.5 |

1Binge drinking is defined as having 5 or more drinks (if male) or 4 or more drinks (if female) on a single occasion.

1. All superscripted footnotes may be found in Section G. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)