

## **(1) Introduction**

Sri Lanka per capita use of alcohol is known to be one of the highest in the world increased in Sri Lanka during the past decade. Statistics reveal that consumption of arrack has increased from 37,244,107 liters in 1990 to 56,624,910 liters in 2002 while beer consumption has increased from 9,115,821 liters in 1991 to 56,742,781 liters in 2002. In contrast a slight decline has been seen in tobacco use.

Problems related to use of tobacco/alcohol have also shown a corresponding increase. For example hospitalized cirrhosis patients have almost doubled from 9330 cases in 1990 to 17104 cases in 1999)

Available data on the economic impact of drug use on families shows that families spend a considerable amount of money on substance use. In a low income urban community, 29.6 percent of the families were found to spend a sum equivalent to 30% of their total expenditure on tobacco and alcohol (ADIC, 1994).

Statistics on use related social problems such as absenteeism, loss of production, family disharmony; behavioral problems of children as a result of father's use of alcohol are not readily available.

Most of the studies that have been carried out In Sri Lanka, have been confined to villages. The few large scale studies have been mostly confined to a few districts and have investigated one or two substances. (Randeniya et.al<sup>1</sup> SLANA<sup>2</sup>, ADIC<sup>3</sup>). No recent study has been carried out on a representative sample.

Thus the non-availability of a convincing information base has been one of the factors that has contributed to the lack of recognition of the problem.

The present study intends to be representative of the country. The methodology proposed in this survey is cost effective and has been used in Goa, India in 1984 by Dr. S.G. Vaidya and Dr. U.D. Naik. It involves obtaining from students' information about their parental smoking and drinking habits. In India, students were asked to raise their hands if their parents used tobacco. For this study it is proposed to use a one-page questionnaire to obtain the data.

A reliable and comprehensive information base will enable organizations working in the field of drug prevention to lobby policymakers, as well as educate the general public and students about the magnitude of the problem. It will also assist the policymakers in their endeavors to convince the politicians that it is necessary to formulate and implement policies relating to alcohol and tobacco use.

---

1 ADIC, Impact of alcohol use on family well-being, 1994

2 SLANA, Trend study of the use of Heroin, Ganja and Opium according to three prevalence patterns, 1990.

3 Randeniya B, Weeraooriya WAJ, Smoking patterns in Sri Lanka, 1989

4 ADIC, Community survey on substance use, 1992/93, 1995

5 Vaidya S G & Naik U D

Objectives of the survey:

1. To determine the prevalence of smoking, alcohol and other drug use
2. To identify urban/rural differentials in tobacco/alcohol use
3. To determine the attitudes and beliefs related to alcohol/tobacco use among students

## METHODOLOGY

This study was carried out in collaboration with NIE and the Ministry of Education. ADIC has worked in close collaboration with these two institutions previously.

The study was carried out among students in Year 6 and above. The age group was selected, as the students were able to fill up the questionnaire on their own.

The field work was carried out with the assistance of the Ministry of Education. The advisory committee of the Ministry was first informed about this proposal and gave their consent. Permission was also obtained from the Provincial Directors of Education. A co-coordinator for each school was appointed with the assistance of the respective Directors of Education and principals of selected schools. A small allowance was paid to these teachers to administer the questionnaires to the selected classes. They were asked to collect the questionnaires from the provincial centres and also return the filled questionnaires to these same offices. ADIC field co-coordinator was responsible for delivering the questionnaires to the regional offices, collecting the filled questionnaires and training teachers to select the sample.

The questionnaires were entered into the computers available at ADIC with the help of a team of data entry operators. Assistance for weighting the data was obtained from a qualified statistician. The data was analyzed by the research division of ADIC.

## **Study population**

The survey was conducted to study the parental drug use by administering a questionnaire on school going children who were in Grades 6 to 13.

## **Sample**

## Sample and time frame

This survey was carried out during January – February 2003. Preparation of the field work started in December 2001. Responses were taken within the last two weeks of January to minimize the possibility of a variation in the pattern of use.

The services of an experienced consultant was obtained to select the sample. Details of the sample is given below

Sample of the respondents were selected from 20 districts to represent all the socio economical levels of the country. A total number of 9195 school students were selected for the survey.

A stratified sample of school children was selected in two stages. At the first stage a sample schools was selected and at the second stage a sample of school children was selected.

## **Stratification**

The schools in the country were stratified as follows:

Strata 1- Schools in Colombo Municipal Council area

Strata 2 – Schools in the District of Colombo (excluding Colombo Municipal Council area), Gampaha, Kalutara, Galle and Matara

Strata 3 – Schools in the District of Hambantota, Ampara, Putlam, Anuradhapura, Polonnaruwa and Moneragala

Strata 4 – Schools in the District of Kandy, Matale, Nuwara Eliya, Kurunegala, Badulla, Ratnapura, and Kegalle

Strata 5 – Schools in the District of Batticaloa, Trincomalee

Schools in the Northern province consisting of the District of Jaffna, Kilinochchi, Mannar, Vavuniya, and Mulativu were excluded from the survey due to difficulties in data collection

This stratification was based on the Zones used in the Consumer Finance and Socio-economic surveys conducted by the Central Bank of Sri Lanka.

## Sampling Frame

The sampling frame consisted of the School categories 1 to 3 with over 80 students per school.

## Sample size and its allocation

### First stage sample

A sample of 150 schools was allocated to each stratum with probability proportionate to the size of the student population. The allocation of the sample was as follows:

Table 1

Selection of school per zone

Stratum	Number of schools	Student population	Sample of schools allocated
1	112	97510	7
2	1347	668171	46
3	1155	463469	32
4	2119	860842	59
5	240	96039	6
Total	4973	2186031	150

### Second stage sample

A sample of 80 students from each of the schools in the first stage sample was selected by the investigator (teacher) appointed to canvas the questionnaire. In the first instance, the investigator ascertained the number of classes in grades 6 to 13 in the school, divided 80 by this number and obtained the number of students to be selected from each class (round off the decimals to nearest number in such a way when added up the total will not exceed 80) and selected the number of students from each class by systematic simple random sampling method.

Table 2

## Selection of students and response rate

### Response to the questionnaire

Stratum	Number of schools	Student population	allocated Sample of schools	Sample of students selected	Schools responded	Students responded	% of sample responded	Response as a fraction of the student population.
1	112	97510	7	560		397	71	.00407
2	1347	668171	46	3680		3131	85	.00468
3	1155	463469	32	2560		1886	74	.00407
4	2119	860842	59	4720		3309	70	.00384
5	240	96039	6	480		472	98	.00491
Total	4973	2186031	150	12000		9195	77	.00421

The sample selected was an unbiased one. However the response to the total sample canvassed was 77 percent and it varied from strata to strata ranging from 70 percent to 98 percent. Therefore the unbiased ness has changed. However the impact on the findings of the survey appears to be negligible in view of the large size of the sample and the little variation of the findings within strata. Therefore in estimation of the totals for each variable the multiplication of the results by the inverse of the sampling fraction for each stratum was considered reasonably adequate for most purposes.

### Field work

#### Limitations of the study

As mentioned above the schools in the Northern Province were excluded from the sample due to difficulties in collecting information in this Province.

The survey covered students in Grades 6 to 13. Therefore information on parents of students below Grade 6 is not included.

Some parents may have more than one child going to the same school or another school. Since there was no way to prepare a list of students excluding the number of children more than one per parent the same parent may have got counted more than once.

The parents of children who are not attending any school and The adults who are not parents have got excluded in the study.

The lack of co-operation given by the Principals, especially those in the Colombo district, was a problem faced during the field work.

## Results

### Demographic data

Table 3 reveals that 50.4% of the respondents were females while 49.6% were males.

Table 3

Percentage distribution of the respondents by sex and living area

	LIVE		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Female	672 51.4%	3965 50.3%	4637 50.4%
Male	636 48.6%	3922 49.7%	4558 49.6%

The following table shows that up to year 11 the students were fairly evenly distributed.

Table 4

Percentage of the students by grade

Year		LIVE		Total
		Urban	Rural	
6	No	157	1033	1190
	%	12.0%	13.1%	12.9%
7		156	1061	1217
		11.9%	13.5%	13.2%
8		180	1085	1265
		13.8%	13.8%	13.8%
9		177	1157	1334
		13.5%	14.7%	14.5%
10		183	1189	1372
		14.0%	15.1%	14.9%
11		194	1145	1339
		14.8%	14.5%	14.6%
12		154	727	881
		11.8%	9.2%	9.6%
13		107	490	597
		8.2%	6.2%	6.5%
		1308	7887	9195
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

When the father's occupation is considered, table 5 reveals that 21.8 percent of the fathers were farmers, 20.8 percent were self-employed and 19.9 percent were laborers. When considering the rural sector, the highest percentage of fathers was employed as farmers (24.7%) whereas in the urban sector 29.0 percent of the fathers were self-employed. (see annexure for fathers occupation by zone)

Table 05

Percentage distribution of the fathers occupation

		LIVE		Total
		Urban	Rural	
No response	No	92	593	685
	%	7.0%	7.5%	7.4%
White collar		276	846	1122
		21.1%	10.7%	12.2%
Security forces		68	287	355
		5.2%	3.6%	3.9%
Technicians		127	693	820
		9.7%	8.8%	8.9%
Self employed		379	1530	1909
		29.0%	19.4%	20.8%
Farmers		53	1948	2001
		4.1%	24.7%	21.8%
Laboure		186	1640	1826
		14.2%	20.8%	19.9%
Other		127	350	477
		9.7%	4.4%	5.2%
		1308	7887	9195
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Data on number of sibling were obtained. It was seen that 14% of the sample had no siblings while 33 percent had only one sibling and 31 percent had two siblings.

Table 6

Percentage Distribution of students by number of siblings

		LIVE		Total
		Urban	Rural	
No of sibling		219	1153	1372
		16.7%	14.6%	14.9%
1		441	2593	3034
		33.7%	32.9%	33.0%
2		418	2430	2848
		32.0%	30.8%	31.0%
3		162	1188	1350
		12.4%	15.1%	14.7%
4		50	366	416
		3.8%	4.6%	4.5%
5		13	114	127
		1.0%	1.4%	1.4%
6		2	29	31
		.2%	.4%	.3%
7			5	5
			.1%	.1%
8		2	4	6
		.2%	.1%	.1%
9		1	5	6
		.1%	.1%	.1%

		1308	7887	9195
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

When area of residence was considered 14.1% resided in an urban sector and the majority (85.9%) lived in the rural areas.

### Parental of Tobacco

Of the total sample 48% of the students stated that their father smoked. This percentage was higher in the rural areas (50%) as opposed to the urban areas (38%)

Table 7  
Percentage distribution of fathers' use of Tobacco by urban/rural sector

	LIVE		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Yes	501	3935	4436
	38.3%	49.9%	48.2%
No	807	3952	4759
	61.7%	50.1%	51.8%
Total	1308	7887	9195
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

When zone is considered, it is seen that parents of the students living in the Colombo municipal area smoke considerably less (23%) while the highest prevalence is for parents living in dry zone district (56%). Parents living in Baticaloa and Trincomalee also smoke comparatively less than those living in the other zones(except Colombo Municipal area) .

Table 8  
Fathers use of tobacco by zone

	STRATA NO					Total
	Col MC	We prov	Dry zone	Central	Trinco/bat	
Yes	92	1523	1033	1624	164	4436
	23.2%	48.6%	54.8%	49.1%	34.7%	48.2%
No	305	1608	853	1685	308	4759
	76.8%	51.4%	45.2%	50.9%	65.3%	51.8%
	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

It is also interesting to note that when questioned '*if their mother smoked*' a positive response was given by only 0.4 percent of all respondents from both the urban and rural areas. Further analysis on smoking patterns of the mother was not carried out because the sample is small.

Table 9

Percentage distribution of Mothers use of tobacco by –urban rural sector

	LIVE		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Yes	10	26	36
	.8%	.3%	.4%
No	1298	7861	9159
	99.2%	99.7%	99.6%
Total	1308	7887	9195
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The children were questioned as to the frequency of their fathers' tobacco use. 47.6 percent classified their father as a daily smoker while 52.4 percent mentioned that their father was an occasional smoker. Urban rural differentials were minimal.

Table 10

Percentage distribution of fathers who are smokers by frequency of smoking and sector

	LIVE		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Daily	244	1868	2112
	48.7%	47.5%	47.6%
Occasionally	257	2067	2324
	51.3%	52.5%	52.4%
Total	501	3935	4436
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 11 shows that daily smokers are least in Colombo Municipal area (40%) and highest in dry zone (53%)

Table 11

Percentage distribution of fathers who are smokers by frequency of smoking and zone

	STRATA NO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Daily	37 40.2%	686 45.0%	548 53.0%	756 46.6%	85 51.8%	2112 47.6%
Occasionally	55 59.8%	837 55.0%	485 47.0%	868 53.4%	79 48.2%	2324 52.4%
	92 100.0%	1523 100.0%	1033 100.0%	1624 100.0%	164 100.0%	4436 100.0%

### Parental use of Alcohol

When questioned about fathers drinking habits 49.7% of the students reported positively. The percentage of fathers drinking was higher in the rural sector as opposed to the urban sector

Table 12

Percentage distribution of fathers use of alcohol by sector

	LIVE		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Yes	610	3956	4566
	46.6%	50.2%	49.7%
No	698	3931	4629
	53.4%	49.8%	50.3%
	1308	7887	9195
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 13 REVEALS THE ANALYSIS BY ZONE. THIS TABLE SHOWS THAT THE FATHERS WHO LIVE IN BATALOIA AND TRINCOMALEE DRINK THE LEAST WHILE THOSE FATHERS LIVING IN THE CENTRAL AND SABARAGAMUAWA PROVINCE DRINK THE MOST(53%)

Table 13

Percentage distribution of fathers use of alcohol by zone

	STRATA NO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Yes	171	1558	902	1759	176	4566
	43.1%	49.8%	47.8%	53.2%	37.3%	49.7%
No	226	1573	984	1550	296	4629
	56.9%	50.2%	52.2%	46.8%	62.7%	50.3%
	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Mothers pattern of drinking is seen in table 14 Out of the total respondents only 0.6 percent mentioned that their mothers drink alcohol. The prevalence was more (1.5%) in the urban areas when compared with the prevalence in the rural areas (0.5%). Since the percentage for mothers smoking is comparatively low, no further analysis was carried out .

TABLE 14

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MOTHERS USE OF ALCOHOL BY SECTOR

	LIVE		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Yes	19	40	59
	1.5%	.5%	.6%
No	1289	7847	9136
	98.5%	99.5%	99.4%

Total		1308	7887	9195
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Frequency of alcohol use was also considered in this survey. The findings were as follows. 15.1 percent were daily users and 84.9 percent were occasional users, with daily users being more frequent in rural areas.

Table 15

Percentage distribution of fathers who are drinkers by frequency of drinking and sector

	LIVE		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Daily	76	613	689
	12.5%	15.5%	15.1%
Occasionally	534	3343	3877
	87.5%	84.5%	84.9%
Total	610	3956	4566
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

WHEN ZONAL RESULTS ARE CONSIDERED IT IS SEEN THAT DAILY DRINKERS ARE AROUND 14% - 16% IN 4 ZONES (EXCEPT COLOMBO MUNICIPAL AREA )

Table 16

Percentage distribution of fathers who are drinkers by frequency of drinking and zone

	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Daily	6	253	150	252	28	689
	3.5%	16.2%	16.6%	14.3%	15.9%	15.1%
Occasionally	165	1305	752	1507	148	3877
	96.5%	83.8%	83.4%	85.7%	84.1%	84.9%
Total	171	1558	902	1759	176	4566
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Respondent were also questioned as to the type of alcohol their father drank and where they obtained it.

Table 17

Percentage distribution of fathers who are drinkers by source of obtaining alcohol and sector

	LIVE		Total
	Urban	Rural	
From bar	251	1355	1606
	41.1%	34.3%	35.2%
From community	118	1713	1831
	19.3%	49.3%	40.1%

Table shows that 40 percent of those residing in the urban sector had obtained their alcohol from a bar as opposed to 34% in the rural areas. in contrast a grater number of rural parents obtained their alcohol from the community (40%) as opposed to urban parents (19%)

According to the zonal data over 50 percent of the parents living in Baticaloa /Trincomalee obtained their supplies of alcohol from the bar. 50 percent of the parents living in the dry zone used supplies available in the community. On the other hand only 4% in the Colombo M C area replied that their fathers obtained their drink from the community.

Table 18

Percentage distribution of fathers who are users by source of obtaining alcohol and zone

Source	STRATA NO				
	1	2	3	4	5
Alcohol from bar	60 35.1%	522 33.5%	279 30.9%	649 36.9%	96 54.5%
Alcohol from Community	7 4.1%	576 37.0%	506 56.1%	673 38.3%	69 39.2%

**Fathers use of beer was also obtained**

**Beer**

37.7 percent of the respondents gave a positive response to the question ‘does your father use beer? this percentage was higher in urban sector (53.9%) when compared to rural sector (35.2%)

Table 20

Percentage distribution of fathers use of beer by sector

	LIVE		Total
	Urban	Rural	
No	281 46.1%	2564 64.8%	2845 62.3%
Yes	329 53.9%	1392 35.2%	1721 37.7%
Total	610 100.0%	3956 100.0%	4566 100.0%

WHEN ZONAL DIFFERENTIALS WERE EXAMINED IT WAS SEEN THAT BEER DRINKING WAS MORE PREDOMINANT IN THE COLOMBO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL AREA (73%) AND LEASE IN TRINCOMALEE/BATICALOA ZONE (38%)

Table 20

Percentage distribution of fathers use of beer by zone

	STRATA NO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No	46 26.9%	967 62.1%	622 69.0%	1077 61.2%	133 75.6%	2845 62.3%
Yes	125 73.1%	591 37.9%	280 31.0%	682 38.8%	43 24.4%	1721 37.7%
	171 100.0%	1558 100.0%	902 100.0%	1759 100.0%	176 100.0%	4566 100.0%

### Attitude of the students towards Alcohol Use

The students were asked if they agreed/disagreed with three statements on alcohol use in order to determine the students attitude towards use of tobacco alcohol. The first statement was 'whether alcohol brings enjoyment'. 79.5 percent of the respondent disagreed with this statement. On the other hand only 4.5% agreed with this statement with the percentage being slightly higher in the urban sector (6%) opposed to the rural sector (4%). Therefore it is seen that the majority of students recognize that alcohol does not bring enjoyment.

Table 21

Percentage distribution of students attitudes towards alcohol use by sector –Does alcohol use leads to enjoyment

	LIVE		Total
	Urban	Rural	
No responses	103 7.9%	734 9.3%	837 9.1%
Agree	80 6.1%	330 4.2%	410 4.5%
Some Agree	147 11.2%	491 6.2%	638 6.9%
Disagree	978 74.8%	6332 80.3%	7310 79.5%
Total	1308 100.0%	7887 100.0%	9195 100.0%

When the percentage agreeing /some what agreeing examined by zone , Table 22 reveals that those living in Baticaloa /Trincomalee believe that alcohol leads to enjoyment to a grater extent than students living in other zones

Table 22

Percentage distribution of students attitudes towards alcohol use by zone –Does alcohol use leads to enjoyment

	STRATA NO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No responses	24 6.0%	269 8.6%	193 10.2%	274 8.3%	77 16.3%	837 9.1%
Agree	15 3.8%	98 3.1%	96 5.1%	154 4.7%	47 10.0%	410 4.5%
Some Agree	45 11.3%	176 5.6%	143 7.6%	220 6.6%	54 11.4%	638 6.9%
Disagree	313 78.8%	2588 82.7%	1454 77.1%	2661 80.4%	294 62.3%	7310 79.5%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

‘Does alcohol make the user aggressive?’ was the second statement that was included. 66.4 percent disagreed with this statement. It must be noted that 33 percent of those in the urban areas agreed or somewhat agreed while 21 percent of those in rural areas gave a positive response to this statement

Table 23

Percentage distribution of students attitude towards alcohol use by sector- Does alcohol use leads to aggressiveness

	LIVE		Total
	Urban	Rural	
No responses	123 9.4%	861 10.9%	984 10.7%
Agree	211 16.1%	755 9.6%	966 10.5%
Some Agree	220 16.8%	922 11.7%	1142 12.4%
Disagree	754 57.6%	5349 67.8%	6103 66.4%
Total	1308	7887	9195

		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	--	--------	--------	--------

Examination of zonal differentiations reveals that over 30% of the student living in Colombo M C area and Trincomalee /Baticaloa District believe that alcohol use leads to aggressive behavior

Table 24

Percentage distribution of students attitude towards alcohol use by zone- Does alcohol use leads to aggressiveness

	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No responses	27 6.8%	291 9.3%	210 11.1%	368 11.1%	88 18.6%	984 10.7%
Agree	86 21.7%	291 9.3%	184 9.8%	309 9.3%	96 20.3%	966 10.5%
Some Agree	75 18.9%	347 11.1%	210 11.1%	443 13.4%	67 14.2%	1142 12.4%
Disagree	209 52.6%	2202 70.3%	1282 68.0%	2189 66.2%	221 46.8%	6103 66.4%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

'Does alcohol relieve tiredness?' was the third statement that was included. 66.4 percent disagreed with this statement. The percentage of those agreeing /some what agreeing with this statement were 25% in the urban areas and 22% in the rural areas

Table 25

Percentage distribution of students attitude towards alcohol use by sector- Does alcohol use leads to tiredness

Response	LIVE		Total
	Urban	Rural	
No responses	142	858	1000
	10.9%	10.9%	10.9%
Agree	115	614	729
	8.8%	7.8%	7.9%
Some Agree	223	1113	1336
	17.0%	14.1%	14.5%
Disagree	828	5302	6130
	63.3%	67.2%	66.7%
	1308	7887	9195

		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	--	--------	--------	--------

When zonal differential are considered it is seen that over 25 % in Trincomalee/Baticaloa and the dry zone agree/some what agree with the given statement

Table 26

Percentage distribution of students attitude towards alcohol use by sector- Does alcohol use leads to tiredness

Response	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No responses	34 8.6%	317 10.1%	224 11.9%	359 10.8%	66 14.0%	1000 10.9%
Agree	32 8.1%	187 6.0%	217 11.5%	230 7.0%	63 13.3%	729 7.9%
Some Agree	55 13.9%	398 12.7%	298 15.8%	473 14.3%	112 23.7%	1336 14.5%
Disagree	276 69.5%	2229 71.2%	1147 60.8%	2247 67.9%	231 48.9%	6130 66.7%
	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

Students were also asked to name the two factors that would influence a person to use tobacco alcohol .The responses are given in the following table.

According to the results it is clearly seen that students think that friends are the most factor that influences them to use alcohol. Over 65% stated this factor. Next in importance was advertisements. This response was given by over 30% of the students. Indirect advertisements through tele drama was also mentioned as a factor by 28% of the students

Table 27

Percentage distribution of students opinion on factors that would influence a person to use tobacco alcohol by sector

Factor	LIVE		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Availability	21.2%	22.9%	22.6%
Low cost	14.5%	17.5%	17.1%
Promotion	34.6%	32.7%	32.9%
Tele dramas Total	30.5%	27.9%	28.3%
Friends	66.0%	67.1%	67.0%
Family Problems	14.9%	11.4%	11.9%

Zonal analysis reveals similar trends with friends being the most important factor. However in the Trincomalee /Baticaloa Zone Tele dramas is seen to be more important than direct advertisements

Table 28

Percentage distribution of students opinion on factors that would influence a person to use tobacco alcohol by zone

	STRATA NO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Advertisements	154	1132	551	1079	113	3029
	38.8	36.2	29.2	32.6	23.9	32.9
Tele dramas	122	933	510	877	158	2600
	30.7%	29.8%	27.0%	26.5%	33.5%	28.3%
Friends	290	2089	1283	219	298	6158
	73.0	66.7	68.0	66.4	63.1	67.0
Family Problems	67	363	228	395	43	1096
	16.9	11.6	12.1	11.9	9.1	11.9

## Discussion

This study was carried out as hardly any national level data was available. Results shows that prevalence for tobacco was 48% with the percentage of fathers use being lower in urban sector (38%) an opposed to rural sector (50%). As for zonal differentials prevalence was highest for those parents residing in the dry zone district and lowest in the Colombo municipal area

Spot surveys conducted in bus stops in urban areas has revealed that tobacco use for males over 15 years was 40% during the period December 2002/January 2003.(ADIC 2003) Alcohol use figures for same period were 57.8%.

Prevalence rate for alcohol as reported by the students was 49% for their fathers with the percentage being lower in the urban sector (46.6%) as opposed to the rural sector (50.2%). Furthermore fathers residing in the Central /Sabaragamuwa region seemed to drink comparatively more alcohol than those in other zones.

Comparison of the results of this survey with that of the spot surveys reveal that for tobacco use a similar trend with the urban sector results could be seen. However for alcohol use alcohol use figures are comparatively higher. The differences could be due to the relatively higher beer drinking population in the urban areas. *(In the spot survey the sample comprise of youth who are in the age group 15 – 24. In this survey the sample population was parents. It is observed that beer is more popular among youth. this factor may be influenced to the results)* Mala is it ok to insert this

According to the results beer drinking is more prevalent in the Colombo Municipal council are (over 70%) compared to less than 40% in the other zones. In the spot surveys beer was identified as the most popular drink among males over 15 years of age with over % sating that they drank beer.

The results pertaining to mothers use of tobacco/alcohol use conform the fact that Sri Lankan women do not drink or smoke

Examination of students attitude reveals that the majority of students do not believe that tobacco alcohol use leads to enjoyment, aggressive behavior and relief from tiredness

influences of friends seen as the main influence that leads to people smoke and drinking. This results needs notify by youth parents and those engaged in drug prevention

**Mala please note the table number that should be inserted to annexure**

**Annexure**

**STRATANO \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

		LIVE		Total	
		Urban	Rural		
STRATANO	1	Count	225	172	397
		% within LIVE	17.2%	2.2%	4.3%
	2	Count	432	2699	3131
		% within LIVE	33.0%	34.2%	34.1%
	3	Count	192	1694	1886
		% within LIVE	14.7%	21.5%	20.5%
	4	Count	357	2952	3309
		% within LIVE	27.3%	37.4%	36.0%
	5	Count	102	370	472
		% within LIVE	7.8%	4.7%	5.1%
Total	Count	1308	7887	9195	
	% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

**YEAR \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
YEAR 6	Count		157	1033	1190
	% within LIVE		12.0%	13.1%	12.9%
7	Count		156	1061	1217
	% within LIVE		11.9%	13.5%	13.2%
8	Count		180	1085	1265
	% within LIVE		13.8%	13.8%	13.8%
9	Count		177	1157	1334
	% within LIVE		13.5%	14.7%	14.5%
10	Count		183	1189	1372
	% within LIVE		14.0%	15.1%	14.9%
11	Count		194	1145	1339
	% within LIVE		14.8%	14.5%	14.6%
12	Count		154	727	881
	% within LIVE		11.8%	9.2%	9.6%
13	Count		107	490	597
	% within LIVE		8.2%	6.2%	6.5%
Total	Count		1308	7887	9195
	% within LIVE		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**SEX \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
SEX Female	Count		672	3965	4637
	% within LIVE		51.4%	50.3%	50.4%
Male	Count		636	3922	4558
	% within LIVE		48.6%	49.7%	49.6%
Total	Count		1308	7887	9195
	% within LIVE		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**AGE \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
AGE	10	Count	65	265	330
		% within LIVE	5.0%	3.4%	3.6%
	11	Count	145	925	1070
		% within LIVE	11.1%	11.7%	11.6%
	12	Count	173	1142	1315
		% within LIVE	13.2%	14.5%	14.3%
	13	Count	164	1195	1359
		% within LIVE	12.5%	15.2%	14.8%
	14	Count	196	1114	1310
		% within LIVE	15.0%	14.1%	14.2%
	15	Count	178	1227	1405
		% within LIVE	13.6%	15.6%	15.3%
	16	Count	117	680	797
		% within LIVE	8.9%	8.6%	8.7%
	17	Count	130	636	766
		% within LIVE	9.9%	8.1%	8.3%
	18	Count	101	509	610
		% within LIVE	7.7%	6.5%	6.6%
	19	Count	36	167	203
		% within LIVE	2.8%	2.1%	2.2%
	20	Count	3	27	30
		% within LIVE	.2%	.3%	.3%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**JOB \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
JOB	No response	Count	92	593	685
		% within LIVE	7.0%	7.5%	7.4%
	White collar	Count	276	846	1122
		% within LIVE	21.1%	10.7%	12.2%
	Security forces	Count	68	287	355
		% within LIVE	5.2%	3.6%	3.9%
	Technicians	Count	127	693	820
		% within LIVE	9.7%	8.8%	8.9%
	Self employed	Count	379	1530	1909
		% within LIVE	29.0%	19.4%	20.8%
	Farmers	Count	53	1948	2001
		% within LIVE	4.1%	24.7%	21.8%
	Laboure	Count	186	1640	1826
		% within LIVE	14.2%	20.8%	19.9%
	Other	Count	127	350	477
		% within LIVE	9.7%	4.4%	5.2%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**SISBRO \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
SISBRO	No	Count	219	1153	1372
		% within LIVE	16.7%	14.6%	14.9%
1		Count	441	2593	3034
		% within LIVE	33.7%	32.9%	33.0%
2		Count	418	2430	2848
		% within LIVE	32.0%	30.8%	31.0%
3		Count	162	1188	1350
		% within LIVE	12.4%	15.1%	14.7%
4		Count	50	366	416
		% within LIVE	3.8%	4.6%	4.5%
5		Count	13	114	127
		% within LIVE	1.0%	1.4%	1.4%
6		Count	2	29	31
		% within LIVE	.2%	.4%	.3%
7		Count		5	5
		% within LIVE		.1%	.1%
8		Count	2	4	6
		% within LIVE	.2%	.1%	.1%
9		Count	1	5	6
		% within LIVE	.1%	.1%	.1%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**FSMOKE \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
FSMOKE	Yes	Count	501	3935	4436
		% within LIVE	38.3%	49.9%	48.2%
	No	Count	807	3952	4759
		% within LIVE	61.7%	50.1%	51.8%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**MSMOKE \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
MSMOKE	Yes	Count	10	26	36
		% within LIVE	.8%	.3%	.4%
	No	Count	1298	7861	9159
		% within LIVE	99.2%	99.7%	99.6%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**FDRINK \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
FDRINK	Yes	Count	610	3956	4566
		% within LIVE	46.6%	50.2%	49.7%
	No	Count	698	3931	4629
		% within LIVE	53.4%	49.8%	50.3%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**MDRINK \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
MDRINK	Yes	Count	19	40	59
		% within LIVE	1.5%	.5%	.6%
	No	Count	1289	7847	9136
		% within LIVE	98.5%	99.5%	99.4%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Crosstabs**

**Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
FSmokeFre * LIVE	4436	100.0%	0	.0%	4436	100.0%

**FSmokeFre \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
FSmokeFre	Daily	Count	244	1868	2112
		% within LIVE	48.7%	47.5%	47.6%
	Occasionally	Count	257	2067	2324
		% within LIVE	51.3%	52.5%	52.4%
Total		Count	501	3935	4436
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

## Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
FDrinkFre * LIVE	4566	100.0%	0	.0%	4566	100.0%

**FDrinkFre \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
FDrinkFre	Daily	Count	76	613	689
		% within LIVE	12.5%	15.5%	15.1%
	Occasionally	Count	534	3343	3877
		% within LIVE	87.5%	84.5%	84.9%
Total		Count	610	3956	4566
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

## Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
BARAL * LIVE	4566	100.0%	0	.0%	4566	100.0%
VillageAL * LIVE	4566	100.0%	0	.0%	4566	100.0%
BEER * LIVE	4566	100.0%	0	.0%	4566	100.0%

Where dose your father get alcohol

**BARAL \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
BARAL	No	Count	359	2601	2960
		% within LIVE	58.9%	65.7%	64.8%
	Yes	Count	251	1355	1606
		% within LIVE	41.1%	34.3%	35.2%
Total		Count	610	3956	4566
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Within the village

**VillageAL \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
VillageAL	No	Count	492	2243	2735
		% within LIVE	80.7%	56.7%	59.9%
	Yes	Count	118	1713	1831
		% within LIVE	19.3%	43.3%	40.1%
Total		Count	610	3956	4566
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Dose your father use beer

**BEER \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
BEER	No	Count	281	2564	2845
		% within LIVE	46.1%	64.8%	62.3%
	Yes	Count	329	1392	1721
		% within LIVE	53.9%	35.2%	37.7%
Total		Count	610	3956	4566
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Crosstabs**

**Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
ENJOY * LIVE	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
ROWDY * LIVE	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
TIRED * LIVE	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%

**ENJOY \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
ENJOY	No responses	Count	103	734	837
		% within LIVE	7.9%	9.3%	9.1%
	Agree	Count	80	330	410
		% within LIVE	6.1%	4.2%	4.5%
	Some Agree	Count	147	491	638
		% within LIVE	11.2%	6.2%	6.9%
	Disagree	Count	978	6332	7310
		% within LIVE	74.8%	80.3%	79.5%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**ROWDY \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
ROWDY	No responses	Count	123	861	984
		% within LIVE	9.4%	10.9%	10.7%
	Agree	Count	211	755	966
		% within LIVE	16.1%	9.6%	10.5%
	Some Agree	Count	220	922	1142
		% within LIVE	16.8%	11.7%	12.4%
	Disagree	Count	754	5349	6103
		% within LIVE	57.6%	67.8%	66.4%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**TIRED \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
TIRED	No responses	Count	142	858	1000
		% within LIVE	10.9%	10.9%	10.9%
	Agree	Count	115	614	729
		% within LIVE	8.8%	7.8%	7.9%
	Some Agree	Count	223	1113	1336
		% within LIVE	17.0%	14.1%	14.5%
	Disagree	Count	828	5302	6130
		% within LIVE	63.3%	67.2%	66.7%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Crosstabs**

**Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Availability * LIVE	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
PRICE * LIVE	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
AD * LIVE	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
TELE * LIVE	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
FRIENDS * LIVE	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%

What are the influence factors for alcohol use

**Availability \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
Availability	No	Count	1032	6084	7116
		% within LIVE	78.9%	77.1%	77.4%
	Yes	Count	276	1803	2079
		% within LIVE	21.1%	22.9%	22.6%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**PRICE \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
PRICE	No	Count	1118	6508	7626
		% within LIVE	85.5%	82.5%	82.9%
	Yes	Count	190	1379	1569
		% within LIVE	14.5%	17.5%	17.1%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**AD \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
AD	No	Count	856	5310	6166
		% within LIVE	65.4%	67.3%	67.1%
	Yes	Count	452	2577	3029
		% within LIVE	34.6%	32.7%	32.9%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**TELE \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
TELE	0	Count	909	5686	6595
		% within LIVE	69.5%	72.1%	71.7%
	1	Count	399	2201	2600
		% within LIVE	30.5%	27.9%	28.3%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**FRIENDS \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
FRIENDS	No	Count	445	2592	3037
		% within LIVE	34.0%	32.9%	33.0%
	Yes	Count	863	5295	6158
		% within LIVE	66.0%	67.1%	67.0%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reasons given by students

**Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
OTHER01 * LIVE	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%

**OTHER01 \* LIVE Crosstabulation**

			LIVE		Total
			Urban	Rural	
OTHER01	0	Count	1013	6301	7314
		% within LIVE	77.4%	79.9%	79.5%
Family Prob		Count	195	901	1096
		% within LIVE	14.9%	11.4%	11.9%
Habit		Count	23	154	177
		% within LIVE	1.8%	2.0%	1.9%
Enjoyment		Count	27	135	162
		% within LIVE	2.1%	1.7%	1.8%
Outstand		Count	18	63	81
		% within LIVE	1.4%	.8%	.9%
Produce		Count	2	54	56
		% within LIVE	.2%	.7%	.6%
Size		Count	10	162	172
		% within LIVE	.8%	2.1%	1.9%
Immiteate		Count	2	32	34
		% within LIVE	.2%	.4%	.4%
Not aware of harm		Count	16	81	97
		% within LIVE	1.2%	1.0%	1.1%
no legal act		Count	2	4	6
		% within LIVE	.2%	.1%	.1%
Total		Count	1308	7887	9195
		% within LIVE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

## Crosstabs by Strata

### Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
YEAR * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
SEX * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
AGE * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
JOB * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
SISBRO * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
LIVE * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
FSMOKE * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
MSMOKE * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
FDRINK * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
MDRINK * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%

### YEAR \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

		STRATANO					Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
YEAR 6	Count	54	408	250	411	67	1190
	% within STRATANO	13.6%	13.0%	13.3%	12.4%	14.2%	12.9%
7	Count	47	444	247	410	69	1217
	% within STRATANO	11.8%	14.2%	13.1%	12.4%	14.6%	13.2%
8	Count	50	455	241	454	65	1265
	% within STRATANO	12.6%	14.5%	12.8%	13.7%	13.8%	13.8%
9	Count	50	477	269	480	58	1334
	% within STRATANO	12.6%	15.2%	14.3%	14.5%	12.3%	14.5%
10	Count	60	527	269	459	57	1372
	% within STRATANO	15.1%	16.8%	14.3%	13.9%	12.1%	14.9%
11	Count	46	459	286	478	70	1339
	% within STRATANO	11.6%	14.7%	15.2%	14.4%	14.8%	14.6%
12	Count	70	214	180	376	41	881
	% within STRATANO	17.6%	6.8%	9.5%	11.4%	8.7%	9.6%
13	Count	20	147	144	241	45	597
	% within STRATANO	5.0%	4.7%	7.6%	7.3%	9.5%	6.5%
Total	Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
	% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**SEX \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
SEX	Female	Count	80	1374	1053	1807	323	4637
		% within STRATANO	20.2%	43.9%	55.8%	54.6%	68.4%	50.4%
	Male	Count	317	1757	833	1502	149	4558
		% within STRATANO	79.8%	56.1%	44.2%	45.4%	31.6%	49.6%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**AGE \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
AGE	10	Count	20	104	63	129	14	330
		% within STRATANO	5.0%	3.3%	3.3%	3.9%	3.0%	3.6%
	11	Count	54	396	209	338	73	1070
		% within STRATANO	13.6%	12.6%	11.1%	10.2%	15.5%	11.6%
	12	Count	50	458	274	480	53	1315
		% within STRATANO	12.6%	14.6%	14.5%	14.5%	11.2%	14.3%
	13	Count	48	486	250	497	78	1359
		% within STRATANO	12.1%	15.5%	13.3%	15.0%	16.5%	14.8%
	14	Count	56	478	249	457	70	1310
		% within STRATANO	14.1%	15.3%	13.2%	13.8%	14.8%	14.2%
	15	Count	61	545	277	472	50	1405
		% within STRATANO	15.4%	17.4%	14.7%	14.3%	10.6%	15.3%
	16	Count	20	283	180	271	43	797
		% within STRATANO	5.0%	9.0%	9.5%	8.2%	9.1%	8.7%
	17	Count	54	177	170	338	27	766
		% within STRATANO	13.6%	5.7%	9.0%	10.2%	5.7%	8.3%
	18	Count	29	158	141	254	28	610
		% within STRATANO	7.3%	5.0%	7.5%	7.7%	5.9%	6.6%
	19	Count	5	42	63	65	28	203
		% within STRATANO	1.3%	1.3%	3.3%	2.0%	5.9%	2.2%
	20	Count		4	10	8	8	30
		% within STRATANO		.1%	.5%	.2%	1.7%	.3%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**JOB \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
JOB	No response	Count	19	278	114	235	39	685
		% within STRATANO	4.8%	8.9%	6.0%	7.1%	8.3%	7.4%
	White collur	Count	148	385	141	414	34	1122
		% within STRATANO	37.3%	12.3%	7.5%	12.5%	7.2%	12.2%
	Security forces	Count	29	139	53	104	30	355
		% within STRATANO	7.3%	4.4%	2.8%	3.1%	6.4%	3.9%
	Technicians	Count	17	420	106	269	8	820
		% within STRATANO	4.3%	13.4%	5.6%	8.1%	1.7%	8.9%
	Self employed	Count	134	736	273	697	69	1909
		% within STRATANO	33.8%	23.5%	14.5%	21.1%	14.6%	20.8%
	Farmers	Count	1	120	852	881	147	2001
		% within STRATANO	.3%	3.8%	45.2%	26.6%	31.1%	21.8%
	Laboure	Count	5	866	294	574	87	1826
		% within STRATANO	1.3%	27.7%	15.6%	17.3%	18.4%	19.9%
	Other	Count	44	187	53	135	58	477
		% within STRATANO	11.1%	6.0%	2.8%	4.1%	12.3%	5.2%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**SISBRO \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
SISBRO	No	Count	84	466	267	492	63	1372
		% within STRATANO	21.2%	14.9%	14.2%	14.9%	13.3%	14.9%
	1	Count	165	1084	592	1073	120	3034
		% within STRATANO	41.6%	34.6%	31.4%	32.4%	25.4%	33.0%
	2	Count	111	969	562	1046	160	2848
		% within STRATANO	28.0%	30.9%	29.8%	31.6%	33.9%	31.0%
	3	Count	27	424	305	498	96	1350
		% within STRATANO	6.8%	13.5%	16.2%	15.0%	20.3%	14.7%
	4	Count	9	140	108	134	25	416
		% within STRATANO	2.3%	4.5%	5.7%	4.0%	5.3%	4.5%
	5	Count	1	35	42	43	6	127
		% within STRATANO	.3%	1.1%	2.2%	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%
	6	Count		10	7	13	1	31
		% within STRATANO		.3%	.4%	.4%	.2%	.3%
	7	Count			1	4		5
		% within STRATANO			.1%	.1%		.1%
	8	Count		2	2	2		6
		% within STRATANO		.1%	.1%	.1%		.1%
	9	Count		1		4	1	6
		% within STRATANO		.0%		.1%	.2%	.1%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**LIVE \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
LIVE	Urban	Count	225	432	192	357	102	1308
		% within STRATANO	56.7%	13.8%	10.2%	10.8%	21.6%	14.2%
	Rural	Count	172	2699	1694	2952	370	7887
		% within STRATANO	43.3%	86.2%	89.8%	89.2%	78.4%	85.8%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**FSMOKE \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
FSMOKE	Yes	Count	92	1523	1033	1624	164	4436
		% within STRATANO	23.2%	48.6%	54.8%	49.1%	34.7%	48.2%
	No	Count	305	1608	853	1685	308	4759
		% within STRATANO	76.8%	51.4%	45.2%	50.9%	65.3%	51.8%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**MSMOKE \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
MSMOKE	Yes	Count	2	6	13	15		36
		% within STRATANO	.5%	.2%	.7%	.5%		.4%
	No	Count	395	3125	1873	3294	472	9159
		% within STRATANO	99.5%	99.8%	99.3%	99.5%	100.0%	99.6%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**FDRINK \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
FDRINK	Yes	Count	171	1558	902	1759	176	4566
		% within STRATANO	43.1%	49.8%	47.8%	53.2%	37.3%	49.7%
	No	Count	226	1573	984	1550	296	4629
		% within STRATANO	56.9%	50.2%	52.2%	46.8%	62.7%	50.3%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**MDRINK \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
MDRINK	Yes	Count	5	14	8	29	3	59
		% within STRATANO	1.3%	.4%	.4%	.9%	.6%	.6%
	No	Count	392	3117	1878	3280	469	9136
		% within STRATANO	98.7%	99.6%	99.6%	99.1%	99.4%	99.4%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Crosstabs**

**Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
FSmokeFre * STRATANO	4436	100.0%	0	.0%	4436	100.0%

**FSmokeFre \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
FSmokeFre	Daily	Count	37	686	548	756	85	2112
		% within STRATANO	40.2%	45.0%	53.0%	46.6%	51.8%	47.6%
	Occasionally	Count	55	837	485	868	79	2324
		% within STRATANO	59.8%	55.0%	47.0%	53.4%	48.2%	52.4%
Total		Count	92	1523	1033	1624	164	4436
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Crosstabs**

**Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
FDrinkFre * STRATANO	4566	100.0%	0	.0%	4566	100.0%

**FDrinkFre \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
FDrinkFre	Daily	Count	6	253	150	252	28	689
		% within STRATANO	3.5%	16.2%	16.6%	14.3%	15.9%	15.1%
	Occasionally	Count	165	1305	752	1507	148	3877
		% within STRATANO	96.5%	83.8%	83.4%	85.7%	84.1%	84.9%
Total		Count	171	1558	902	1759	176	4566
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Crosstabs**

**Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
BARAL * STRATANO	4566	100.0%	0	.0%	4566	100.0%
OTHER * STRATANO	4566	100.0%	0	.0%	4566	100.0%
BEER * STRATANO	4566	100.0%	0	.0%	4566	100.0%

**BARAL \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
BARAL	No	Count	111	1036	623	1110	80	2960
		% within STRATANO	64.9%	66.5%	69.1%	63.1%	45.5%	64.8%
	Yes	Count	60	522	279	649	96	1606
		% within STRATANO	35.1%	33.5%	30.9%	36.9%	54.5%	35.2%
Total		Count	171	1558	902	1759	176	4566
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**OTHER \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
OTHER	No	Count	170	1555	902	1759	176	4562
		% within STRATANO	99.4%	99.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%
	3	Count	1	3				4
		% within STRATANO	.6%	.2%				.1%
Total		Count	171	1558	902	1759	176	4566
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**BEER \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
BEER	No	Count	46	967	622	1077	133	2845
		% within STRATANO	26.9%	62.1%	69.0%	61.2%	75.6%	62.3%
	Yes	Count	125	591	280	682	43	1721
		% within STRATANO	73.1%	37.9%	31.0%	38.8%	24.4%	37.7%
Total		Count	171	1558	902	1759	176	4566
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Crosstabs**

**Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
VillageAL * STRATANO	4566	100.0%	0	.0%	4566	100.0%

**VillageAL \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
VillageAL	No	Count	164	982	396	1086	107	2735
		% within STRATANO	95.9%	63.0%	43.9%	61.7%	60.8%	59.9%
	Yes	Count	7	576	506	673	69	1831
		% within STRATANO	4.1%	37.0%	56.1%	38.3%	39.2%	40.1%
Total		Count	171	1558	902	1759	176	4566
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Crosstabs**

**Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
ENJOY * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
ROWDY * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
TIRED * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
Availability * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
PRICE * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
AD * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
TELE * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
FRIENDS * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%
OTHER01 * STRATANO	9195	100.0%	0	.0%	9195	100.0%

**ENJOY \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
ENJOY	No responses	Count	24	269	193	274	77	837
		% within STRATANO	6.0%	8.6%	10.2%	8.3%	16.3%	9.1%
	Agree	Count	15	98	96	154	47	410
		% within STRATANO	3.8%	3.1%	5.1%	4.7%	10.0%	4.5%
	Some Agree	Count	45	176	143	220	54	638
		% within STRATANO	11.3%	5.6%	7.6%	6.6%	11.4%	6.9%
	Disagree	Count	313	2588	1454	2661	294	7310
		% within STRATANO	78.8%	82.7%	77.1%	80.4%	62.3%	79.5%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**ROWDY \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
ROWDY	No responses	Count	27	291	210	368	88	984
		% within STRATANO	6.8%	9.3%	11.1%	11.1%	18.6%	10.7%
	Agree	Count	86	291	184	309	96	966
		% within STRATANO	21.7%	9.3%	9.8%	9.3%	20.3%	10.5%
	Some Agree	Count	75	347	210	443	67	1142
		% within STRATANO	18.9%	11.1%	11.1%	13.4%	14.2%	12.4%
	Disagree	Count	209	2202	1282	2189	221	6103
		% within STRATANO	52.6%	70.3%	68.0%	66.2%	46.8%	66.4%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**TIRED \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
TIRED	No responses	Count	34	317	224	359	66	1000
		% within STRATANO	8.6%	10.1%	11.9%	10.8%	14.0%	10.9%
	Agree	Count	32	187	217	230	63	729
		% within STRATANO	8.1%	6.0%	11.5%	7.0%	13.3%	7.9%
	Some Agree	Count	55	398	298	473	112	1336
		% within STRATANO	13.9%	12.7%	15.8%	14.3%	23.7%	14.5%
	Disagree	Count	276	2229	1147	2247	231	6130
		% within STRATANO	69.5%	71.2%	60.8%	67.9%	48.9%	66.7%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Availability \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Availability	No	Count	318	2444	1386	2588	380	7116
		% within STRATANO	80.1%	78.1%	73.5%	78.2%	80.5%	77.4%
	Yes	Count	79	687	500	721	92	2079
		% within STRATANO	19.9%	21.9%	26.5%	21.8%	19.5%	22.6%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**PRICE \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
PRICE	No	Count	356	2615	1459	2781	415	7626
		% within STRATANO	89.7%	83.5%	77.4%	84.0%	87.9%	82.9%
	Yes	Count	41	516	427	528	57	1569
		% within STRATANO	10.3%	16.5%	22.6%	16.0%	12.1%	17.1%
Total		Count	397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
		% within STRATANO	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**AD \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
AD	No	Count	243	1999	1335	2230	359	6166
		% within STRATANO	61.2%	63.8%	70.8%	67.4%	76.1%	67.1%
	Yes	Count	154	1132	551	1079	113	3029
		% within STRATANO	38.8%	36.2%	29.2%	32.6%	23.9%	32.9%
Total	Count		397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
	% within STRATANO		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**TELE \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
TELE	0	Count	275	2198	1376	2432	314	6595
		% within STRATANO	69.3%	70.2%	73.0%	73.5%	66.5%	71.7%
	1	Count	122	933	510	877	158	2600
		% within STRATANO	30.7%	29.8%	27.0%	26.5%	33.5%	28.3%
Total	Count		397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
	% within STRATANO		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**FRIENDS \* STRATANO Crosstabulation**

			STRATANO					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
FRIENDS	No	Count	107	1042	603	1111	174	3037
		% within STRATANO	27.0%	33.3%	32.0%	33.6%	36.9%	33.0%
	Yes	Count	290	2089	1283	2198	298	6158
		% within STRATANO	73.0%	66.7%	68.0%	66.4%	63.1%	67.0%
Total	Count		397	3131	1886	3309	472	9195
	% within STRATANO		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

OTHER01 \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

			STRATANO				
			1	2	3	4	5
OTHER01 0	Count		289	2581	1493	2558	393
	% within STRATANO		72.8%	82.4%	79.2%	77.3%	83.3%
Family Prob	Count		67	363	228	395	43
	% within STRATANO		16.9%	11.6%	12.1%	11.9%	9.1%
Habit	Count		12	32	33	85	15
	% within STRATANO		3.0%	1.0%	1.7%	2.6%	3.2%
Enjoyment	Count		9	32	33	75	13
	% within STRATANO		2.3%	1.0%	1.7%	2.3%	2.8%
Outstand	Count		8	25	11	36	1
	% within STRATANO		2.0%	.8%	.6%	1.1%	.2%
Produce	Count		2	5	14	32	3
	% within STRATANO		.5%	.2%	.7%	1.0%	.6%
Size	Count		2	50	45	74	1
	% within STRATANO		.5%	1.6%	2.4%	2.2%	.2%
Immiteate	Count			18	6	10	
	% within STRATANO			.6%	.3%	.3%	
Not aware of harm	Count		8	23	22	41	3
	% within STRATANO		2.0%	.7%	1.2%	1.2%	.6%
no legal act	Count			2	1	3	
	% within STRATANO			.1%	.1%	.1%	
Total	Count		397	3131	1886	3309	472
	% within STRATANO		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

YEAR \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

YEAR \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

Year	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
6	54 13.6%	408 13.0%	250 13.3%	411 12.4%	67 14.2%	1190 12.9%
7	47 11.8%	444 14.2%	247 13.1%	410 12.4%	69 14.6%	1217 13.2%
8	50 12.6%	455 14.5%	241 12.8%	454 13.7%	65 13.8%	1265 13.8%
9	50 12.6%	477 15.2%	269 14.3%	480 14.5%	58 12.3%	1334 14.5%
10	60 15.1%	527 16.8%	269 14.3%	459 13.9%	57 12.1%	1372 14.9%
11	46 11.6%	459 14.7%	286 15.2%	478 14.4%	70 14.8%	1339 14.6%
12	70 17.6%	214 6.8%	180 9.5%	376 11.4%	41 8.7%	881 9.6%

13	20 5.0%	147 4.7%	144 7.6%	241 7.3%	45 9.5%	597 6.5%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

SEX \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

SEX	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Female	80 20.2%	1374 43.9%	1053 55.8%	1807 54.6%	323 68.4%	4637 50.4%
Male	317 79.8%	1757 56.1%	833 44.2%	1502 45.4%	149 31.6%	4558 49.6%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

AGE \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

AGE	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
10	20 5.0%	104 3.3%	63 3.3%	129 3.9%	14 3.0%	330 3.6%
11	54 13.6%	396 12.6%	209 11.1%	338 10.2%	73 15.5%	1070 11.6%
12	50 12.6%	458 14.6%	274 14.5%	480 14.5%	53 11.2%	1315 14.3%
13	48 12.1%	486 15.5%	250 13.3%	497 15.0%	78 16.5%	1359 14.8%
14	56 14.1%	478 15.3%	249 13.2%	457 13.8%	70 14.8%	1310 14.2%
15	61 15.4%	545 17.4%	277 14.7%	472 14.3%	50 10.6%	1405 15.3%
16	20 5.0%	283 9.0%	180 9.5%	271 8.2%	43 9.1%	797 8.7%
17	54 13.6%	177 5.7%	170 9.0%	338 10.2%	27 5.7%	766 8.3%
18	29 7.3%	158 5.0%	141 7.5%	254 7.7%	28 5.9%	610 6.6%
19	5 1.3%	42 1.3%	63 3.3%	65 2.0%	28 5.9%	203 2.2%
20		4 .1%	10 .5%	8 .2%	8 1.7%	30 .3%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

JOB \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

JOB	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No response	19 4.8%	278 8.9%	114 6.0%	235 7.1%	39 8.3%	685 7.4%
White collar	148 37.3%	385 12.3%	141 7.5%	414 12.5%	34 7.2%	1122 12.2%
Security forces	29 7.3%	139 4.4%	53 2.8%	104 3.1%	30 6.4%	355 3.9%
Technicians	17 4.3%	420 13.4%	106 5.6%	269 8.1%	8 1.7%	820 8.9%
Self employed	134 33.8%	736 23.5%	273 14.5%	697 21.1%	69 14.6%	1909 20.8%
Farmers	1 .3%	120 3.8%	852 45.2%	881 26.6%	147 31.1%	2001 21.8%
Labourers	5 1.3%	866 27.7%	294 15.6%	574 17.3%	87 18.4%	1826 19.9%
Other	44 11.1%	187 6.0%	53 2.8%	135 4.1%	58 12.3%	477 5.2%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

SISBRO \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

SISBRO	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No	84 21.2%	466 14.9%	267 14.2%	492 14.9%	63 13.3%	1372 14.9%
1	165 41.6%	1084 34.6%	592 31.4%	1073 32.4%	120 25.4%	3034 33.0%
2	111 28.0%	969 30.9%	562 29.8%	1046 31.6%	160 33.9%	2848 31.0%
3	27 6.8%	424 13.5%	305 16.2%	498 15.0%	96 20.3%	1350 14.7%
4	9 2.3%	140 4.5%	108 5.7%	134 4.0%	25 5.3%	416 4.5%
5	1 .3%	35 1.1%	42 2.2%	43 1.3%	6 1.3%	127 1.4%
6		10 .3%	7 .4%	13 .4%	1 .2%	31 .3%
7			1 .1%	4 .1%		5 .1%
8		2 .1%	2 .1%	2 .1%		6 .1%
9		1 .0%		4 .1%	1 .2%	6 .1%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

LIVE \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

LIVE	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Urban	225 56.7%	432 13.8%	192 10.2%	357 10.8%	102 21.6%	1308 14.2%
Rural	172 43.3%	2699 86.2%	1694 89.8%	2952 89.2%	370 78.4%	7887 85.8%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

FSMOKE \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

FSMOKE	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Yes	92 23.2%	1523 48.6%	1033 54.8%	1624 49.1%	164 34.7%	4436 48.2%
No	305 76.8%	1608 51.4%	853 45.2%	1685 50.9%	308 65.3%	4759 51.8%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

MSMOKE \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

MSMOKE	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Yes	2 .5%	6 .2%	13 .7%	15 .5%		36 .4%
No	395 99.5%	3125 99.8%	1873 99.3%	3294 99.5%	472 100.0%	9159 99.6%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

FDRINK \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

FDRINK	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Yes	171 43.1%	1558 49.8%	902 47.8%	1759 53.2%	176 37.3%	4566 49.7%
No	226 56.9%	1573 50.2%	984 52.2%	1550 46.8%	296 62.7%	4629 50.3%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

MDRINK \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

MDRINK	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	

Yes	5 1.3%	14 .4%	8 .4%	29 .9%	3 .6%	59 .6%
No	392 98.7%	3117 99.6%	1878 99.6%	3280 99.1%	469 99.4%	9136 99.4%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

FSmokeFre \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

FSmokeFre	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Daily	37 40.2%	686 45.0%	548 53.0%		85 51.8%	2112 47.6%
Occasionally	55 59.8%	837 55.0%	485 47.0%	868 53.4%	79 48.2%	2324 52.4%
Total	92 100.0%	1523 100.0%	1033 100.0%	1624 100.0%	164 100.0%	4436 100.0%

FDrinkFre \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

FDrinkFre	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Daily	6 3.5%	253 16.2%	150 16.6%	252 14.3%	28 15.9%	689 15.1%
Occasionally	165 96.5%	1305 83.8%	752 83.4%	1507 85.7%	148 84.1%	3877 84.9%
Total	171 100.0%	1558 100.0%	902 100.0%	1759 100.0%	176 100.0%	4566 100.0%

BARAL \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

BARAL	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No	111 64.9%	1036 66.5%	623 69.1%	1110 63.1%	80 45.5%	2960 64.8%
Yes	60 35.1%	522 33.5%	279 30.9%	649 36.9%	96 54.5%	1606 35.2%
Total	171 100.0%	1558 100.0%	902 100.0%	1759 100.0%	176 100.0%	4566 100.0%

OTHER \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

OTHER	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No	170 99.4%	1555 99.8%	902 100.0%	1759 100.0%	176 100.0%	4562 99.9%
3	1 .6%	3 .2%				4 .1%

Total	171 100.0%	1558 100.0%	902 100.0%	1759 100.0%	176 100.0%	4566 100.0%
-------	---------------	----------------	---------------	----------------	---------------	----------------

BEER \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

BEER	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No	46 26.9%	967 62.1%	622 69.0%	1077 61.2%	133 75.6%	2845 62.3%
Yes	125 73.1%	591 37.9%	280 31.0%	682 38.8%	43 24.4%	1721 37.7%
Total	171 100.0%	1558 100.0%	902 100.0%	1759 100.0%	176 100.0%	4566 100.0%

VillageAL \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

VillageAL	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No	164 95.9%	982 63.0%	396 43.9%	1086 61.7%	107 60.8%	2735 59.9%
Yes	7 4.1%	576 37.0%	506 56.1%	673 38.3%	69 39.2%	1831 40.1%
Total	171 100.0%	1558 100.0%	902 100.0%	1759 100.0%	176 100.0%	4566 100.0%

ENJOY \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

ENJOY	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No responses	24 6.0%	269 8.6%	193 10.2%	274 8.3%	77 16.3%	837 9.1%
Agree	15 3.8%	98 3.1%	96 5.1%	154 4.7%	47 10.0%	410 4.5%
Some Agree	45 11.3%	176 5.6%	143 7.6%	220 6.6%	54 11.4%	638 6.9%
Disagree	313 78.8%	2588 82.7%	1454 77.1%	2661 80.4%	294 62.3%	7310 79.5%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

ROWDY \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

ROWDY	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	

No responses	27 6.8%	291 9.3%	210 11.1%	368 11.1%	88 18.6%	984 10.7%
Agree	86 21.7%	291 9.3%	184 9.8%	309 9.3%	96 20.3%	966 10.5%
Some Agree	75 18.9%	347 11.1%	210 11.1%	443 13.4%	67 14.2%	1142 12.4%
Disagree	209 52.6%	2202 70.3%	1282 68.0%	2189 66.2%	221 46.8%	6103 66.4%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

TIRED \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

TIRED	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No responses	34 8.6%	317 10.1%	224 11.9%	359 10.8%	66 14.0%	1000 10.9%
Agree	32 8.1%	187 6.0%	217 11.5%	230 7.0%	63 13.3%	729 7.9%
Some Agree	55 13.9%	398 12.7%	298 15.8%	473 14.3%	112 23.7%	1336 14.5%
Disagree	276 69.5%	2229 71.2%	1147 60.8%	2247 67.9%	231 48.9%	6130 66.7%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

Availability \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

Availability	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No	318 80.1%	2444 78.1%	1386 73.5%	2588 78.2%	380 80.5%	7116 77.4%
Yes	79 19.9%	687 21.9%	500 26.5%	721 21.8%	92 19.5%	2079 22.6%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

PRICE \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

PRICE	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No	356 89.7%	2615 83.5%	1459 77.4%	2781 84.0%	415 87.9%	7626 82.9%
Yes	41 10.3%	516 16.5%	427 22.6%	528 16.0%	57 12.1%	1569 17.1%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

AD \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

AD	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No	243 61.2%	1999 63.8%	1335 70.8%	2230 67.4%	359 76.1%	6166 67.1%
Yes	154 38.8%	1132 36.2%	551 29.2%	1079 32.6%	113 23.9%	3029 32.9%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

TELE \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

TELE	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
0	275 69.3%	2198 70.2%	1376 73.0%	2432 73.5%	314 66.5%	6595 71.7%
1	122 30.7%	933 29.8%	510 27.0%	877 26.5%	158 33.5%	2600 28.3%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

FRIENDS \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

FRIENDS	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No	107 27.0%	1042 33.3%	603 32.0%	1111 33.6%	174 36.9%	3037 33.0%
Yes	290 73.0%	2089 66.7%	1283 68.0%	2198 66.4%	298 63.1%	6158 67.0%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%

OTHER01 \* STRATANO Crosstabulation

OTHER01	STRATANO					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
0	289 72.8%	2581 82.4%	1493 79.2%	2558 77.3%	393 83.3%	7314 79.5%
Family Prob	67 16.9%	363 11.6%	228 12.1%	395 11.9%	43 9.1%	1096 11.9%
Habit	12 3.0%	32 1.0%	33 1.7%	85 2.6%	15 3.2%	177 1.9%
Enjoyment	9 2.3%	32 1.0%	33 1.7%	75 2.3%	13 2.8%	162 1.8%

Outstand	8 2.0%	25 .8%	11 .6%	36 1.1%	1 .2%	81 .9%
Produce	2 .5%	5 .2%	14 .7%	32 1.0%	3 .6%	56 .6%
Size	2 .5%	50 1.6%	45 2.4%	74 2.2%	1 .2%	172 1.9%
Immiteate		18 .6%	6 .3%	10 .3%		34 .4%
Not aware of harm	8 2.0%	23 .7%	22 1.2%	41 1.2%	3 .6%	97 1.1%
no legal act		2 .1%	1 .1%	3 .1%		6 .1%
Total	397 100.0%	3131 100.0%	1886 100.0%	3309 100.0%	472 100.0%	9195 100.0%