

Community Readiness in Indiana - The County Readiness Survey -

Introduction and Background

Community capacity has become an important construct in public health and prevention efforts. Goodman et al. calls it “a necessary condition for the development, implementation, and maintenance of effective, community-based health promotion and disease prevention programs” (Goodman et al., 1998). However, capacity is an elusive concept and may be difficult to define. In 1995, the Division of Chronic Disease Control and Community Intervention, CDC, convened a symposium to reach a consensus regarding aspects and dimensions of community capacity. Community capacity was defined as:

- (1) The characteristics of communities that affect their ability to identify, mobilize, and address social and public health problems, and
- (2) The cultivation and use of transferable knowledge, skills, systems, and resources that affect community- and individual-level changes consistent with public health-related goals and objectives (Goodman et al., 1998).

Community capacity is a complex and dynamic construct: it is a process as well as an outcome; it includes supportive organizational structures and processes; it is multi-dimensional; and context-specific. Its dimensions include but are not limited to citizen participation, leadership, skills, resources, social and interorganizational networks, sense of community, understanding of community history, community power, community values, and critical reflection (Goodman et al., 1998). The term ‘capacity’ has been used interchangeably with similar constructs, such as community empowerment, competence, or readiness. Even though these expressions refer to related concepts, they are not quite the same. However, Goodman, et al. stated that community readiness is the most similar to capacity, in that both relate to potential states that may lead to community action (Goodman et al., 1998). Basically, community readiness has been defined as the extent to which a community is adequately prepared to implement a prevention program. Awareness in the community, support and commitment of community members, as well as resources (financial, human, and organizational) are essential in implementing effective prevention programs. A capacity assessment is part of the *Strategic Prevention Framework*, the five-step process mandated by CSAP. Grantees are required to (a) review existing resources and assets (financial, human, and organizational) and (b) assess community readiness (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2006).

Survey Development

A variety of tools have been designed to assess community readiness. One of the most well known theoretical models, the *Community Readiness Model*, was developed by the Tri-Ethnic Center for Prevention Research, at Colorado State University (Edwards, Jumper-Thurman, Plested, Oetting, & Swanson, 2000). The model was built on two research traditions: psychological readiness for treatment and factors related to community development (Plested, Jumper-Thurman, Edwards, & Oetting, 1998). Prochaska and DiClemente’s *Transtheoretical Model* with its stages of change contributed to the development of the theoretical background of community readiness

(Edwards et al., 2000). The *Community Readiness Model* is based on certain assumptions, such as:

- Communities are at different stages of readiness for dealing with a specific problem
- The stage of readiness can be accurately assessed
- Communities can be moved through a series of stages to develop, implement, maintain, and improve effective programs
- It is critical to identify the stage of readiness because interventions to move communities to the next stage differ for each stage.

According to the model, nine stages of community readiness can be identified: community tolerance (no awareness), denial, vague awareness, pre-planning, preparation, initiation, stabilization/institutionalization, confirmation/expansion, and finally, professionalization (Edwards et al., 2000; Plested et al., 1998). The questionnaire is administered to community key informants (i.e., individuals that are familiar with substance abuse and prevention efforts in a community) in a semi-structured face-to-face or phone interview, and can take up to an hour to complete.

Another commonly used instrument, the *Community Key Leader Survey*, was developed by Robert Goodman and Abraham Wandersman at the University of South Carolina. The questionnaire examines community key leaders' organizations and their personal opinions about substance abuse and prevention efforts. The instrument has a multiple-choice design, consisting of 47 questions, and can be easily administered online. A theoretical basis of or empirical evidence for the survey was not readily available. However, Goodman and Wandersman both have been extensively involved in research efforts regarding community development, readiness, and capacity (Butterfoss, Goodman, & Wandersman, 1993, 1996; Goodman et al., 1998). Furthermore, various prevention-focused agencies, such as CSAP's Centers for Applied Prevention Technologies, suggested both *the Community Key Leader Survey* as well as the *Community Readiness Model*, among others, for assessing community readiness.

In order to employ an instrument that was suited for our specific needs, grounded in theory, and fairly simple to administer, we developed the web-based *County Readiness Survey*. The 30-item questionnaire, which examines how 'ready' Indiana counties are to implement substance abuse prevention programs, is primarily based on the *Community Readiness Model*. Additionally, items from *the Community Key Leader Survey* were incorporated. We modified and adapted their questions to suit our purposes and also asked SPF SIG/SEOW members for item recommendations. The survey design is primarily fixed-choice (rating scales and yes/no questions) and some short-answer questions, making the instrument reasonably brief and simple to complete to facilitate a high response rate. The questionnaire elicited information (attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge) for the following dimensions:

1. Existing prevention efforts
 - Listing of current substance abuse prevention efforts in the county
2. Community knowledge of prevention efforts
 - Awareness of substance abuse prevention efforts
 - Additional prevention planning efforts
3. Leadership
 - Leadership concern regarding substance abuse prevention
 - Leadership support for additional prevention efforts
 - Visibility of substance abuse prevention leaders

4. Community climate
 - Community attitude and concern toward substance abuse
 - Community concern for substance abuse prevention
5. Community knowledge of substance abuse
 - Community knowledge of substance abuse and risk factors
 - Availability of local substance abuse data
 - Media contribution to inform and educate about substance abuse
 - Severity of problems caused by individual substances
6. Resources for prevention
 - Skill level of prevention providers in county
 - Community support and collaboration for prevention programs
7. Demographics
 - Gender, age, race/ethnicity, educational background, and occupation of respondents
 - Subjective rating of level of knowledge regarding substance abuse prevention efforts
8. Community contacts
 - Listing of individuals who are knowledgeable about substance abuse prevention in the county

The *County Readiness Survey* targeted key informants, which we defined as professionals who are knowledgeable about substance abuse issues and prevention efforts in their counties. A database was developed containing the names and contact information of such individuals. The database included professionals from local coordinating councils (LCCs), community consultants from the Governor's Commission for a Drug Free Indiana, Sheriff's departments, local health departments, community- and minority-based health and anti-drug coalitions, DSA program directors (Afternoons R.O.C.K.), school corporations, and substance abuse treatment providers. Invitations to participate in the survey were sent out via email in January 2007 and reminders were emailed to potential subjects who had not completed the survey approximately every 3 weeks. Data collection was terminated by April 2007.

Results from the 2007 County Readiness Survey

Invitations to participate in the survey were sent to approximately 900 individuals via email. Of these, 345 subjects completed the questionnaire. Five responses were invalid (participants did not select a county), so only 340 responses were analyzed. This represents a response rate of 37.78%. For 27 of Indiana's 92 counties, at least 4 key informants per county completed the survey, which is the minimum suggested by the *Community Readiness Model* (Edwards et al., 2000; Plested et al., 1998). For the majority of counties (53), we received between 1 and 3 responses per county and 12 counties did not provide any data [see Table 1]. Urban and rural counties were fairly evenly represented in the sample with 47.6% and 52.4% respectively [see Table 2]. Regionality was established according to the FSSA planning regions [see Table 3]. Most subjects were from Northeast (31.5%), North Central (14.4%), and Southwest (12.4%) regions of Indiana [see Table 4]. Participants did not differ significantly by region or county on demographic variables.

Twenty-three (23) of the survey questions utilized a rating scale from 1 to 10 on which key informants rated the different variables. Twelve (12) of these questions focused on

respondents' beliefs about their county's awareness, knowledge, and concern regarding substance abuse and prevention efforts; 10 items addressed the severity of problems caused by individual substances; and one question allowed participants to rate their own knowledge of substance abuse prevention efforts. Mean scores for Indiana, the 8 regions, and 92 counties were calculated for each question. As mentioned before, 12 counties did not respond to the survey, therefore, regional means were assigned to these counties for comparison purposes.

County Awareness, Knowledge, and Concern

Items used to assess county attitude toward substance abuse prevention efforts included:

- How aware are people in your county of substance abuse prevention efforts?
- How much of a concern is substance abuse prevention to the leadership in your county?
- How much of a concern is substance abuse in your county?
- What is your county attitude about substance abuse prevention?
- How important is it to your county to prevent substance abuse among youth?
- How knowledgeable are members of your county about substance abuse?
- How knowledgeable are members of your county about risk factors leading to substance abuse?
- How much do the local media contribute to educate and inform your county on substance abuse related issues?
- What is the level of expertise, training, and skill among the substance abuse prevention staff in your county?
- How supportive are local businesses in your county of substance abuse prevention efforts?
- How supportive are the citizens in your county of substance abuse prevention efforts?
- How much collaboration occurs among public and private agencies involved in substance abuse prevention?

On average, Indiana counties scored highest on the perceived importance of substance abuse prevention among youth (mean = 7.72; sd = 2.01) and lowest on community knowledge about risk factors (mean = 4.85; sd = 1.85) [For all mean scores (for Indiana, by region, and by county), see Tables 5 and 6].

Severity of Problems Caused by Individual Substances

Respondents were asked to rate various substances on a scale from 1 to 10 on the number of problems they cause within the county. According to the survey results, key informants believe that alcohol produces the most problems (mean = 8.92; sd = 1.25), followed by tobacco (mean = 8.66; sd = 1.76), marijuana (mean = 8.17; sd = 1.58), methamphetamine (mean = 7.55; sd = 2.34), prescription drugs (mean = 7.36; sd = 1.81), cocaine/crack (mean = 6.13; sd = 2.19), and inhalants (mean = 5.25; sd = 2.12). Fewer problems were attributed to rave drugs (mean = 4.74; sd = 2.08), hallucinogens (mean = 4.68; sd = 1.95), and heroin (mean = 4.15; sd = 2.12) [see Tables 7 for regional and 8 for county-level data].

Self-Rating of Knowledge of Substance Abuse Prevention Efforts

The rating of one's own knowledge regarding substance abuse prevention efforts was overall moderately high (mean = 7.30; sd = 1.85) but differed by region with the lowest score for the Northwest (mean = 6.85; sd = 1.99) and the highest for the Southwest region (mean = 7.85; sd = 1.84). However, regional differences were statistically not significant [see Table 9]. At the county-level, the lowest score was found in Ripley Co. (mean = 3.67; sd = 1.53) and the highest in Greene, Miami, Perry, and Starke counties (mean = 10.00; sd = n/a). Between-group differences on the county-level were significant ($F = 1.43$; $p = .02$) [see Tables 9 for regional and 10 for county-level data].

Expansion of Programs, Leadership Concerns, and Tolerance of Substance Abuse

Overall, 92.6% of respondents feel a need to expand substance abuse prevention efforts in their county; 52.7% state that planning for additional programs is ongoing; 69.7% believe that the local leadership would support additional programs; and 70.7% report knowing the substance abuse prevention leadership in their county. Furthermore, 21.9% of key informants report that at certain times or under certain circumstances, substance abuse is tolerated in the county [see Tables 11 – 15 for regional and Tables 16 – 20 for county-level data].

Availability of Data/Data Needs

According to 67.4% participants, local substance abuse data are available but only 15.6% state that a sufficient amount of information is obtainable [see Tables 21 – 22 for regional and Tables 23 – 24 for county-level information]. In addition, key informants described the areas for which they believed more data collection was needed. These comments were coded by grouping them into 9 categories (youth use; adult use; availability/accessibility to general population; risk factors and prevention; individual substances; consequences (psycho-social, legal, and medical); treatment and recovery; other data needs; and no additional data needs). Fifty-two (52 or 25.0%) of all subjects responding to the question commented on needing more information regarding youth use, 37 (17.8%) would like more data on use of individual substances, and 11 (5.3%) stated a lack of treatment and recovery data. Moreover, survey respondents claimed a need for local data on adult use (10 or 4.8%), consequences of use (10 or 4.8%), risk factors and prevention (7 or 3.4%), and 'other data needs' (70 or 33.7%). Eight (8 or 3.8%) participants felt that data should be made more available and accessible to the general population and 3 (1.4%) stated that no additional data are needed [see Appendix A 'Data Needs 2007' for all comments made, sorted by county].

Existing Prevention Efforts

Respondents listed substance abuse prevention programs, activities, services, and policies that are currently in existence in their county. Additionally, information regarding target populations and sources of funding was collected. For analysis purposes, the data were 'cleaned up' (i.e., multiple entries of programs within a county were deleted) and coded. Three coding variables were created to code for (1) target population (not specified/general population; female; male; minorities; pregnant women/mothers with children; smokers; substance abusers/in recovery/court-ordered; families of substance abusers; and others), (2) age of target population (not specified/general population; youth; and adult), and (3) type of service (youth-focused services; coalitions/LCCs; support groups; treatment; law enforcement/judicial; faith-based services; minority-based services; tobacco programs; and other services). For Indiana, 740 prevention efforts were listed of which 418 (56.5%) programs were directed toward children and adolescents, 54 (7.3%) toward adults, and 268 (36.2%) were unspecified. In regard to

special populations, the majority of services (527 or 71.2%) did not address a specific group, 107 (14.5%) programs were directed at substance abusers/individuals in recovery/court-ordered services, 22 (3.0%) targeted minorities, and 16 (2.2%) aimed at smokers. The rest of the programs addressed pregnant women/mothers with children (8 or 1.1%), females (6 or 0.8%), families of substance abusers (5 or 0.7%), males (3 or 0.4%), and others (46 or 6.2%). The types of programs listed were youth-focused services (356 or 48.1%), coalitions/LCCs (76 or 10.3%), tobacco programs (68 or 9.2%), treatment (60 or 8.1%), law enforcement/judicial endeavors (42 or 5.7%), support groups (20 or 2.7%), faith-based services (7 or 0.9%), minority-based services (5 or 0.7%), and other services (106 or 14.3%) [see Appendix B 'Prevention Efforts 2007' for a list of all services, sorted by county].

Table 1: Survey Responses by County

Counties with 4 or more responses	Counties with less than 4 responses	Counties that did not respond
Adams	Bartholomew	Benton
Allen	Blackford	Carroll
Clay	Boone	Crawford
Daviess	Brown	Jennings
Delaware	Cass	Lawrence
Dubois	Clark	Montgomery
Elkhart	Clinton	Pike
Franklin	Dearborn	Posey
Fulton	Decatur	Rush
Hancock	DeKalb	Shelby
Jasper	Fayette	Warren
Knox	Floyd	Washington
Lake	Fountain	
LaPorte	Gibson	
Marion	Grant	
Marshall	Greene	
Monroe	Hamilton	
Newton	Harrison	
Noble	Hendricks	
Porter	Henry	
St. Joseph	Howard	
Steuben	Huntington	
Vanderburgh	Jackson	
Vigo	Jay	
Warrick	Jefferson	
Wells	Johnson	
Whitley	Kosciusko	
	LaGrange	
	Madison	
	Martin	
	Miami	
	Morgan	
	Ohio	
	Orange	
	Owen	
	Parke	
	Perry	
	Pulaski	
	Putnam	
	Randolph	

Counties with 4 or more responses	Counties with less than 4 responses	Counties that did not respond
	Ripley	
	Scott	
	Spencer	
	Starke	
	Sullivan	
	Switzerland	
	Tippecanoe	
	Tipton	
	Union	
	Vermillion	
	Wabash	
	Wayne	
	White	

Table 2: Urbanicity

		Urbanicity			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Rural	178	51.6	52.4	52.4
	Urban	162	47.0	47.6	100.0
	Total	340	98.6	100.0	
Missing	999	5	1.4		
Total		345	100.0		

Table 3: FSSA Planning Regions

Regions	Counties
Central	Boone, Hamilton, Hancock, Hendricks, Johnson, Marion, Morgan, Shelby
East	Blackford, Delaware, Fayette, Grant, Henry, Jay, Madison, Randolph, Rush, Union, Wayne
North Central	Cass, Elkhart, Fulton, Howard, Kosciusko, LaPorte, Marshall, Miami, St. Joseph, Tipton, Wabash
Northeast	Adams, Allen, DeKalb, Huntington, LaGrange, Noble, Steuben, Wells, Whitley
Northwest	Jasper, Lake, Newton, Porter, Pulaski, Starke
West	Benton, Carroll, Clay, Clinton, Fountain, Monroe, Montgomery, Owen, Parke, Putnam, Sullivan, Tippecanoe, Vermillion, Vigo, Warren, White
Southeast	Bartholomew, Brown, Clark, Crawford, Dearborn, Decatur, Floyd, Franklin, Harrison, Jackson, Jefferson, Jennings, Lawrence, Ohio, Orange, Ripley, Scott, Switzerland, Washington
Southwest	Daviess, Dubois, Gibson, Greene, Knox, Martin, Perry, Pike, Posey, Spencer, Vanderburgh, Warrick

Table 4: Regionality

		Region			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Central	18	5.2	5.3	5.3
	East	20	5.8	5.9	11.2
	North Central	49	14.2	14.4	25.6
	Northeast	107	31.0	31.5	57.1
	Northwest	35	10.1	10.3	67.4
	West	31	9.0	9.1	76.5
	Southeast	38	11.0	11.2	87.6
	Southwest	42	12.2	12.4	100.0
	Total	340	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.4		
Total		345	100.0		

Table 5: Respondents' Beliefs about their County's Attitude Regarding Substance Abuse and Prevention Efforts (Calculated Means by Region)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
How aware are people in your county of substance abuse prevention efforts	Central	17	4.82	1.912	.464	3.84	5.81	2	9
	East	20	5.05	1.638	.366	4.28	5.82	2	8
	North Central	49	4.78	2.114	.302	4.17	5.38	2	10
	Northeast	107	5.62	2.131	.206	5.21	6.03	1	10
	Northwest	34	4.74	1.729	.296	4.13	5.34	2	10
	West	30	4.83	1.744	.318	4.18	5.48	2	8
	Southeast	38	4.61	1.669	.271	4.06	5.15	2	9
	Southwest	42	6.05	1.821	.281	5.48	6.61	2	10
	Total	337	5.20	1.979	.108	4.99	5.41	1	10
How much of a concern is substance abuse prevention to leadership	Central	17	5.29	1.687	.409	4.43	6.16	3	8
	East	20	6.05	2.038	.456	5.10	7.00	3	9
	North Central	48	5.54	1.924	.278	4.98	6.10	2	10
	Northeast	106	6.78	2.301	.224	6.34	7.23	1	10
	Northwest	33	5.91	1.860	.324	5.25	6.57	2	9
	West	31	7.06	1.999	.359	6.33	7.80	3	10
	Southeast	38	6.08	2.352	.382	5.31	6.85	2	10
	Southwest	40	6.73	2.309	.365	5.99	7.46	2	10
	Total	333	6.34	2.196	.120	6.10	6.57	1	10
How much of a concern is substance abuse in your county	Central	17	7.00	1.500	.364	6.23	7.77	5	10
	East	20	7.65	1.755	.393	6.83	8.47	4	10
	North Central	49	6.82	1.911	.273	6.27	7.37	2	10
	Northeast	107	7.18	1.975	.191	6.80	7.56	3	10
	Northwest	33	7.58	2.151	.374	6.81	8.34	2	10
	West	31	7.74	1.390	.250	7.23	8.25	5	10
	Southeast	38	7.00	2.156	.350	6.29	7.71	3	10
	Southwest	41	7.98	1.837	.287	7.40	8.56	4	10
	Total	336	7.31	1.927	.105	7.11	7.52	2	10

What is your county attitude about substance abuse prevention	Central	17	5.59	1.417	.344	4.86	6.32	3	8
	East	20	6.70	1.780	.398	5.87	7.53	4	9
	North Central	49	6.27	1.879	.268	5.73	6.81	2	10
	Northeast	107	6.56	1.972	.191	6.18	6.94	2	10
	Northwest	33	7.00	2.305	.401	6.18	7.82	2	10
	West	31	6.65	1.762	.316	6.00	7.29	3	10
	Southeast	38	6.13	1.803	.293	5.54	6.72	3	10
	Southwest	41	7.00	2.074	.324	6.35	7.65	2	10
	Total	336	6.53	1.948	.106	6.32	6.74	2	10
How important is it to your county to prevent substance abuse among youth	Central	17	7.12	1.576	.382	6.31	7.93	5	10
	East	20	7.95	2.089	.467	6.97	8.93	3	10
	North Central	48	7.31	2.054	.296	6.72	7.91	2	10
	Northeast	107	7.85	1.994	.193	7.47	8.23	3	10
	Northwest	34	8.18	2.124	.364	7.44	8.92	2	10
	West	31	7.52	2.080	.374	6.75	8.28	2	10
	Southeast	38	7.34	2.184	.354	6.62	8.06	4	10
	Southwest	40	8.15	1.718	.272	7.60	8.70	4	10
	Total	335	7.72	2.011	.110	7.51	7.94	2	10
How knowledgeable are members of your county about substance abuse	Central	17	4.88	1.269	.308	4.23	5.53	3	8
	East	20	5.20	1.852	.414	4.33	6.07	2	8
	North Central	48	5.00	1.689	.244	4.51	5.49	2	8
	Northeast	107	5.39	1.816	.176	5.04	5.74	1	10
	Northwest	33	4.70	1.828	.318	4.05	5.35	2	9
	West	31	4.45	1.410	.253	3.93	4.97	2	7
	Southeast	37	4.51	1.539	.253	4.00	5.03	2	8
	Southwest	42	5.33	2.205	.340	4.65	6.02	1	10
	Total	335	5.04	1.789	.098	4.85	5.23	1	10

How knowledgeable are members of your county about risk factors	Central	17	4.59	1.004	.243	4.07	5.10	3	6
	East	19	4.68	1.734	.398	3.85	5.52	1	8
	North Central	48	4.79	1.762	.254	4.28	5.30	2	9
	Northeast	106	5.26	1.874	.182	4.90	5.62	1	10
	Northwest	33	4.85	2.167	.377	4.08	5.62	2	10
	West	31	4.35	1.684	.302	3.74	4.97	1	8
	Southeast	37	4.16	1.519	.250	3.66	4.67	1	7
	Southwest	42	5.05	2.152	.332	4.38	5.72	2	10
	Total	333	4.85	1.853	.102	4.65	5.05	1	10
How much do the local media contribute to inform and educate	Central	17	3.71	1.404	.340	2.98	4.43	2	6
	East	20	5.25	1.997	.446	4.32	6.18	1	9
	North Central	47	4.60	1.690	.246	4.10	5.09	2	8
	Northeast	106	5.74	1.982	.193	5.35	6.12	2	10
	Northwest	33	4.61	1.886	.328	3.94	5.27	1	9
	West	31	5.23	2.028	.364	4.48	5.97	2	9
	Southeast	37	4.86	2.238	.368	4.12	5.61	1	9
	Southwest	40	5.93	2.153	.340	5.24	6.61	2	10
	Total	331	5.21	2.039	.112	4.98	5.43	1	10
What is the level of expertise, training, skill among prevention staff	Central	17	6.94	1.249	.303	6.30	7.58	4	9
	East	20	7.15	1.309	.293	6.54	7.76	4	9
	North Central	48	7.13	1.734	.250	6.62	7.63	3	10
	Northeast	106	7.26	1.838	.178	6.91	7.62	3	10
	Northwest	33	7.03	1.237	.215	6.59	7.47	5	9
	West	31	7.52	1.503	.270	6.96	8.07	3	10
	Southeast	38	7.21	1.862	.302	6.60	7.82	3	10
	Southwest	41	7.39	1.909	.298	6.79	7.99	2	10
	Total	334	7.23	1.690	.092	7.05	7.41	2	10

How supportive are local businesses in your county of prevention efforts	Central	17	5.41	1.543	.374	4.62	6.21	3	9
	East	20	5.90	1.971	.441	4.98	6.82	3	10
	North Central	48	5.21	1.978	.286	4.63	5.78	2	10
	Northeast	104	5.92	1.899	.186	5.55	6.29	2	10
	Northwest	32	5.06	1.865	.330	4.39	5.74	3	9
	West	31	5.97	1.941	.349	5.26	6.68	2	9
	Southeast	38	5.32	2.267	.368	4.57	6.06	1	9
	Southwest	41	5.63	2.059	.321	4.98	6.28	2	10
	Total	331	5.61	1.973	.108	5.39	5.82	1	10
How much collaboration occurs among public and private agencies	Central	17	5.47	1.231	.298	4.84	6.10	3	8
	East	20	6.35	1.631	.365	5.59	7.11	3	10
	North Central	47	5.55	2.145	.313	4.92	6.18	1	10
	Northeast	104	6.36	1.859	.182	5.99	6.72	2	10
	Northwest	33	5.85	2.093	.364	5.11	6.59	1	8
	West	31	6.03	1.853	.333	5.35	6.71	2	9
	Southeast	38	5.68	2.015	.327	5.02	6.35	2	9
	Southwest	41	6.49	2.075	.324	5.83	7.14	2	10
	Total	331	6.05	1.947	.107	5.84	6.26	1	10
How supportive are citizens of substance abuse prevention efforts	Central	17	5.59	1.228	.298	4.96	6.22	4	8
	East	20	6.25	1.832	.410	5.39	7.11	3	10
	North Central	48	5.56	1.749	.252	5.05	6.07	2	10
	Northeast	106	5.93	1.785	.173	5.59	6.28	1	10
	Northwest	33	5.33	1.708	.297	4.73	5.94	2	9
	West	31	6.32	1.777	.319	5.67	6.97	3	10
	Southeast	38	5.32	1.847	.300	4.71	5.92	1	8
	Southwest	41	5.93	1.571	.245	5.43	6.42	3	10
	Total	334	5.79	1.745	.095	5.60	5.98	1	10

Table 6: Respondents' Beliefs about their County's Attitude Regarding Substance Abuse and Prevention Efforts (Calculated Means by County)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
How aware are people in your county of substance abuse prevention efforts	Adams	8	5.25	1.581	.559	3.93	6.57	3	7
	Allen	32	4.97	2.658	.470	4.01	5.93	1	10
	Bartholomew	3	5.00	1.000	.577	2.52	7.48	4	6
	Benton*		4.83						
	Blackford	3	5.00	3.000	1.732	-2.45	12.45	2	8
	Boone	2	3.50	2.121	1.500	-15.56	22.56	2	5
	Brown	1	6.00	6	6
	Carroll*		4.83						
	Cass	1	3.00	3	3
	Clark	3	5.67	1.528	.882	1.87	9.46	4	7
	Clay	5	4.40	1.817	.812	2.14	6.66	2	6
	Clinton	1	6.00	6	6
	Crawford*		4.61						
	Daviess	9	6.33	2.121	.707	4.70	7.96	3	10
	Dearborn	3	5.33	2.082	1.202	.16	10.50	3	7
	Decatur	1	3.00	3	3
	DeKalb	3	3.33	.577	.333	1.90	4.77	3	4
	Delaware	4	5.25	.500	.250	4.45	6.05	5	6
	Dubois	8	6.25	1.389	.491	5.09	7.41	4	8
	Elkhart	13	4.08	2.139	.593	2.78	5.37	2	8
Fayette	3	5.00	1.732	1.000	.70	9.30	3	6	
Floyd	2	4.50	.707	.500	-1.85	10.85	4	5	
Fountain	2	6.00	2.828	2.000	-19.41	31.41	4	8	
Franklin	11	3.45	.934	.282	2.83	4.08	2	5	
Fulton	4	5.75	2.217	1.109	2.22	9.28	3	8	
Gibson	2	6.00	.000	.000	6.00	6.00	6	6	

Grant	1	5.00	5	5
Greene	1	7.00	7	7
Hamilton	1	6.00	6	6
Hancock	4	7.25	1.500	.750	4.86	9.64	6	9
Harrison	2	6.00	4.243	3.000	-32.12	44.12	3	9
Hendricks	2	5.00	1.414	1.000	-7.71	17.71	4	6
Henry	3	5.33	1.528	.882	1.54	9.13	4	7
Howard	1	6.00	6	6
Huntington	3	5.00	1.732	1.000	.70	9.30	4	7
Jackson	1	3.00	3	3
Jasper	8	5.13	.991	.350	4.30	5.95	4	7
Jay	1	5.00	5	5
Jefferson	3	6.33	2.309	1.333	.60	12.07	5	9
Jennings*		4.61						
Johnson	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4
Knox	9	6.89	2.028	.676	5.33	8.45	5	10
Kosciusko	1	5.00	5	5
LaGrange	3	5.00	1.000	.577	2.52	7.48	4	6
Lake	6	6.17	2.787	1.138	3.24	9.09	3	10
LaPorte	7	5.14	1.952	.738	3.34	6.95	2	7
Lawrence*		4.61						
Madison	1	2.00	2	2
Marion	5	3.80	.837	.374	2.76	4.84	3	5
Marshall	7	5.14	2.673	1.010	2.67	7.61	2	10
Martin	1	5.00	5	5
Miami	1	3.00	3	3
Monroe	9	5.89	1.453	.484	4.77	7.01	4	8
Montgomery*		4.83						
Morgan	1	5.00	5	5
Newton	10	4.50	1.509	.477	3.42	5.58	2	7
Noble	30	6.57	1.675	.306	5.94	7.19	3	10

Ohio	1	4.00	4	4
Orange	1	5.00	5	5
Owen	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4
Parke	1	5.00	5	5
Perry	1	7.00	7	7
Pike*		6.05						
Porter	7	3.57	.787	.297	2.84	4.30	2	4
Posey*		6.05						
Pulaski	2	3.50	.707	.500	-2.85	9.85	3	4
Putnam	2	4.50	2.121	1.500	-14.56	23.56	3	6
Randolph	1	5.00	5	5
Ripley	3	5.00	1.732	1.000	.70	9.30	4	7
Rush*		5.05						
St. Joseph	12	5.17	2.125	.613	3.82	6.52	2	10
Scott	2	5.00	.000	.000	5.00	5.00	5	5
Shelby*		4.82						
Spencer	2	5.50	2.121	1.500	-13.56	24.56	4	7
Starke	1	6.00	6	6
Steuben	5	4.40	1.342	.600	2.73	6.07	3	6
Sullivan	1	3.00	3	3
Switzerland	1	3.00	3	3
Tippecanoe	1	2.00	2	2
Tipton	1	2.00	2	2
Union	1	3.00	3	3
Vanderburgh	5	5.80	.837	.374	4.76	6.84	5	7
Vermillion	1	3.00	3	3
Vigo	4	5.00	1.414	.707	2.75	7.25	3	6
Wabash	1	5.00	5	5
Warren*		4.83						
Warrick	4	3.50	1.732	.866	.74	6.26	2	6
Washington*		4.61						

How much of a concern is substance abuse prevention to leadership	Wayne	2	7.00	.000	.000	7.00	7.00	7	7
	Wells	9	6.00	1.732	.577	4.67	7.33	3	8
	White	1	4.00	4	4
	Whitley	14	6.21	1.968	.526	5.08	7.35	3	10
	Total	337	5.20	1.979	.108	4.99	5.41	1	10
	Adams	7	7.43	2.299	.869	5.30	9.55	4	10
	Allen	32	5.72	2.372	.419	4.86	6.57	2	10
	Bartholomew	3	9.33	.577	.333	7.90	10.77	9	10
	Benton*		7.06						
	Blackford	3	5.00	3.464	2.000	-3.61	13.61	3	9
	Boone	2	7.00	1.414	1.000	-5.71	19.71	6	8
	Brown	1	8.00	8	8
	Carroll*		7.06						
	Cass	1	4.00	4	4
	Clark	3	4.67	2.082	1.202	-.50	9.84	3	7
	Clay	5	6.00	2.449	1.095	2.96	9.04	3	9
	Clinton	1	8.00	8	8
	Crawford*		6.08						
	Daviess	9	6.89	2.848	.949	4.70	9.08	3	10
	Dearborn	3	5.00	2.646	1.528	-1.57	11.57	3	8
	Decatur	1	4.00	4	4
	DeKalb	3	6.67	2.082	1.202	1.50	11.84	5	9
	Delaware	4	7.00	.816	.408	5.70	8.30	6	8
	Dubois	8	7.13	1.885	.666	5.55	8.70	4	9
	Elkhart	12	5.08	1.379	.398	4.21	5.96	3	7
	Fayette	3	4.00	1.000	.577	1.52	6.48	3	5
	Floyd	2	8.50	2.121	1.500	-10.56	27.56	7	10
	Fountain	2	7.00	.000	.000	7.00	7.00	7	7
Franklin	11	4.55	2.115	.638	3.12	5.97	2	9	
Fulton	4	3.75	1.500	.750	1.36	6.14	2	5	
Gibson	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8	

Grant	1	8.00	8	8
Greene	1	10.00	10	10
Hamilton	1	3.00	3	3
Hancock	4	5.25	1.258	.629	3.25	7.25	4	7
Harrison	2	8.00	1.414	1.000	-4.71	20.71	7	9
Hendricks	2	6.00	2.828	2.000	-19.41	31.41	4	8
Henry	3	7.00	1.732	1.000	2.70	11.30	5	8
Howard	1	8.00	8	8
Huntington	3	7.33	1.528	.882	3.54	11.13	6	9
Jackson	1	5.00	5	5
Jasper	7	5.86	2.340	.884	3.69	8.02	2	9
Jay	1	8.00	8	8
Jefferson	3	7.00	.000	.000	7.00	7.00	7	7
Jennings*		6.08						
Johnson	2	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
Knox	9	7.89	1.900	.633	6.43	9.35	4	10
Kosciusko	1	5.00	5	5
LaGrange	3	5.33	.577	.333	3.90	6.77	5	6
Lake	6	7.17	1.602	.654	5.49	8.85	5	9
LaPorte	7	6.71	2.628	.993	4.28	9.14	4	10
Lawrence*		6.08						
Madison	1	3.00	3	3
Marion	5	5.20	1.924	.860	2.81	7.59	3	8
Marshall	7	5.57	2.149	.812	3.58	7.56	3	8
Martin	1	5.00	5	5
Miami	1	6.00	6	6
Monroe	10	7.70	1.636	.517	6.53	8.87	4	10
Montgomery*		7.06						
Morgan	1	6.00	6	6
Newton	10	5.50	1.841	.582	4.18	6.82	2	8
Noble	30	7.93	2.164	.395	7.13	8.74	1	10

Ohio	1	7.00	7	7
Orange	1	7.00	7	7
Owen	2	5.00	2.828	2.000	-20.41	30.41	3	7
Parke	1	10.00	10	10
Perry	1	8.00	8	8
Pike*		6.73						
Porter	7	5.43	1.618	.612	3.93	6.93	2	7
Posey*		6.73						
Pulaski	2	5.00	.000	.000	5.00	5.00	5	5
Putnam	2	6.50	2.121	1.500	-12.56	25.56	5	8
Randolph	1	6.00	6	6
Ripley	3	7.00	2.646	1.528	.43	13.57	5	10
Rush*		6.05						
St. Joseph	12	5.67	1.826	.527	4.51	6.83	3	8
Scott	2	7.00	2.828	2.000	-18.41	32.41	5	9
Shelby*		5.29						
Spencer	1	4.00	4	4
Starke	1	8.00	8	8
Steuben	5	5.20	2.168	.970	2.51	7.89	2	7
Sullivan	1	9.00	9	9
Switzerland	1	4.00	4	4
Tippecanoe	1	8.00	8	8
Tipton	1	8.00	8	8
Union	1	7.00	7	7
Vanderburgh	5	5.20	1.304	.583	3.58	6.82	4	7
Vermillion	1	8.00	8	8
Vigo	4	6.25	2.754	1.377	1.87	10.63	3	9
Wabash	1	5.00	5	5
Warren*		7.06						
Warrick	3	3.67	1.528	.882	-.13	7.46	2	5
Washington*		6.08						

How much of a concern is substance abuse in your county	Wayne	2	6.50	2.121	1.500	-12.56	25.56	5	8
	Wells	9	6.44	1.810	.603	5.05	7.84	4	9
	White	1	7.00	7	7
	Whitley	14	7.43	1.950	.521	6.30	8.55	4	10
	Total	333	6.34	2.196	.120	6.10	6.57	1	10
	Adams	8	5.88	2.295	.811	3.96	7.79	3	9
	Allen	32	6.78	1.913	.338	6.09	7.47	3	10
	Bartholomew	3	8.67	2.309	1.333	2.93	14.40	6	10
	Benton*		7.74						
	Blackford	3	7.00	2.000	1.155	2.03	11.97	5	9
	Boone	2	7.00	1.414	1.000	-5.71	19.71	6	8
	Brown	1	7.00	7	7
	Carroll*		7.74						
	Cass	1	3.00	3	3
	Clark	3	6.33	1.155	.667	3.46	9.20	5	7
	Clay	5	6.60	1.517	.678	4.72	8.48	5	9
	Clinton	1	8.00	8	8
	Crawford*		7.00						
	Daviess	9	8.56	2.007	.669	7.01	10.10	4	10
	Dearborn	3	7.00	1.732	1.000	2.70	11.30	5	8
	Decatur	1	7.00	7	7
	DeKalb	3	5.67	1.155	.667	2.80	8.54	5	7
	Delaware	4	8.25	.957	.479	6.73	9.77	7	9
	Dubois	8	6.88	1.808	.639	5.36	8.39	4	9
	Elkhart	13	7.46	1.854	.514	6.34	8.58	4	10
	Fayette	3	7.33	2.082	1.202	2.16	12.50	5	9
	Floyd	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10
	Fountain	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10
Franklin	11	5.64	2.157	.650	4.19	7.09	3	9	
Fulton	4	6.75	.957	.479	5.23	8.27	6	8	
Gibson	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10	

Grant	1	8.00	8	8
Greene	1	8.00	8	8
Hamilton	1	5.00	5	5
Hancock	4	6.75	1.258	.629	4.75	8.75	5	8
Harrison	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10
Hendricks	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8
Henry	3	9.00	1.000	.577	6.52	11.48	8	10
Howard	1	6.00	6	6
Huntington	3	6.33	2.517	1.453	.08	12.58	4	9
Jackson	1	4.00	4	4
Jasper	7	7.00	1.414	.535	5.69	8.31	5	9
Jay	1	9.00	9	9
Jefferson	3	6.67	2.887	1.667	-.50	13.84	5	10
Jennings*		7.00						
Johnson	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10
Knox	9	9.11	1.054	.351	8.30	9.92	7	10
Kosciusko	1	5.00	5	5
LaGrange	3	4.33	1.155	.667	1.46	7.20	3	5
Lake	6	8.00	2.280	.931	5.61	10.39	5	10
LaPorte	7	6.71	2.563	.969	4.34	9.09	2	10
Lawrence*		7.00						
Madison	1	9.00	9	9
Marion	5	6.80	1.789	.800	4.58	9.02	5	9
Marshall	7	6.29	2.289	.865	4.17	8.40	3	10
Martin	1	7.00	7	7
Miami	1	9.00	9	9
Monroe	10	7.70	1.494	.473	6.63	8.77	5	10
Montgomery*		7.74						
Morgan	1	6.00	6	6
Newton	10	6.00	2.000	.632	4.57	7.43	2	8
Noble	30	8.60	1.221	.223	8.14	9.06	5	10

Ohio	1	9.00	9	9
Orange	1	10.00	10	10
Owen	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8
Parke	1	10.00	10	10
Perry	1	7.00	7	7
Pike*		7.98						
Porter	7	9.43	1.512	.571	8.03	10.83	6	10
Posey*		7.98						
Pulaski	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9
Putnam	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8
Randolph	1	4.00	4	4
Ripley	3	7.33	2.517	1.453	1.08	13.58	5	10
Rush*		7.65						
St. Joseph	12	6.75	1.603	.463	5.73	7.77	4	10
Scott	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8
Shelby*		7.00						
Spencer	2	6.50	3.536	2.500	-25.27	38.27	4	9
Starke	1	10.00	10	10
Steuben	5	6.60	1.673	.748	4.52	8.68	4	8
Sullivan	1	10.00	10	10
Switzerland	1	7.00	7	7
Tippecanoe	1	8.00	8	8
Tipton	1	8.00	8	8
Union	1	5.00	5	5
Vanderburgh	5	7.00	1.871	.837	4.68	9.32	5	10
Vermillion	1	8.00	8	8
Vigo	4	7.75	1.258	.629	5.75	9.75	6	9
Wabash	1	7.00	7	7
Warren*		7.74						
Warrick	3	8.33	1.528	.882	4.54	12.13	7	10
Washington*		7.00						

What is your county attitude about substance abuse prevention	Wayne	2	7.50	2.121	1.500	-11.56	26.56	6	9
	Wells	9	6.44	2.068	.689	4.85	8.03	3	9
	White	1	7.00	7	7
	Whitley	14	7.57	1.651	.441	6.62	8.52	5	10
	Total	336	7.31	1.927	.105	7.11	7.52	2	10
	Adams	8	5.88	1.885	.666	4.30	7.45	4	9
	Allen	32	5.94	2.154	.381	5.16	6.71	2	9
	Bartholomew	3	8.33	2.082	1.202	3.16	13.50	6	10
	Benton*		6.65						
	Blackford	3	6.33	2.309	1.333	.60	12.07	5	9
	Boone	2	5.50	.707	.500	-.85	11.85	5	6
	Brown	1	8.00	8	8
	Carroll*		6.65						
	Cass	1	4.00	4	4
	Clark	3	6.67	.577	.333	5.23	8.10	6	7
	Clay	5	6.20	1.304	.583	4.58	7.82	5	8
	Clinton	1	8.00	8	8
	Crawford*		6.13						
	Daviess	9	7.78	1.787	.596	6.40	9.15	4	10
	Dearborn	3	6.00	1.732	1.000	1.70	10.30	5	8
	Decatur	1	5.00	5	5
	DeKalb	3	4.67	.577	.333	3.23	6.10	4	5
	Delaware	4	7.75	.957	.479	6.23	9.27	7	9
	Dubois	8	6.00	1.690	.598	4.59	7.41	4	9
	Elkhart	13	6.62	1.895	.525	5.47	7.76	4	10
	Fayette	3	6.67	2.309	1.333	.93	12.40	4	8
	Floyd	2	6.00	2.828	2.000	-19.41	31.41	4	8
	Fountain	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8
	Franklin	11	5.09	1.446	.436	4.12	6.06	3	7
	Fulton	4	6.50	.577	.289	5.58	7.42	6	7
Gibson	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9	

Grant	1	8.00	8	8
Greene	1	10.00	10	10
Hamilton	1	5.00	5	5
Hancock	4	5.75	1.500	.750	3.36	8.14	4	7
Harrison	2	7.00	2.828	2.000	-18.41	32.41	5	9
Hendricks	2	5.50	.707	.500	-.85	11.85	5	6
Henry	3	6.33	2.309	1.333	.60	12.07	5	9
Howard	1	8.00	8	8
Huntington	3	6.67	2.082	1.202	1.50	11.84	5	9
Jackson	1	4.00	4	4
Jasper	7	6.14	1.952	.738	4.34	7.95	3	8
Jay	1	9.00	9	9
Jefferson	3	5.67	2.082	1.202	.50	10.84	4	8
Jennings*		6.13						
Johnson	2	3.00	.000	.000	3.00	3.00	3	3
Knox	9	7.44	2.603	.868	5.44	9.45	2	10
Kosciusko	1	5.00	5	5
LaGrange	3	4.33	1.155	.667	1.46	7.20	3	5
Lake	6	7.33	2.658	1.085	4.54	10.12	3	10
LaPorte	7	5.71	2.628	.993	3.28	8.14	2	10
Lawrence*		6.13						
Madison	1	5.00	5	5
Marion	5	6.40	1.140	.510	4.98	7.82	5	8
Marshall	7	5.57	1.512	.571	4.17	6.97	3	7
Martin	1	7.00	7	7
Miami	1	10.00	10	10
Monroe	10	7.80	1.619	.512	6.64	8.96	5	10
Montgomery*		6.65						
Morgan	1	7.00	7	7
Newton	10	6.10	2.079	.657	4.61	7.59	2	10
Noble	30	7.67	1.422	.260	7.14	8.20	5	10

Ohio	1	9.00	9	9
Orange	1	8.00	8	8
Owen	2	5.50	3.536	2.500	-26.27	37.27	3	8
Parke	1	5.00	5	5
Perry	1	7.00	7	7
Pike*		7.00						
Porter	7	8.71	2.215	.837	6.67	10.76	5	10
Posey*		7.00						
Pulaski	2	6.50	2.121	1.500	-12.56	25.56	5	8
Putnam	2	5.00	1.414	1.000	-7.71	17.71	4	6
Randolph	1	5.00	5	5
Ripley	3	5.67	1.155	.667	2.80	8.54	5	7
Rush*		6.70						
St. Joseph	12	6.42	1.881	.543	5.22	7.61	3	10
Scott	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8
Shelby*		5.59						
Spencer	2	7.00	4.243	3.000	-31.12	45.12	4	10
Starke	1	9.00	9	9
Steuben	5	5.60	1.342	.600	3.93	7.27	4	7
Sullivan	1	7.00	7	7
Switzerland	1	5.00	5	5
Tippecanoe	1	5.00	5	5
Tipton	1	6.00	6	6
Union	1	5.00	5	5
Vanderburgh	5	6.60	.894	.400	5.49	7.71	6	8
Vermillion	1	5.00	5	5
Vigo	4	6.00	1.826	.913	3.09	8.91	4	8
Wabash	1	6.00	6	6
Warren*		6.65						
Warrick	3	4.67	1.528	.882	.87	8.46	3	6
Washington*		6.13						

How important is it to your county to prevent substance abuse among youth	Wayne	2	6.50	2.121	1.500	-12.56	25.56	5	8
	Wells	9	5.67	1.658	.553	4.39	6.94	4	8
	White	1	6.00	6	6
	Whitley	14	7.79	1.578	.422	6.87	8.70	5	10
	Total	336	6.53	1.948	.106	6.32	6.74	2	10
	Adams	8	7.25	2.252	.796	5.37	9.13	4	10
	Allen	32	7.13	2.282	.403	6.30	7.95	3	10
	Bartholomew	3	9.33	1.155	.667	6.46	12.20	8	10
	Benton*		7.52						
	Blackford	3	6.67	3.215	1.856	-1.32	14.65	3	9
	Boone	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71	5	7
	Brown	1	10.00	10	10
	Carroll*		7.52						
	Cass	1	7.00	7	7
	Clark	3	7.33	1.528	.882	3.54	11.13	6	9
	Clay	5	6.80	2.168	.970	4.11	9.49	4	9
	Clinton	1	9.00	9	9
	Crawford*		7.34						
	Daviess	9	8.89	1.691	.564	7.59	10.19	5	10
	Dearborn	3	7.33	1.155	.667	4.46	10.20	6	8
	Decatur	1	4.00	4	4
	DeKalb	3	7.00	1.000	.577	4.52	9.48	6	8
	Delaware	4	8.50	1.732	.866	5.74	11.26	7	10
	Dubois	8	7.50	1.852	.655	5.95	9.05	4	10
	Elkhart	13	7.54	1.941	.538	6.37	8.71	3	10
	Fayette	3	7.33	3.055	1.764	-.26	14.92	4	10
	Floyd	2	7.00	4.243	3.000	-31.12	45.12	4	10
Fountain	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8	
Franklin	11	6.82	2.228	.672	5.32	8.31	4	10	
Fulton	4	7.00	2.160	1.080	3.56	10.44	4	9	
Gibson	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9	

Grant	1	8.00	8	8
Greene	1	10.00	10	10
Hamilton	1	7.00	7	7
Hancock	4	6.50	1.915	.957	3.45	9.55	5	9
Harrison	2	7.00	2.828	2.000	-18.41	32.41	5	9
Hendricks	2	6.50	.707	.500	.15	12.85	6	7
Henry	3	9.00	1.000	.577	6.52	11.48	8	10
Howard	1	9.00	9	9
Huntington	3	8.33	1.528	.882	4.54	12.13	7	10
Jackson	1	4.00	4	4
Jasper	8	8.00	1.773	.627	6.52	9.48	5	10
Jay	1	10.00	10	10
Jefferson	3	7.67	1.528	.882	3.87	11.46	6	9
Jennings*		7.34						
Johnson	2	7.00	1.414	1.000	-5.71	19.71	6	8
Knox	8	8.38	1.847	.653	6.83	9.92	5	10
Kosciusko	1	8.00	8	8
LaGrange	3	7.00	2.646	1.528	.43	13.57	5	10
Lake	6	7.83	2.639	1.078	5.06	10.60	3	10
LaPorte	7	7.00	2.769	1.047	4.44	9.56	3	10
Lawrence*		7.34						
Madison	1	8.00	8	8
Marion	5	8.20	1.789	.800	5.98	10.42	6	10
Marshall	6	6.67	2.733	1.116	3.80	9.53	2	10
Martin	1	7.00	7	7
Miami	1	10.00	10	10
Monroe	10	8.50	1.509	.477	7.42	9.58	5	10
Montgomery*		7.52						
Morgan	1	8.00	8	8
Newton	10	7.70	2.452	.775	5.95	9.45	2	10
Noble	30	8.83	1.234	.225	8.37	9.29	6	10

Ohio	1	9.00	9	9
Orange	1	10.00	10	10
Owen	2	6.00	2.828	2.000	-19.41	31.41	4	8
Parke	1	10.00	10	10
Perry	1	7.00	7	7
Pike*		8.15						
Porter	7	9.57	1.134	.429	8.52	10.62	7	10
Posey*		8.15						
Pulaski	2	6.50	2.121	1.500	-12.56	25.56	5	8
Putnam	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8
Randolph	1	6.00	6	6
Ripley	3	6.33	3.215	1.856	-1.65	14.32	4	10
Rush*		7.95						
St. Joseph	12	7.33	1.923	.555	6.11	8.55	4	10
Scott	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10
Shelby*		7.12						
Spencer	2	8.00	2.828	2.000	-17.41	33.41	6	10
Starke	1	10.00	10	10
Steuben	5	6.60	1.342	.600	4.93	8.27	5	8
Sullivan	1	8.00	8	8
Switzerland	1	7.00	7	7
Tippecanoe	1	7.00	7	7
Tipton	1	7.00	7	7
Union	1	5.00	5	5
Vanderburgh	5	7.60	1.140	.510	6.18	9.02	6	9
Vermillion	1	2.00	2	2
Vigo	4	6.75	2.754	1.377	2.37	11.13	4	10
Wabash	1	7.00	7	7
Warren*		7.52						
Warrick	3	8.00	2.646	1.528	1.43	14.57	5	10
Washington*		7.34						

How knowledgeable are members of your county about substance abuse	Wayne	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10
	Wells	9	7.44	2.506	.835	5.52	9.37	3	10
	White	1	7.00	7	7
	Whitley	14	8.71	1.490	.398	7.85	9.57	5	10
	Total	335	7.72	2.011	.110	7.51	7.94	2	10
	Adams	8	4.75	1.035	.366	3.88	5.62	3	6
	Allen	32	4.53	1.849	.327	3.86	5.20	1	8
	Bartholomew	3	3.67	2.082	1.202	-1.50	8.84	2	6
	Benton*		4.45						
	Blackford	3	4.67	2.082	1.202	-.50	9.84	3	7
	Boone	2	4.50	.707	.500	-1.85	10.85	4	5
	Brown	1	5.00	5	5
	Carroll*		4.45						
	Cass	1	3.00	3	3
	Clark	3	5.00	1.732	1.000	.70	9.30	3	6
	Clay	5	3.80	1.789	.800	1.58	6.02	2	6
	Clinton	1	5.00	5	5
	Crawford*		4.51						
	Daviess	9	6.33	2.121	.707	4.70	7.96	2	10
	Dearborn	2	5.50	2.121	1.500	-13.56	24.56	4	7
	Decatur	1	4.00	4	4
	DeKalb	3	3.67	1.155	.667	.80	6.54	3	5
	Delaware	4	5.75	.957	.479	4.23	7.27	5	7
	Dubois	8	4.63	2.066	.730	2.90	6.35	1	7
	Elkhart	12	5.25	1.658	.479	4.20	6.30	3	8
	Fayette	3	4.67	2.517	1.453	-1.58	10.92	2	7
	Floyd	2	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00	4	4
Fountain	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71	5	7	
Franklin	11	3.64	1.433	.432	2.67	4.60	2	6	
Fulton	4	5.50	1.915	.957	2.45	8.55	3	7	
Gibson	2	5.00	2.828	2.000	-20.41	30.41	3	7	

Grant	1	8.00	8	8
Greene	1	6.00	6	6
Hamilton	1	4.00	4	4
Hancock	4	5.25	.957	.479	3.73	6.77	4	6
Harrison	2	5.50	2.121	1.500	-13.56	24.56	4	7
Hendricks	2	4.50	2.121	1.500	-14.56	23.56	3	6
Henry	3	6.00	2.000	1.155	1.03	10.97	4	8
Howard	1	5.00	5	5
Huntington	3	6.00	1.000	.577	3.52	8.48	5	7
Jackson	1	5.00	5	5
Jasper	8	4.38	1.923	.680	2.77	5.98	2	7
Jay	1	3.00	3	3
Jefferson	3	5.33	1.528	.882	1.54	9.13	4	7
Jennings*		4.51						
Johnson	2	4.00	1.414	1.000	-8.71	16.71	3	5
Knox	9	6.67	1.936	.645	5.18	8.16	4	9
Kosciusko	1	4.00	4	4
LaGrange	3	4.00	1.732	1.000	-.30	8.30	2	5
Lake	6	5.67	1.862	.760	3.71	7.62	3	8
LaPorte	7	5.29	1.976	.747	3.46	7.11	3	8
Lawrence*		4.51						
Madison	1	2.00	2	2
Marion	5	5.20	1.643	.735	3.16	7.24	4	8
Marshall	7	4.57	1.512	.571	3.17	5.97	3	7
Martin	1	4.00	4	4
Miami	1	4.00	4	4
Monroe	10	4.60	1.350	.427	3.63	5.57	2	7
Montgomery*		4.45						
Morgan	1	6.00	6	6
Newton	9	4.78	1.481	.494	3.64	5.92	3	7
Noble	30	6.37	1.542	.282	5.79	6.94	2	9

Ohio	1	4.00	4	4
Orange	1	6.00	6	6
Owen	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4
Parke	1	5.00	5	5
Perry	1	5.00	5	5
Pike*		5.33						
Porter	7	4.29	2.215	.837	2.24	6.33	3	9
Posey*		5.33						
Pulaski	2	3.50	2.121	1.500	-15.56	22.56	2	5
Putnam	2	4.00	1.414	1.000	-8.71	16.71	3	5
Randolph	1	4.00	4	4
Ripley	3	4.33	1.155	.667	1.46	7.20	3	5
Rush*		5.20						
St. Joseph	12	5.00	1.859	.537	3.82	6.18	2	8
Scott	2	6.50	2.121	1.500	-12.56	25.56	5	8
Shelby*		4.88						
Spencer	2	6.00	4.243	3.000	-32.12	44.12	3	9
Starke	1	6.00	6	6
Steuben	5	4.60	1.517	.678	2.72	6.48	3	7
Sullivan	1	4.00	4	4
Switzerland	1	5.00	5	5
Tippecanoe	1	3.00	3	3
Tipton	1	3.00	3	3
Union	1	6.00	6	6
Vanderburgh	5	4.80	1.095	.490	3.44	6.16	4	6
Vermillion	1	3.00	3	3
Vigo	4	5.25	.957	.479	3.73	6.77	4	6
Wabash	1	7.00	7	7
Warren*		4.45						
Warrick	4	2.25	.500	.250	1.45	3.05	2	3
Washington*		4.51						

How knowledgeable are members of your county about risk factors	Wayne	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71	5	7
	Wells	9	5.56	1.236	.412	4.61	6.51	3	7
	White	1	6.00	6	6
	Whitley	14	6.36	1.906	.509	5.26	7.46	3	10
	Total	335	5.04	1.789	.098	4.85	5.23	1	10
	Adams	8	4.75	1.282	.453	3.68	5.82	3	6
	Allen	31	4.68	1.869	.336	3.99	5.36	1	9
	Bartholomew	3	4.00	2.000	1.155	-.97	8.97	2	6
	Benton*		4.35						
	Blackford	3	4.00	1.000	.577	1.52	6.48	3	5
	Boone	2	4.50	.707	.500	-1.85	10.85	4	5
	Brown	1	4.00	4	4
	Carroll*		4.35						
	Cass	1	3.00	3	3
	Clark	3	3.67	1.155	.667	.80	6.54	3	5
	Clay	5	3.40	1.673	.748	1.32	5.48	2	6
	Clinton	1	5.00	5	5
	Crawford*		4.16						
	Daviess	9	5.56	1.740	.580	4.22	6.89	2	8
	Dearborn	2	6.50	.707	.500	.15	12.85	6	7
	Decatur	1	4.00	4	4
	DeKalb	3	3.67	1.155	.667	.80	6.54	3	5
	Delaware	4	5.25	.500	.250	4.45	6.05	5	6
	Dubois	8	4.63	1.408	.498	3.45	5.80	3	6
	Elkhart	12	5.33	1.826	.527	4.17	6.49	3	9
	Fayette	3	4.00	2.000	1.155	-.97	8.97	2	6
Floyd	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4	
Fountain	2	5.50	.707	.500	-.85	11.85	5	6	
Franklin	11	3.36	1.567	.472	2.31	4.42	1	6	
Fulton	4	4.50	1.915	.957	1.45	7.55	3	7	
Gibson	2	5.00	2.828	2.000	-20.41	30.41	3	7	

Grant	1	8.00	8	8
Greene	1	7.00	7	7
Hamilton	1	4.00	4	4
Hancock	4	4.75	.957	.479	3.23	6.27	4	6
Harrison	2	5.50	2.121	1.500	-13.56	24.56	4	7
Hendricks	2	4.50	2.121	1.500	-14.56	23.56	3	6
Henry	3	4.67	1.528	.882	.87	8.46	3	6
Howard	1	5.00	5	5
Huntington	3	5.67	2.082	1.202	.50	10.84	4	8
Jackson	1	4.00	4	4
Jasper	7	5.57	2.699	1.020	3.08	8.07	2	10
Jay	1	3.00	3	3
Jefferson	3	4.33	.577	.333	2.90	5.77	4	5
Jennings*		4.16						
Johnson	2	4.00	1.414	1.000	-8.71	16.71	3	5
Knox	9	6.44	2.555	.852	4.48	8.41	3	10
Kosciusko	1	3.00	3	3
LaGrange	3	3.67	1.528	.882	-.13	7.46	2	5
Lake	6	5.67	1.633	.667	3.95	7.38	3	8
LaPorte	7	5.57	2.370	.896	3.38	7.76	3	9
Lawrence*		4.16						
Madison	1	1.00	1	1
Marion	5	5.00	1.000	.447	3.76	6.24	4	6
Marshall	7	4.43	1.134	.429	3.38	5.48	3	6
Martin	1	4.00	4	4
Miami	1	4.00	4	4
Monroe	10	4.40	1.897	.600	3.04	5.76	3	8
Montgomery*		4.35						
Morgan	1	4.00	4	4
Newton	10	5.10	1.663	.526	3.91	6.29	3	8
Noble	30	6.10	1.918	.350	5.38	6.82	2	9

Ohio	1	4.00	4	4
Orange	1	6.00	6	6
Owen	2	2.50	2.121	1.500	-16.56	21.56	1	4
Parke	1	5.00	5	5
Perry	1	5.00	5	5
Pike*		5.05						
Porter	7	3.29	2.360	.892	1.10	5.47	2	8
Posey*		5.05						
Pulaski	2	3.50	2.121	1.500	-15.56	22.56	2	5
Putnam	2	4.00	1.414	1.000	-8.71	16.71	3	5
Randolph	1	5.00	5	5
Ripley	3	4.33	1.155	.667	1.46	7.20	3	5
Rush*		4.68						
St. Joseph	12	4.50	1.883	.544	3.30	5.70	2	8
Scott	2	5.50	2.121	1.500	-13.56	24.56	4	7
Shelby*		4.59						
Spencer	2	5.50	4.950	3.500	-38.97	49.97	2	9
Starke	1	6.00	6	6
Steuben	5	3.80	1.304	.583	2.18	5.42	2	5
Sullivan	1	4.00	4	4
Switzerland	1	5.00	5	5
Tippecanoe	1	3.00	3	3
Tipton	1	4.00	4	4
Union	0
Vanderburgh	5	4.20	1.095	.490	2.84	5.56	3	6
Vermillion	1	7.00	7	7
Vigo	4	5.00	1.414	.707	2.75	7.25	3	6
Wabash	1	5.00	5	5
Warren*		4.35						
Warrick	4	2.25	.500	.250	1.45	3.05	2	3
Washington*		4.16						

How much do the local media contribute to inform and educate	Wayne	2	6.50	.707	.500	.15	12.85	6	7
	Wells	9	5.56	1.333	.444	4.53	6.58	4	8
	White	1	6.00	6	6
	Whitley	14	6.00	1.754	.469	4.99	7.01	3	10
	Total	333	4.85	1.853	.102	4.65	5.05	1	10
	Adams	8	5.38	1.768	.625	3.90	6.85	3	8
	Allen	32	4.91	1.820	.322	4.25	5.56	2	8
	Bartholomew	3	5.67	3.055	1.764	-1.92	13.26	3	9
	Benton*		5.23						
	Blackford	3	3.67	2.309	1.333	-2.07	9.40	1	5
	Boone	2	3.50	.707	.500	-2.85	9.85	3	4
	Brown	1	7.00	7	7
	Carroll*		5.23						
	Cass	1	6.00	6	6
	Clark	3	4.00	2.000	1.155	-.97	8.97	2	6
	Clay	5	5.40	2.302	1.030	2.54	8.26	3	8
	Clinton	1	7.00	7	7
	Crawford		4.86						
	Daviess	9	5.00	1.118	.373	4.14	5.86	4	7
	Dearborn	2	7.00	.000	.000	7.00	7.00	7	7
	Decatur	1	3.00	3	3
	DeKalb	3	5.67	1.528	.882	1.87	9.46	4	7
	Delaware	4	5.50	2.082	1.041	2.19	8.81	3	8
	Dubois	8	6.63	2.326	.822	4.68	8.57	3	9
	Elkhart	11	4.55	1.572	.474	3.49	5.60	3	7
	Fayette	3	6.33	1.155	.667	3.46	9.20	5	7
Floyd	2	5.00	.000	.000	5.00	5.00	5	5	
Fountain	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71	5	7	
Franklin	11	4.09	1.973	.595	2.77	5.42	1	7	
Fulton	4	4.00	1.633	.816	1.40	6.60	2	6	
Gibson	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8	

Grant	1	5.00	5	5
Greene	1	10.00	10	10
Hamilton	1	5.00	5	5
Hancock	4	3.75	1.258	.629	1.75	5.75	2	5
Harrison	2	5.50	4.950	3.500	-38.97	49.97	2	9
Hendricks	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4
Henry	3	6.33	3.055	1.764	-1.26	13.92	3	9
Howard	1	6.00	6	6
Huntington	3	5.67	.577	.333	4.23	7.10	5	6
Jackson	1	6.00	6	6
Jasper	7	4.71	1.380	.522	3.44	5.99	3	7
Jay	1	8.00	8	8
Jefferson	3	7.00	2.646	1.528	.43	13.57	4	9
Jennings*		4.86						
Johnson	2	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
Knox	9	7.11	2.205	.735	5.42	8.81	3	10
Kosciusko	1	7.00	7	7
LaGrange	3	7.00	.000	.000	7.00	7.00	7	7
Lake	6	4.67	1.211	.494	3.40	5.94	3	6
LaPorte	7	4.14	2.268	.857	2.05	6.24	2	7
Lawrence*		4.86						
Madison	1	4.00	4	4
Marion	5	4.20	1.789	.800	1.98	6.42	2	6
Marshall	7	5.43	1.618	.612	3.93	6.93	3	8
Martin	1	2.00	2	2
Miami	1	3.00	3	3
Monroe	10	4.70	2.452	.775	2.95	6.45	2	9
Montgomery*		5.23						
Morgan	1	5.00	5	5
Newton	10	3.60	1.647	.521	2.42	4.78	1	6
Noble	30	6.90	2.187	.399	6.08	7.72	2	10

Ohio	1	1.00	1	1
Orange	1	7.00	7	7
Owen	2	5.50	.707	.500	-.85	11.85	5	6
Parke	1	5.00	5	5
Perry	1	6.00	6	6
Pike*		5.93						
Porter	7	5.86	1.864	.705	4.13	7.58	2	8
Posey*		5.93						
Pulaski	2	2.50	.707	.500	-3.85	8.85	2	3
Putnam	2	5.50	3.536	2.500	-26.27	37.27	3	8
Randolph	1	5.00	5	5
Ripley	3	4.33	.577	.333	2.90	5.77	4	5
Rush*		5.25						
St. Joseph	12	4.42	1.621	.468	3.39	5.45	2	8
Scott	2	5.00	2.828	2.000	-20.41	30.41	3	7
Shelby*		3.71						
Spencer	1	4.00	4	4
Starke	1	9.00	9	9
Steuben	5	6.00	1.871	.837	3.68	8.32	4	9
Sullivan	1	5.00	5	5
Switzerland	1	3.00	3	3
Tippecanoe	1	2.00	2	2
Tipton	1	3.00	3	3
Union	1	4.00	4	4
Vanderburgh	5	5.40	1.517	.678	3.52	7.28	3	7
Vermillion	1	4.00	4	4
Vigo	4	5.75	1.258	.629	3.75	7.75	4	7
Wabash	1	5.00	5	5
Warren*		5.23						
Warrick	3	3.67	1.155	.667	.80	6.54	3	5
Washington*		4.86						

What is the level of expertise, training, skill among prevention staff	Wayne	2	4.00	1.414	1.000	-8.71	16.71	3	5
	Wells	9	4.89	1.616	.539	3.65	6.13	2	7
	White	1	8.00	8	8
	Whitley	13	5.54	1.664	.462	4.53	6.54	3	9
	Total	331	5.21	2.039	.112	4.98	5.43	1	10
	Adams	8	7.38	1.996	.706	5.71	9.04	4	10
	Allen	32	6.00	1.646	.291	5.41	6.59	3	9
	Bartholomew	3	9.00	1.000	.577	6.52	11.48	8	10
	Benton*		7.52						
	Blackford	3	7.00	1.732	1.000	2.70	11.30	5	8
	Boone	2	5.00	1.414	1.000	-7.71	17.71	4	6
	Brown	1	6.00	6	6
	Carroll*		7.52						
	Cass	1	6.00	6	6
	Clark	3	5.67	1.528	.882	1.87	9.46	4	7
	Clay	5	7.60	.548	.245	6.92	8.28	7	8
	Clinton	1	7.00	7	7
	Crawford*		7.21						
	Daviess	9	5.67	2.500	.833	3.74	7.59	2	10
	Dearborn	3	7.67	1.155	.667	4.80	10.54	7	9
	Decatur	1	10.00	10	10
	DeKalb	3	6.33	1.155	.667	3.46	9.20	5	7
	Delaware	4	7.50	.577	.289	6.58	8.42	7	8
	Dubois	8	7.88	1.356	.479	6.74	9.01	6	10
	Elkhart	13	7.31	1.316	.365	6.51	8.10	5	10
	Fayette	3	6.33	1.528	.882	2.54	10.13	5	8
	Floyd	2	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Fountain	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8	
Franklin	11	7.36	1.286	.388	6.50	8.23	5	9	
Fulton	4	7.50	3.109	1.555	2.55	12.45	3	10	
Gibson	2	7.50	2.121	1.500	-11.56	26.56	6	9	

Grant	1	7.00	7	7
Greene	1	9.00	9	9
Hamilton	1	7.00	7	7
Hancock	4	7.50	.577	.289	6.58	8.42	7	8
Harrison	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8
Hendricks	2	5.50	.707	.500	-.85	11.85	5	6
Henry	3	7.67	.577	.333	6.23	9.10	7	8
Howard	1	6.00	6	6
Huntington	3	8.00	1.000	.577	5.52	10.48	7	9
Jackson	1	6.00	6	6
Jasper	7	6.71	1.496	.565	5.33	8.10	5	9
Jay	1	9.00	9	9
Jefferson	3	6.33	2.309	1.333	.60	12.07	5	9
Jennings*		7.21						
Johnson	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8
Knox	9	8.56	1.424	.475	7.46	9.65	6	10
Kosciusko	1	7.00	7	7
LaGrange	3	6.00	2.646	1.528	-.57	12.57	3	8
Lake	6	7.83	.983	.401	6.80	8.87	6	9
LaPorte	7	7.00	2.582	.976	4.61	9.39	4	10
Lawrence*		7.21						
Madison	1	8.00	8	8
Marion	5	7.20	1.095	.490	5.84	8.56	6	9
Marshall	6	6.33	2.160	.882	4.07	8.60	4	10
Martin	1	5.00	5	5
Miami	1	7.00	7	7
Monroe	10	8.10	1.524	.482	7.01	9.19	5	10
Montgomery*		7.52						
Morgan	1	8.00	8	8
Newton	10	6.40	1.174	.371	5.56	7.24	5	8
Noble	30	8.43	1.357	.248	7.93	8.94	3	10

Ohio	1	3.00	3	3
Orange	1	9.00	9	9
Owen	2	4.50	2.121	1.500	-14.56	23.56	3	6
Parke	1	10.00	10	10
Perry	1	9.00	9	9
Pike*		7.39						
Porter	7	7.86	.378	.143	7.51	8.21	7	8
Posey*		7.39						
Pulaski	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71	5	7
Putnam	2	6.50	.707	.500	.15	12.85	6	7
Randolph	1	6.00	6	6
Ripley	3	4.33	.577	.333	2.90	5.77	4	5
Rush*		7.15						
St. Joseph	12	7.58	1.240	.358	6.80	8.37	5	10
Scott	2	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Shelby*		6.94						
Spencer	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8
Starke	1	7.00	7	7
Steuben	5	8.00	1.225	.548	6.48	9.52	6	9
Sullivan	1	8.00	8	8
Switzerland	1	8.00	8	8
Tippecanoe	1	7.00	7	7
Tipton	1	6.00	6	6
Union	1	4.00	4	4
Vanderburgh	5	7.80	.447	.200	7.24	8.36	7	8
Vermillion	1	9.00	9	9
Vigo	4	7.25	1.500	.750	4.86	9.64	6	9
Wabash	1	7.00	7	7
Warren*		7.52						
Warrick	3	6.33	1.528	.882	2.54	10.13	5	8
Washington*		7.21						

How supportive are local businesses in your county of prevention efforts	Wayne	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8
	Wells	9	7.11	1.616	.539	5.87	8.35	4	9
	White	1	7.00	7	7
	Whitley	13	7.77	1.739	.482	6.72	8.82	5	10
	Total	334	7.23	1.690	.092	7.05	7.41	2	10
	Adams	8	6.75	1.581	.559	5.43	8.07	4	9
	Allen	31	4.68	1.759	.316	4.03	5.32	2	8
	Bartholomew	3	5.67	2.082	1.202	.50	10.84	4	8
	Benton*		5.97						
	Blackford	3	4.33	2.309	1.333	-1.40	10.07	3	7
	Boone	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71	5	7
	Brown	1	5.00	5	5
	Carroll*		5.97						
	Cass	1	2.00	2	2
	Clark	3	5.00	3.000	1.732	-2.45	12.45	2	8
	Clay	5	5.60	1.949	.872	3.18	8.02	3	8
	Clinton	1	2.00	2	2
	Crawford*		5.32						
	Daviess	9	5.33	2.236	.745	3.61	7.05	2	9
	Dearborn	3	6.33	2.887	1.667	-.84	13.50	3	8
	Decatur	1	3.00	3	3
	DeKalb	3	5.33	1.528	.882	1.54	9.13	4	7
	Delaware	4	8.25	2.062	1.031	4.97	11.53	6	10
	Dubois	8	6.63	1.598	.565	5.29	7.96	4	8
	Elkhart	13	5.23	.832	.231	4.73	5.73	4	7
	Fayette	3	4.00	1.000	.577	1.52	6.48	3	5
	Floyd	2	4.50	3.536	2.500	-27.27	36.27	2	7
Fountain	2	6.50	.707	.500	.15	12.85	6	7	
Franklin	11	5.45	2.296	.692	3.91	7.00	2	8	
Fulton	4	7.00	2.160	1.080	3.56	10.44	5	10	
Gibson	2	4.50	2.121	1.500	-14.56	23.56	3	6	

Grant	1	7.00	7	7
Greene	1	4.00	4	4
Hamilton	1	9.00	9	9
Hancock	4	6.00	1.414	.707	3.75	8.25	5	8
Harrison	2	6.00	2.828	2.000	-19.41	31.41	4	8
Hendricks	2	4.50	2.121	1.500	-14.56	23.56	3	6
Henry	3	5.33	.577	.333	3.90	6.77	5	6
Howard	1	6.00	6	6
Huntington	3	5.33	2.082	1.202	.16	10.50	3	7
Jackson	1	5.00	5	5
Jasper	6	5.33	1.633	.667	3.62	7.05	3	7
Jay	1	7.00	7	7
Jefferson	3	5.67	1.155	.667	2.80	8.54	5	7
Jennings*		5.32						
Johnson	2	4.00	1.414	1.000	-8.71	16.71	3	5
Knox	9	6.22	1.787	.596	4.85	7.60	5	10
Kosciusko	1	4.00	4	4
LaGrange	3	5.67	1.155	.667	2.80	8.54	5	7
Lake	6	6.50	1.049	.428	5.40	7.60	5	8
LaPorte	7	4.86	2.545	.962	2.50	7.21	2	9
Lawrence*		5.32						
Madison	1	5.00	5	5
Marion	5	5.00	.707	.316	4.12	5.88	4	6
Marshall	6	4.67	2.251	.919	2.30	7.03	3	9
Martin	1	4.00	4	4
Miami	1	10.00	10	10
Monroe	10	6.90	1.663	.526	5.71	8.09	3	9
Montgomery*		5.97						
Morgan	1	5.00	5	5
Newton	10	5.20	1.814	.573	3.90	6.50	3	9
Noble	29	6.72	1.386	.257	6.20	7.25	4	10

Ohio	1	3.00	3	3
Orange	1	6.00	6	6
Owen	2	5.00	1.414	1.000	-7.71	17.71	4	6
Parke	1	8.00	8	8
Perry	1	9.00	9	9
Pike*		5.63						
Porter	7	3.00	.000	.000	3.00	3.00	3	3
Posey*		5.63						
Pulaski	2	5.00	2.828	2.000	-20.41	30.41	3	7
Putnam	2	3.50	.707	.500	-2.85	9.85	3	4
Randolph	1	6.00	6	6
Ripley	3	3.33	2.082	1.202	-1.84	8.50	1	5
Rush*		5.90						
St. Joseph	12	5.08	1.730	.499	3.98	6.18	2	8
Scott	2	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Shelby*		4.41						
Spencer	2	7.00	2.828	2.000	-18.41	32.41	5	9
Starke	1	8.00	8	8
Steuben	5	4.80	1.643	.735	2.76	6.84	3	6
Sullivan	1	8.00	8	8
Switzerland	1	3.00	3	3
Tippecanoe	1	2.00	2	2
Tipton	1	2.00	2	2
Union	1	5.00	5	5
Vanderburgh	5	5.20	1.483	.663	3.36	7.04	3	7
Vermillion	1	6.00	6	6
Vigo	4	6.25	1.258	.629	4.25	8.25	5	8
Wabash	1	7.00	7	7
Warren*		5.97						
Warrick	3	2.67	1.155	.667	-.20	5.54	2	4
Washington*		5.32						

How supportive are citizens of substance abuse prevention efforts	Wayne	2	7.00	.000	.000	7.00	7.00	7	7
	Wells	9	5.67	2.121	.707	4.04	7.30	2	8
	White	1	7.00	7	7
	Whitley	13	7.54	1.561	.433	6.60	8.48	4	10
	Total	331	5.61	1.973	.108	5.39	5.82	1	10
	Adams	8	5.38	1.302	.460	4.29	6.46	4	7
	Allen	32	5.16	1.668	.295	4.55	5.76	2	8
	Bartholomew	3	5.67	1.155	.667	2.80	8.54	5	7
	Benton*		6.32						
	Blackford	3	6.00	2.646	1.528	-.57	12.57	3	8
	Boone	2	5.50	.707	.500	-.85	11.85	5	6
	Brown	1	7.00	7	7
	Carroll*		6.32						
	Cass	1	2.00	2	2
	Clark	3	5.67	1.155	.667	2.80	8.54	5	7
	Clay	5	5.60	1.673	.748	3.52	7.68	3	7
	Clinton	1	5.00	5	5
	Crawford*		5.32						
	Daviess	9	6.00	1.225	.408	5.06	6.94	4	8
	Dearborn	3	6.33	1.155	.667	3.46	9.20	5	7
	Decatur	1	3.00	3	3
	DeKalb	3	4.33	.577	.333	2.90	5.77	4	5
	Delaware	4	8.00	1.826	.913	5.09	10.91	6	10
	Dubois	8	5.75	1.035	.366	4.88	6.62	4	7
	Elkhart	13	5.54	.967	.268	4.95	6.12	4	7
	Fayette	3	4.00	1.000	.577	1.52	6.48	3	5
	Floyd	2	4.00	4.243	3.000	-34.12	42.12	1	7
Fountain	2	6.50	.707	.500	.15	12.85	6	7	
Franklin	11	5.09	1.921	.579	3.80	6.38	2	8	
Fulton	4	6.00	1.414	.707	3.75	8.25	4	7	
Gibson	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71	5	7	

Grant	1	7.00	7	7
Greene	1	4.00	4	4
Hamilton	1	5.00	5	5
Hancock	4	5.75	1.708	.854	3.03	8.47	4	8
Harrison	2	5.50	3.536	2.500	-26.27	37.27	3	8
Hendricks	2	5.00	1.414	1.000	-7.71	17.71	4	6
Henry	3	6.33	.577	.333	4.90	7.77	6	7
Howard	1	6.00	6	6
Huntington	3	5.67	1.528	.882	1.87	9.46	4	7
Jackson	1	4.00	4	4
Jasper	7	5.29	1.604	.606	3.80	6.77	2	7
Jay	1	8.00	8	8
Jefferson	3	5.67	1.155	.667	2.80	8.54	5	7
Jennings*		5.32						
Johnson	2	6.50	2.121	1.500	-12.56	25.56	5	8
Knox	9	6.33	1.803	.601	4.95	7.72	5	10
Kosciusko	1	5.00	5	5
LaGrange	3	4.33	1.528	.882	.54	8.13	3	6
Lake	6	6.50	1.049	.428	5.40	7.60	5	8
LaPorte	7	5.86	1.952	.738	4.05	7.66	3	8
Lawrence*		5.32						
Madison	1	5.00	5	5
Marion	5	5.40	1.140	.510	3.98	6.82	4	7
Marshall	6	5.17	1.329	.543	3.77	6.56	3	7
Martin	1	3.00	3	3
Miami	1	10.00	10	10
Monroe	10	7.20	1.549	.490	6.09	8.31	3	8
Montgomery*		6.32						
Morgan	1	6.00	6	6
Newton	10	5.30	2.003	.633	3.87	6.73	3	9
Noble	30	6.67	1.348	.246	6.16	7.17	4	10

Ohio	1	5.00	5	5
Orange	1	7.00	7	7
Owen	2	6.00	.000	.000	6.00	6.00	6	6
Parke	1	10.00	10	10
Perry	1	10.00	10	10
Pike*		5.93						
Porter	7	4.00	.577	.218	3.47	4.53	3	5
Posey*		5.93						
Pulaski	2	5.00	.000	.000	5.00	5.00	5	5
Putnam	2	4.50	2.121	1.500	-14.56	23.56	3	6
Randolph	1	5.00	5	5
Ripley	3	4.00	1.000	.577	1.52	6.48	3	5
Rush*		6.25						
St. Joseph	12	5.50	1.931	.557	4.27	6.73	2	8
Scott	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8
Shelby*		5.59						
Spencer	2	6.50	3.536	2.500	-25.27	38.27	4	9
Starke	1	9.00	9	9
Steuben	5	4.80	2.168	.970	2.11	7.49	1	6
Sullivan	1	8.00	8	8
Switzerland	1	3.00	3	3
Tippecanoe	1	3.00	3	3
Tipton	1	2.00	2	2
Union	1	5.00	5	5
Vanderburgh	5	5.40	1.140	.510	3.98	6.82	4	7
Vermillion	1	4.00	4	4
Vigo	4	6.25	1.258	.629	4.25	8.25	5	8
Wabash	1	8.00	8	8
Warren*		6.32						
Warrick	3	5.67	.577	.333	4.23	7.10	5	6
Washington*		5.32						

How much collaboration occurs among public and private agencies	Wayne	2	7.00	.000	.000	7.00	7.00	7	7
	Wells	9	5.78	1.856	.619	4.35	7.20	3	8
	White	1	7.00	7	7
	Whitley	13	7.85	1.281	.355	7.07	8.62	6	10
	Total	334	5.79	1.745	.095	5.60	5.98	1	10
	Adams	8	6.00	1.309	.463	4.91	7.09	4	8
	Allen	31	5.68	2.039	.366	4.93	6.43	2	10
	Bartholomew	3	6.00	2.646	1.528	-.57	12.57	4	9
	Benton*		6.03						
	Blackford	3	5.33	.577	.333	3.90	6.77	5	6
	Boone	2	4.50	.707	.500	-1.85	10.85	4	5
	Brown	1	9.00	9	9
	Carroll*		6.03						
	Cass	1	2.00	2	2
	Clark	3	5.00	2.646	1.528	-1.57	11.57	3	8
	Clay	5	5.40	2.191	.980	2.68	8.12	3	9
	Clinton	1	5.00	5	5
	Crawford*		5.68						
	Daviess	9	5.67	2.236	.745	3.95	7.39	2	10
	Dearborn	3	7.00	2.000	1.155	2.03	11.97	5	9
	Decatur	1	3.00	3	3
	DeKalb	3	5.67	1.528	.882	1.87	9.46	4	7
	Delaware	4	7.50	1.291	.645	5.45	9.55	6	9
	Dubois	8	7.25	1.669	.590	5.85	8.65	4	9
	Elkhart	13	5.38	1.193	.331	4.66	6.11	3	7
	Fayette	3	5.00	2.000	1.155	.03	9.97	3	7
Floyd	2	6.00	2.828	2.000	-19.41	31.41	4	8	
Fountain	2	7.00	.000	.000	7.00	7.00	7	7	
Franklin	11	5.27	2.102	.634	3.86	6.68	2	8	
Fulton	4	5.50	2.517	1.258	1.50	9.50	2	8	
Gibson	2	5.50	2.121	1.500	-13.56	24.56	4	7	

Grant	1	8.00	8	8
Greene	1	10.00	10	10
Hamilton	1	7.00	7	7
Hancock	4	5.75	.500	.250	4.95	6.55	5	6
Harrison	2	5.50	3.536	2.500	-26.27	37.27	3	8
Hendricks	2	5.50	.707	.500	-.85	11.85	5	6
Henry	3	7.00	2.646	1.528	.43	13.57	5	10
Howard	1	6.00	6	6
Huntington	3	7.00	1.000	.577	4.52	9.48	6	8
Jackson	1	7.00	7	7
Jasper	7	5.71	2.498	.944	3.40	8.02	2	8
Jay	1	6.00	6	6
Jefferson	3	5.33	1.528	.882	1.54	9.13	4	7
Jennings*		5.68						
Johnson	2	4.00	1.414	1.000	-8.71	16.71	3	5
Knox	9	7.22	1.716	.572	5.90	8.54	4	9
Kosciusko	1	4.00	4	4
LaGrange	3	5.33	1.528	.882	1.54	9.13	4	7
Lake	6	6.17	1.472	.601	4.62	7.71	4	8
LaPorte	7	5.86	3.625	1.370	2.50	9.21	1	10
Lawrence*		5.68						
Madison	1	6.00	6	6
Marion	5	5.60	1.517	.678	3.72	7.48	4	8
Marshall	5	4.60	1.140	.510	3.18	6.02	3	6
Martin	1	4.00	4	4
Miami	1	10.00	10	10
Monroe	10	7.70	1.059	.335	6.94	8.46	6	9
Montgomery*		6.03						
Morgan	1	7.00	7	7
Newton	10	5.30	1.829	.578	3.99	6.61	3	8
Noble	29	7.07	1.791	.333	6.39	7.75	2	10

Ohio	1	6.00	6	6
Orange	1	5.00	5	5
Owen	2	3.50	2.121	1.500	-15.56	22.56	2	5
Parke	1	5.00	5	5
Perry	1	9.00	9	9
Pike*		6.49						
Porter	7	6.71	1.976	.747	4.89	8.54	3	8
Posey*		6.49						
Pulaski	2	4.00	4.243	3.000	-34.12	42.12	1	7
Putnam	2	6.50	.707	.500	.15	12.85	6	7
Randolph	1	6.00	6	6
Ripley	3	4.33	.577	.333	2.90	5.77	4	5
Rush*		6.35						
St. Joseph	12	6.00	2.089	.603	4.67	7.33	3	9
Scott	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8
Shelby*		5.47						
Spencer	2	6.00	2.828	2.000	-19.41	31.41	4	8
Starke	1	8.00	8	8
Steuben	5	5.80	1.304	.583	4.18	7.42	4	7
Sullivan	1	4.00	4	4
Switzerland	1	7.00	7	7
Tippecanoe	1	3.00	3	3
Tipton	1	5.00	5	5
Union	1	5.00	5	5
Vanderburgh	5	6.20	.837	.374	5.16	7.24	5	7
Vermillion	1	4.00	4	4
Vigo	4	5.25	.500	.250	4.45	6.05	5	6
Wabash	1	6.00	6	6
Warren*		6.03						
Warrick	3	5.00	3.464	2.000	-3.61	13.61	3	9
Washington*		5.68						

Wayne	2	7.00	1.414	1.000	-5.71	19.71	6	8
Wells	9	6.22	1.787	.596	4.85	7.60	3	9
White	1	7.00	7	7
Whitley	13	7.15	1.819	.504	6.05	8.25	4	10
Total	331	6.05	1.947	.107	5.84	6.26	1	10

*Denotes counties with missing data: county-level mean based on regional mean and not considered for 'total' computation.

Table 7: Respondents' Beliefs about Number of Problems Caused by Individual Substances (Calculated Means by Region)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Rating of alcohol problems	Central	17	8.76	1.147	.278	8.17	9.35	7	10
	East	20	8.60	.940	.210	8.16	9.04	7	10
	North Central	47	8.85	1.367	.199	8.45	9.25	4	10
	Northeast	106	8.85	1.256	.122	8.61	9.09	3	10
	Northwest	33	8.91	1.100	.192	8.52	9.30	6	10
	West	30	8.83	1.341	.245	8.33	9.33	4	10
	Southeast	37	9.27	.962	.158	8.95	9.59	7	10
	Southwest	42	9.14	1.475	.228	8.68	9.60	5	10
	Total	332	8.92	1.245	.068	8.78	9.05	3	10
Rating of cocaine problems	Central	17	5.82	2.351	.570	4.61	7.03	2	10
	East	20	6.90	2.245	.502	5.85	7.95	2	10
	North Central	47	6.66	1.959	.286	6.08	7.23	3	10
	Northeast	102	6.10	2.164	.214	5.67	6.52	2	10
	Northwest	33	6.42	2.180	.379	5.65	7.20	2	10
	West	30	5.70	2.307	.421	4.84	6.56	1	10
	Southeast	33	5.58	2.372	.413	4.73	6.42	1	10
	Southwest	39	5.87	2.092	.335	5.19	6.55	2	10
	Total	321	6.13	2.190	.122	5.89	6.37	1	10
Rating of hallucinogen problems	Central	17	4.59	1.734	.421	3.70	5.48	1	7
	East	18	5.33	1.715	.404	4.48	6.19	2	8

Rating of heroin problems	North Central	45	4.16	1.678	.250	3.65	4.66	1	8	
	Northeast	100	4.81	2.073	.207	4.40	5.22	1	10	
	Northwest	33	4.85	2.063	.359	4.12	5.58	1	10	
	West	30	4.43	1.906	.348	3.72	5.15	2	10	
	Southeast	33	4.58	2.000	.348	3.87	5.29	1	9	
	Southwest	36	4.81	1.954	.326	4.14	5.47	1	10	
	Total	312	4.68	1.945	.110	4.46	4.89	1	10	
	Central	17	4.18	2.069	.502	3.11	5.24	1	7	
	East	19	4.84	1.979	.454	3.89	5.80	1	9	
	North Central	45	4.02	1.751	.261	3.50	4.55	1	9	
	Northeast	100	4.09	2.184	.218	3.66	4.52	1	10	
	Northwest	33	5.00	2.669	.465	4.05	5.95	1	10	
	West	30	4.03	2.266	.414	3.19	4.88	1	10	
	Southeast	32	3.91	1.820	.322	3.25	4.56	1	8	
Rating of inhalant problems	Southwest	37	3.65	1.947	.320	3.00	4.30	1	10	
	Total	313	4.15	2.124	.120	3.91	4.39	1	10	
	Central	17	5.35	1.902	.461	4.38	6.33	1	8	
	East	19	5.37	2.140	.491	4.34	6.40	2	9	
	North Central	44	4.75	2.036	.307	4.13	5.37	1	10	
	Northeast	102	5.46	2.081	.206	5.05	5.87	1	10	
	Northwest	33	4.76	1.921	.334	4.08	5.44	1	9	
	West	30	5.50	2.129	.389	4.70	6.30	1	10	
	Southeast	32	5.31	2.348	.415	4.47	6.16	1	10	
	Southwest	37	5.35	2.360	.388	4.56	6.14	1	10	
	Total	314	5.25	2.117	.119	5.02	5.49	1	10	
	Rating of marijuana problems	Central	17	8.00	1.936	.470	7.00	9.00	3	10
		East	20	7.90	1.410	.315	7.24	8.56	5	10
		North Central	47	8.21	1.366	.199	7.81	8.61	4	10
Northeast		105	8.09	1.563	.153	7.78	8.39	3	10	
Northwest		33	8.70	1.447	.252	8.18	9.21	4	10	
West		30	7.97	1.732	.316	7.32	8.61	3	10	

Rating of methamphetamine problems	Southeast	35	8.03	1.740	.294	7.43	8.63	2	10
	Southwest	40	8.38	1.659	.262	7.84	8.91	5	10
	Total	327	8.17	1.584	.088	8.00	8.34	2	10
	Central	17	6.59	2.763	.670	5.17	8.01	1	10
	East	19	7.16	1.893	.434	6.25	8.07	2	10
	North Central	47	6.68	2.424	.354	5.97	7.39	1	10
	Northeast	104	7.83	1.997	.196	7.44	8.22	3	10
	Northwest	33	5.48	2.551	.444	4.58	6.39	2	10
	West	30	8.30	2.246	.410	7.46	9.14	3	10
	Southeast	35	7.94	1.970	.333	7.27	8.62	3	10
Rating of prescription drug problems	Southwest	42	9.17	1.464	.226	8.71	9.62	4	10
	Total	327	7.55	2.335	.129	7.30	7.80	1	10
	Central	17	7.24	1.715	.416	6.35	8.12	3	9
	East	19	8.42	1.677	.385	7.61	9.23	4	10
	North Central	46	7.04	1.699	.251	6.54	7.55	3	10
	Northeast	103	7.02	1.743	.172	6.68	7.36	3	10
	Northwest	33	6.76	1.640	.285	6.18	7.34	4	10
	West	30	7.73	1.660	.303	7.11	8.35	5	10
	Southeast	36	7.67	2.014	.336	6.99	8.35	1	10
	Southwest	39	8.08	1.855	.297	7.48	8.68	2	10
Rating of rave drug problems	Total	323	7.36	1.809	.101	7.16	7.55	1	10
	Central	17	4.88	2.288	.555	3.71	6.06	1	9
	East	19	4.84	2.007	.461	3.87	5.81	1	8
	North Central	45	4.47	1.829	.273	3.92	5.02	1	8
	Northeast	102	5.04	2.148	.213	4.62	5.46	1	10
	Northwest	31	4.45	1.912	.343	3.75	5.15	1	8
	West	30	4.50	2.177	.398	3.69	5.31	1	10
	Southeast	33	4.61	2.120	.369	3.85	5.36	1	10
	Southwest	37	4.65	2.239	.368	3.90	5.40	1	9
	Total	314	4.74	2.084	.118	4.50	4.97	1	10

Rating of tobacco problems	Central	17	9.12	1.409	.342	8.39	9.84	6	10
	East	20	8.90	1.071	.240	8.40	9.40	7	10
	North Central	47	8.60	1.919	.280	8.03	9.16	1	10
	Northeast	106	8.55	1.790	.174	8.20	8.89	1	10
	Northwest	33	8.33	1.865	.325	7.67	8.99	2	10
	West	30	8.87	1.634	.298	8.26	9.48	3	10
	Southeast	37	8.86	1.601	.263	8.33	9.40	3	10
	Southwest	42	8.62	2.036	.314	7.98	9.25	1	10
	Total	332	8.66	1.758	.096	8.47	8.85	1	10

Table 7: Respondents' Beliefs about Number of Problems Caused by Individual Substances (Calculated Means by County)

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Rating of alcohol problems	Adams	8	9.38	.916	.324	8.61	10.14	8	10
	Allen	32	8.97	1.555	.275	8.41	9.53	3	10
	Bartholomew	3	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10
	Benton*		8.83						
	Blackford	3	9.00	1.000	.577	6.52	11.48	8	10
	Boone	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10
	Brown	1	7.00	7	7
	Carroll*		8.83						
	Cass	1	4.00	4	4
	Clark	3	9.33	.577	.333	7.90	10.77	9	10
	Clay	5	8.80	.837	.374	7.76	9.84	8	10
	Clinton	1	8.00	8	8
	Crawford*		9.27						
	Daviess	9	8.44	1.740	.580	7.11	9.78	5	10
	Dearborn	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10

Decatur	1	7.00	7	7
DeKalb	3	8.33	.577	.333	6.90	9.77	8	9
Delaware	4	9.25	.957	.479	7.73	10.77	8	10
Dubois	8	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10
Elkhart	11	9.36	1.027	.310	8.67	10.05	7	10
Fayette	3	8.67	.577	.333	7.23	10.10	8	9
Floyd	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10
Fountain	2	8.00	1.414	1.000	-4.71	20.71	7	9
Franklin	11	9.36	.924	.279	8.74	9.98	8	10
Fulton	4	8.75	1.500	.750	6.36	11.14	7	10
Gibson	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10
Grant	1	8.00	8	8
Greene	1	10.00	10	10
Hamilton	1	10.00	10	10
Hancock	4	8.00	1.155	.577	6.16	9.84	7	9
Harrison	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10
Hendricks	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9
Henry	3	8.00	1.000	.577	5.52	10.48	7	9
Howard	1	8.00	8	8
Huntington	3	8.00	2.000	1.155	3.03	12.97	6	10
Jackson	1	9.00	9	9
Jasper	8	8.88	.991	.350	8.05	9.70	7	10
Jay	1	8.00	8	8
Jefferson	3	9.33	.577	.333	7.90	10.77	9	10
Jennings*		9.27						
Johnson	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10
Knox	9	8.56	1.667	.556	7.27	9.84	5	10
Kosciusko	1	10.00	10	10
LaGrange	3	8.33	1.528	.882	4.54	12.13	7	10
Lake	6	8.33	1.033	.422	7.25	9.42	7	10
LaPorte	7	9.43	.535	.202	8.93	9.92	9	10

Lawrence*		9.27							
Madison	1	9.00		9	9
Marion	5	8.60	1.342	.600	6.93	10.27		7	10
Marshall	7	8.14	1.676	.634	6.59	9.69		5	10
Martin	1	10.00		10	10
Miami	1	10.00		10	10
Monroe	10	9.70	.483	.153	9.35	10.05		9	10
Montgomery*		8.83							
Morgan	1	10.00		10	10
Newton	9	8.33	1.225	.408	7.39	9.27		6	10
Noble	30	8.73	1.258	.230	8.26	9.20		6	10
Ohio	1	10.00		10	10
Orange	1	10.00		10	10
Owen	2	7.00	4.243	3.000	-31.12	45.12		4	10
Parke	1	10.00		10	10
Perry	1	10.00		10	10
Pike*		9.14							
Porter	7	9.86	.378	.143	9.51	10.21		9	10
Posey*		9.14							
Pulaski	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85		9	10
Putnam	2	8.50	2.121	1.500	-10.56	27.56		7	10
Randolph	1	10.00		10	10
Ripley	3	8.67	1.155	.667	5.80	11.54		8	10
Rush*		8.60							
St. Joseph	12	8.92	1.084	.313	8.23	9.61		7	10
Scott	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00		10	10
Shelby		8.76							
Spencer	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00		10	10
Starke	1	10.00		10	10
Steuben	5	8.80	.837	.374	7.76	9.84		8	10
Sullivan	1	8.00		8	8

Rating of cocaine problems	Switzerland	1	9.00	9	9
	Tippecanoe	1	8.00	8	8
	Tipton	1	8.00	8	8
	Union	1	8.00	8	8
	Vanderburgh	5	9.60	.894	.400	8.49	10.71	8	10
	Vermillion	1	8.00	8	8
	Vigo	3	8.67	1.155	.667	5.80	11.54	8	10
	Wabash	1	8.00	8	8
	Warren*		8.83						
	Warrick	4	8.75	2.500	1.250	4.77	12.73	5	10
	Washington*		9.27						
	Wayne	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8
	Wells	9	8.44	.527	.176	8.04	8.85	8	9
	White	1	9.00	9	9
	Whitley	13	9.23	.927	.257	8.67	9.79	7	10
	Total	332	8.92	1.245	.068	8.78	9.05	3	10
	Adams	8	5.88	2.357	.833	3.90	7.85	3	9
	Allen	32	7.50	1.685	.298	6.89	8.11	4	10
	Bartholomew	3	6.00	1.000	.577	3.52	8.48	5	7
	Benton*		5.70						
	Blackford	3	7.00	1.000	.577	4.52	9.48	6	8
	Boone	2	5.00	2.828	2.000	-20.41	30.41	3	7
	Brown	1	3.00	3	3
	Carroll*		5.70						
	Cass	1	3.00	3	3
	Clark	2	7.50	2.121	1.500	-11.56	26.56	6	9
	Clay	5	3.20	1.789	.800	.98	5.42	1	5
	Clinton	1	7.00	7	7
	Crawford*		5.58						
	Daviess	8	4.88	1.885	.666	3.30	6.45	2	8
	Dearborn	2	4.50	.707	.500	-1.85	10.85	4	5

Decatur	1	6.00	6	6
DeKalb	3	8.00	1.000	.577	5.52	10.48	7	9
Delaware	4	8.00	2.160	1.080	4.56	11.44	5	10
Dubois	7	5.29	1.113	.421	4.26	6.31	4	7
Elkhart	11	5.73	1.489	.449	4.73	6.73	3	8
Fayette	3	5.00	3.000	1.732	-2.45	12.45	2	8
Floyd	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8
Fountain	2	7.50	2.121	1.500	-11.56	26.56	6	9
Franklin	11	4.91	2.023	.610	3.55	6.27	2	9
Fulton	4	5.75	.957	.479	4.23	7.27	5	7
Gibson	2	5.00	.000	.000	5.00	5.00	5	5
Grant	1	10.00	10	10
Greene	1	6.00	6	6
Hamilton	1	2.00	2	2
Hancock	4	3.75	1.258	.629	1.75	5.75	2	5
Harrison	1	5.00	5	5
Hendricks	2	7.00	1.414	1.000	-5.71	19.71	6	8
Henry	3	7.00	2.000	1.155	2.03	11.97	5	9
Howard	1	9.00	9	9
Huntington	3	5.67	1.528	.882	1.87	9.46	4	7
Jackson	1	6.00	6	6
Jasper	8	5.75	1.488	.526	4.51	6.99	4	8
Jay	1	7.00	7	7
Jefferson	3	7.00	3.606	2.082	-1.96	15.96	3	10
Jennings*		5.58						
Johnson	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10
Knox	9	6.78	2.438	.813	4.90	8.65	3	10
Kosciusko	1	4.00	4	4
LaGrange	3	4.33	.577	.333	2.90	5.77	4	5
Lake	6	8.83	.753	.307	8.04	9.62	8	10
LaPorte	7	7.43	1.397	.528	6.14	8.72	5	9

Lawrence*		5.58							
Madison	1	9.00	9	9	
Marion	5	6.60	1.342	.600	4.93	8.27	5	8	
Marshall	7	6.00	2.236	.845	3.93	8.07	4	10	
Martin	1	3.00	3	3	
Miami	1	5.00	5	5	
Monroe	10	6.50	2.461	.778	4.74	8.26	2	10	
Montgomery*		5.70							
Morgan	1	6.00	6	6	
Newton	9	4.22	1.641	.547	2.96	5.48	2	6	
Noble	27	5.15	2.032	.391	4.34	5.95	2	9	
Ohio	0	
Orange	1	9.00	9	9	
Owen	2	5.50	.707	.500	-.85	11.85	5	6	
Parke	1	5.00	5	5	
Perry	1	8.00	8	8	
Pike*		5.87							
Porter	7	7.86	1.464	.553	6.50	9.21	5	10	
Posey*		5.87							
Pulaski	2	7.00	1.414	1.000	-5.71	19.71	6	8	
Putnam	2	5.00	4.243	3.000	-33.12	43.12	2	8	
Randolph	1	7.00	7	7	
Ripley	2	2.00	1.414	1.000	-10.71	14.71	1	3	
Rush*		6.90							
St. Joseph	12	8.33	1.497	.432	7.38	9.28	6	10	
Scott	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9	
Shelby*		5.82							
Spencer	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71	5	7	
Starke	1	6.00	6	6	
Steuben	5	3.20	.837	.374	2.16	4.24	2	4	
Sullivan	1	5.00	5	5	

Rating of hallucinogen problems	Switzerland	1	2.00	2	2
	Tippecanoe	1	7.00	7	7
	Tipton	1	5.00	5	5
	Union	1	2.00	2	2
	Vanderburgh	5	7.40	2.608	1.166	4.16	10.64	4	10
	Vermillion	1	6.00	6	6
	Vigo	3	7.00	1.000	.577	4.52	9.48	6	8
	Wabash	1	7.00	7	7
	Warren*		5.70						
	Warrick	3	5.33	2.517	1.453	-.92	11.58	3	8
	Washington*		5.58						
	Wayne	2	7.00	.000	.000	7.00	7.00	7	7
	Wells	8	6.25	1.488	.526	5.01	7.49	4	9
	White	1	3.00	3	3
	Whitley	13	5.85	2.267	.629	4.48	7.22	2	10
	Total	321	6.13	2.190	.122	5.89	6.37	1	10
	Adams	8	5.38	2.387	.844	3.38	7.37	2	8
	Allen	32	5.59	1.898	.336	4.91	6.28	3	9
	Bartholomew	3	4.67	.577	.333	3.23	6.10	4	5
	Benton*		4.43						
	Blackford	3	5.67	1.155	.667	2.80	8.54	5	7
	Boone	2	4.00	1.414	1.000	-8.71	16.71	3	5
	Brown	1	2.00	2	2
	Carroll*		4.43						
	Cass	1	3.00	3	3
	Clark	2	6.00	2.828	2.000	-19.41	31.41	4	8
	Clay	5	3.60	1.517	.678	1.72	5.48	2	5
	Clinton	1	7.00	7	7
	Crawford*		4.58						
	Daviess	8	4.13	2.100	.743	2.37	5.88	1	8
	Dearborn	2	4.50	.707	.500	-1.85	10.85	4	5

Decatur	1	6.00	6	6
DeKalb	3	5.00	1.000	.577	2.52	7.48	4	6
Delaware	4	6.50	1.291	.645	4.45	8.55	5	8
Dubois	7	5.00	.816	.309	4.24	5.76	4	6
Elkhart	10	4.60	1.506	.476	3.52	5.68	2	7
Fayette	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4
Floyd	2	4.50	2.121	1.500	-14.56	23.56	3	6
Fountain	2	6.00	.000	.000	6.00	6.00	6	6
Franklin	11	4.27	1.849	.557	3.03	5.51	2	8
Fulton	4	2.75	1.500	.750	.36	5.14	1	4
Gibson	2	5.00	.000	.000	5.00	5.00	5	5
Grant	1	6.00	6	6
Greene	0
Hamilton	1	3.00	3	3
Hancock	4	3.00	1.826	.913	.09	5.91	1	5
Harrison	1	5.00	5	5
Hendricks	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71	5	7
Henry	3	5.67	.577	.333	4.23	7.10	5	6
Howard	1	6.00	6	6
Huntington	3	3.67	2.082	1.202	-1.50	8.84	2	6
Jackson	1	5.00	5	5
Jasper	8	5.38	1.768	.625	3.90	6.85	3	8
Jay	1	7.00	7	7
Jefferson	3	4.00	1.732	1.000	-.30	8.30	3	6
Jennings*		4.58						
Johnson	2	4.50	.707	.500	-1.85	10.85	4	5
Knox	8	5.38	2.973	1.051	2.89	7.86	1	10
Kosciusko	1	3.00	3	3
LaGrange	3	3.33	.577	.333	1.90	4.77	3	4
Lake	6	6.00	2.608	1.065	3.26	8.74	2	10
LaPorte	7	4.14	2.340	.884	1.98	6.31	1	8

Lawrence*		4.58							
Madison	1	3.00		3	3
Marion	5	6.00	1.225	.548	4.48	7.52		4	7
Marshall	6	4.33	1.862	.760	2.38	6.29		2	6
Martin	1	3.00		3	3
Miami	1	3.00		3	3
Monroe	10	4.50	2.677	.847	2.58	6.42		2	10
Montgomery*		4.43							
Morgan	1	4.00		4	4
Newton	9	3.11	1.833	.611	1.70	4.52		1	6
Noble	27	4.19	1.902	.366	3.43	4.94		1	7
Ohio	0
Orange	1	7.00		7	7
Owen	2	4.00	.000	.000	4.00	4.00		4	4
Parke	1	5.00		5	5
Perry	0
Pike*		4.81							
Porter	7	4.86	.900	.340	4.03	5.69		3	6
Posey*		4.81							
Pulaski	2	6.50	2.121	1.500	-12.56	25.56		5	8
Putnam	2	4.00	2.828	2.000	-21.41	29.41		2	6
Randolph	0
Ripley	2	2.00	1.414	1.000	-10.71	14.71		1	3
Rush*		5.33							
St. Joseph	12	4.25	1.485	.429	3.31	5.19		2	8
Scott	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85		8	9
Shelby*		4.59							
Spencer	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71		5	7
Starke	1	6.00		6	6
Steuben	5	3.00	1.000	.447	1.76	4.24		2	4
Sullivan	1	6.00		6	6

Rating of heroin problems	Switzerland	1	2.00	2	2
	Tippecanoe	1	3.00	3	3
	Tipton	1	3.00	3	3
	Union	1	2.00	2	2
	Vanderburgh	5	4.60	1.517	.678	2.72	6.48	3	7
	Vermillion	1	5.00	5	5
	Vigo	3	4.33	.577	.333	2.90	5.77	4	5
	Wabash	1	6.00	6	6
	Warren*		4.43						
	Warrick	3	4.67	2.517	1.453	-1.58	10.92	2	7
	Washington*		4.58						
	Wayne	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71	5	7
	Wells	6	4.67	2.251	.919	2.30	7.03	1	7
	White	1	3.00	3	3
	Whitley	13	5.15	2.544	.706	3.62	6.69	1	10
	Total	312	4.68	1.945	.110	4.46	4.89	1	10
	Adams	8	3.50	2.673	.945	1.27	5.73	1	8
	Allen	32	5.06	2.199	.389	4.27	5.86	1	9
	Bartholomew	3	3.00	1.000	.577	.52	5.48	2	4
	Benton*		4.03						
	Blackford	3	5.33	.577	.333	3.90	6.77	5	6
	Boone	2	3.50	2.121	1.500	-15.56	22.56	2	5
	Brown	1	2.00	2	2
	Carroll*		4.03						
	Cass	1	1.00	1	1
	Clark	2	4.50	3.536	2.500	-27.27	36.27	2	7
	Clay	5	2.20	.837	.374	1.16	3.24	1	3
	Clinton	1	7.00	7	7
	Crawford*		3.91						
	Daviess	8	3.13	1.642	.581	1.75	4.50	1	5
	Dearborn	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71	5	7

Decatur	1	6.00	6	6
DeKalb	3	5.33	1.528	.882	1.54	9.13	4	7
Delaware	4	5.25	1.708	.854	2.53	7.97	3	7
Dubois	7	4.14	1.574	.595	2.69	5.60	2	6
Elkhart	10	3.50	1.179	.373	2.66	4.34	2	5
Fayette	3	3.67	.577	.333	2.23	5.10	3	4
Floyd	2	2.50	.707	.500	-3.85	8.85	2	3
Fountain	2	6.00	.000	.000	6.00	6.00	6	6
Franklin	11	3.55	1.293	.390	2.68	4.41	2	5
Fulton	4	2.75	1.500	.750	.36	5.14	1	4
Gibson	2	2.50	.707	.500	-3.85	8.85	2	3
Grant	1	6.00	6	6
Greene	0
Hamilton	1	2.00	2	2
Hancock	4	2.75	2.062	1.031	-.53	6.03	1	5
Harrison	1	5.00	5	5
Hendricks	2	5.50	2.121	1.500	-13.56	24.56	4	7
Henry	3	4.33	2.517	1.453	-1.92	10.58	2	7
Howard	1	5.00	5	5
Huntington	3	3.00	2.000	1.155	-1.97	7.97	1	5
Jackson	1	4.00	4	4
Jasper	8	3.88	1.246	.441	2.83	4.92	2	6
Jay	1	7.00	7	7
Jefferson	2	4.00	1.414	1.000	-8.71	16.71	3	5
Jennings*		3.91						
Johnson	2	4.00	4.243	3.000	-34.12	42.12	1	7
Knox	9	3.89	3.060	1.020	1.54	6.24	1	10
Kosciusko	1	1.00	1	1
LaGrange	3	1.67	.577	.333	.23	3.10	1	2
Lake	6	7.00	.894	.365	6.06	7.94	6	8
LaPorte	7	4.29	1.799	.680	2.62	5.95	3	8

Lawrence*		3.91							
Madison	1	3.00	3	3	
Marion	5	5.40	.894	.400	4.29	6.51	4	6	
Marshall	6	4.33	1.862	.760	2.38	6.29	2	6	
Martin	1	3.00	3	3	
Miami	1	3.00	3	3	
Monroe	10	5.60	2.459	.777	3.84	7.36	2	10	
Montgomery*		4.03							
Morgan	1	5.00	5	5	
Newton	9	2.11	1.167	.389	1.21	3.01	1	5	
Noble	26	3.54	1.749	.343	2.83	4.24	1	7	
Ohio	0	
Orange	1	5.00	5	5	
Owen	2	4.50	.707	.500	-1.85	10.85	4	5	
Parke	1	1.00	1	1	
Perry	0	
Pike*		3.65							
Porter	7	8.43	1.134	.429	7.38	9.48	7	10	
Posey*		3.65							
Pulaski	2	5.00	1.414	1.000	-7.71	17.71	4	6	
Putnam	2	3.00	1.414	1.000	-9.71	15.71	2	4	
Randolph	0	
Ripley	2	2.00	1.414	1.000	-10.71	14.71	1	3	
Rush*		4.84							
St. Joseph	12	4.92	1.782	.514	3.78	6.05	2	9	
Scott	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8	
Shelby*		4.18							
Spencer	2	4.50	.707	.500	-1.85	10.85	4	5	
Starke	1	4.00	4	4	
Steuben	5	2.60	1.517	.678	.72	4.48	1	5	
Sullivan	1	2.00	2	2	

Rating of inhalant problems	Switzerland	1	2.00	2	2
	Tippecanoe	1	3.00	3	3
	Tipton	1	4.00	4	4
	Union	1	1.00	1	1
	Vanderburgh	5	3.40	.894	.400	2.29	4.51	2	4
	Vermillion	1	4.00	4	4
	Vigo	3	3.00	1.000	.577	.52	5.48	2	4
	Wabash	1	6.00	6	6
	Warren*		4.03						
	Warrick	3	4.00	2.646	1.528	-2.57	10.57	1	6
	Washington*		3.91						
	Wayne	2	7.00	2.828	2.000	-18.41	32.41	5	9
	Wells	7	4.57	1.618	.612	3.07	6.07	1	6
	White	1	1.00	1	1
	Whitley	13	4.00	2.550	.707	2.46	5.54	1	10
	Total	313	4.15	2.124	.120	3.91	4.39	1	10
	Adams	8	5.50	2.563	.906	3.36	7.64	3	10
	Allen	32	5.75	2.079	.368	5.00	6.50	1	10
	Bartholomew	3	7.00	2.646	1.528	.43	13.57	5	10
	Benton*		5.50						
	Blackford	3	6.00	2.646	1.528	-.57	12.57	4	9
	Boone	2	4.00	1.414	1.000	-8.71	16.71	3	5
	Brown	1	3.00	3	3
	Carroll*		5.50						
	Cass	1	4.00	4	4
	Clark	2	7.50	2.121	1.500	-11.56	26.56	6	9
	Clay	5	6.40	1.949	.872	3.98	8.82	4	9
	Clinton	1	8.00	8	8
	Crawford*		5.31						
	Daviess	8	4.38	2.504	.885	2.28	6.47	1	8
	Dearborn	2	6.00	.000	.000	6.00	6.00	6	6

Decatur	1	6.00	6	6
DeKalb	3	5.33	.577	.333	3.90	6.77	5	6
Delaware	4	6.75	1.893	.946	3.74	9.76	4	8
Dubois	7	6.14	2.035	.769	4.26	8.03	3	9
Elkhart	9	5.56	1.333	.444	4.53	6.58	3	7
Fayette	3	5.33	2.082	1.202	.16	10.50	3	7
Floyd	2	6.50	4.950	3.500	-37.97	50.97	3	10
Fountain	2	6.00	.000	.000	6.00	6.00	6	6
Franklin	11	4.18	1.537	.464	3.15	5.21	2	7
Fulton	4	4.00	2.160	1.080	.56	7.44	1	6
Gibson	2	5.50	2.121	1.500	-13.56	24.56	4	7
Grant	1	6.00	6	6
Greene	0
Hamilton	1	4.00	4	4
Hancock	4	4.00	2.582	1.291	-.11	8.11	1	7
Harrison	1	5.00	5	5
Hendricks	2	6.50	.707	.500	.15	12.85	6	7
Henry	3	3.33	1.528	.882	-.46	7.13	2	5
Howard	1	5.00	5	5
Huntington	3	4.33	2.082	1.202	-.84	9.50	2	6
Jackson	1	4.00	4	4
Jasper	8	5.50	1.852	.655	3.95	7.05	2	7
Jay	1	8.00	8	8
Jefferson	2	6.50	2.121	1.500	-12.56	25.56	5	8
Jennings*		5.31						
Johnson	2	6.00	2.828	2.000	-19.41	31.41	4	8
Knox	9	6.00	3.240	1.080	3.51	8.49	1	10
Kosciusko	1	7.00	7	7
LaGrange	3	4.00	1.000	.577	1.52	6.48	3	5
Lake	6	5.17	2.041	.833	3.02	7.31	2	8
LaPorte	7	3.57	1.988	.751	1.73	5.41	1	7

Lawrence*		5.31							
Madison	1	3.00		3	3
Marion	5	6.40	1.140	.510	4.98	7.82		5	8
Marshall	6	5.17	3.061	1.249	1.95	8.38		2	10
Martin	1	5.00		5	5
Miami	1	3.00		3	3
Monroe	10	5.90	2.558	.809	4.07	7.73		2	10
Montgomery*		5.50							
Morgan	1	6.00		6	6
Newton	9	4.22	2.279	.760	2.47	5.97		2	9
Noble	27	5.56	2.100	.404	4.72	6.39		1	10
Ohio	0
Orange	1	5.00		5	5
Owen	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71		5	7
Parke	1	5.00		5	5
Perry	0
Pike*		5.35							
Porter	7	3.71	1.254	.474	2.55	4.87		1	5
Posey*		5.35							
Pulaski	2	5.50	.707	.500	-.85	11.85		5	6
Putnam	2	4.50	.707	.500	-1.85	10.85		4	5
Randolph	0
Ripley	2	4.00	4.243	3.000	-34.12	42.12		1	7
Rush*		5.37							
St. Joseph	12	4.75	2.137	.617	3.39	6.11		1	9
Scott	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85		8	9
Shelby*		5.35							
Spencer	2	7.00	.000	.000	7.00	7.00		7	7
Starke	1	7.00		7	7
Steuben	5	3.20	1.304	.583	1.58	4.82		1	4
Sullivan	1	6.00		6	6

Rating of marijuana problems	Switzerland	1	2.00	2	2
	Tippecanoe	1	2.00	2	2
	Tipton	1	5.00	5	5
	Union	1	3.00	3	3
	Vanderburgh	5	4.40	.894	.400	3.29	5.51	3	5
	Vermillion	1	5.00	5	5
	Vigo	3	4.67	1.528	.882	.87	8.46	3	6
	Wabash	1	6.00	6	6
	Warren*		5.50						
	Warrick	3	4.67	2.517	1.453	-1.58	10.92	2	7
	Washington*		5.31						
	Wayne	2	5.50	2.121	1.500	-13.56	24.56	4	7
	Wells	8	6.25	2.053	.726	4.53	7.97	3	10
	White	1	1.00	1	1
	Whitley	13	5.54	2.066	.573	4.29	6.79	3	10
	Total	314	5.25	2.117	.119	5.02	5.49	1	10
	Adams	8	9.13	1.126	.398	8.18	10.07	7	10
	Allen	32	8.16	1.780	.315	7.51	8.80	3	10
	Bartholomew	3	8.00	2.646	1.528	1.43	14.57	5	10
	Benton*		7.97						
	Blackford	3	8.33	.577	.333	6.90	9.77	8	9
	Boone	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10
	Brown	1	6.00	6	6
	Carroll		7.97						
	Cass	1	8.00	8	8
	Clark	3	6.33	3.786	2.186	-3.07	15.74	2	9
	Clay	5	7.60	1.517	.678	5.72	9.48	6	10
	Clinton	1	9.00	9	9
	Crawford*		8.03						
	Daviess	8	8.50	1.512	.535	7.24	9.76	6	10
	Dearborn	2	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9

Decatur	1	6.00	6	6
DeKalb	3	8.00	1.000	.577	5.52	10.48	7	9
Delaware	4	8.75	.957	.479	7.23	10.27	8	10
Dubois	7	8.14	1.574	.595	6.69	9.60	6	10
Elkhart	11	8.55	.934	.282	7.92	9.17	7	10
Fayette	3	7.00	2.000	1.155	2.03	11.97	5	9
Floyd	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10
Fountain	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9
Franklin	11	8.36	1.362	.411	7.45	9.28	6	10
Fulton	4	8.25	2.872	1.436	3.68	12.82	4	10
Gibson	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10
Grant	1	8.00	8	8
Greene	1	10.00	10	10
Hamilton	1	7.00	7	7
Hancock	4	7.25	2.872	1.436	2.68	11.82	3	9
Harrison	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9
Hendricks	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10
Henry	3	7.67	2.082	1.202	2.50	12.84	6	10
Howard	1	9.00	9	9
Huntington	3	7.67	1.528	.882	3.87	11.46	6	9
Jackson	1	8.00	8	8
Jasper	8	8.50	1.195	.423	7.50	9.50	6	10
Jay	1	8.00	8	8
Jefferson	3	8.67	.577	.333	7.23	10.10	8	9
Jennings*		8.03						
Johnson	2	6.00	2.828	2.000	-19.41	31.41	4	8
Knox	9	8.44	1.878	.626	7.00	9.89	5	10
Kosciusko	1	9.00	9	9
LaGrange	3	6.67	2.887	1.667	-.50	13.84	5	10
Lake	6	9.17	.983	.401	8.13	10.20	8	10
LaPorte	7	7.86	1.464	.553	6.50	9.21	5	9

Lawrence*		8.03							
Madison	1	9.00	9	9	
Marion	5	8.60	1.140	.510	7.18	10.02	7	10	
Marshall	7	8.14	.900	.340	7.31	8.97	7	10	
Martin	1	8.00	8	8	
Miami	1	10.00	10	10	
Monroe	10	8.30	1.252	.396	7.40	9.20	6	10	
Montgomery*		7.97							
Morgan	1	8.00	8	8	
Newton	9	7.67	1.732	.577	6.34	9.00	4	10	
Noble	29	8.00	1.336	.248	7.49	8.51	5	10	
Ohio	0	
Orange	1	8.00	8	8	
Owen	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10	
Parke	1	10.00	10	10	
Perry	1	9.00	9	9	
Pike*		8.38							
Porter	7	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10	
Posey*		8.38							
Pulaski	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10	
Putnam	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10	
Randolph	1	9.00	9	9	
Ripley	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71	5	7	
Rush*		7.90							
St. Joseph	12	7.75	1.422	.411	6.85	8.65	5	10	
Scott	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10	
Shelby*		8.00							
Spencer	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8	
Starke	1	7.00	7	7	
Steuben	5	7.60	.894	.400	6.49	8.71	6	8	
Sullivan	1	8.00	8	8	

Rating of methamphetamine problems	Switzerland	1	9.00	9	9
	Tippecanoe	1	10.00	10	10
	Tipton	1	10.00	10	10
	Union	1	7.00	7	7
	Vanderburgh	5	7.80	2.280	1.020	4.97	10.63	5	10
	Vermillion	1	7.00	7	7
	Vigo	3	5.00	1.732	1.000	.70	9.30	3	6
	Wabash	1	8.00	8	8
	Warren*		7.97						
	Warrick	4	8.50	2.380	1.190	4.71	12.29	5	10
	Washington*		8.03						
	Wayne	2	6.50	2.121	1.500	-12.56	25.56	5	8
	Wells	9	7.89	.782	.261	7.29	8.49	7	9
	White	1	5.00	5	5
	Whitley	13	8.23	2.006	.556	7.02	9.44	3	10
	Total	327	8.17	1.584	.088	8.00	8.34	2	10
	Adams	8	6.38	1.598	.565	5.04	7.71	4	8
	Allen	32	6.84	2.127	.376	6.08	7.61	3	10
	Bartholomew	3	9.33	1.155	.667	6.46	12.20	8	10
	Benton*		8.30						
	Blackford	3	8.33	.577	.333	6.90	9.77	8	9
	Boone	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10
	Brown	1	6.00	6	6
	Carroll*		8.30						
	Cass	1	8.00	8	8
	Clark	3	6.67	1.528	.882	2.87	10.46	5	8
	Clay	5	9.20	1.095	.490	7.84	10.56	8	10
	Clinton	1	8.00	8	8
	Crawford*		7.94						
	Daviess	9	9.44	.726	.242	8.89	10.00	8	10
	Dearborn	2	8.00	1.414	1.000	-4.71	20.71	7	9

Decatur	1	6.00	6	6
DeKalb	3	9.33	.577	.333	7.90	10.77	9	10
Delaware	4	8.50	1.291	.645	6.45	10.55	7	10
Dubois	8	7.75	2.121	.750	5.98	9.52	4	10
Elkhart	11	7.18	2.316	.698	5.63	8.74	4	10
Fayette	3	7.33	1.528	.882	3.54	11.13	6	9
Floyd	2	7.00	4.243	3.000	-31.12	45.12	4	10
Fountain	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9
Franklin	11	8.73	1.794	.541	7.52	9.93	4	10
Fulton	4	8.00	1.414	.707	5.75	10.25	7	10
Gibson	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10
Grant	1	5.00	5	5
Greene	1	10.00	10	10
Hamilton	1	2.00	2	2
Hancock	4	4.50	2.646	1.323	.29	8.71	1	7
Harrison	2	8.00	2.828	2.000	-17.41	33.41	6	10
Hendricks	2	7.00	2.828	2.000	-18.41	32.41	5	9
Henry	3	4.67	2.517	1.453	-1.58	10.92	2	7
Howard	1	8.00	8	8
Huntington	3	4.67	1.155	.667	1.80	7.54	4	6
Jackson	1	8.00	8	8
Jasper	8	6.38	2.134	.754	4.59	8.16	4	10
Jay	1	8.00	8	8
Jefferson	3	7.67	1.528	.882	3.87	11.46	6	9
Jennings*		7.94						
Johnson	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10
Knox	9	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10
Kosciusko	1	8.00	8	8
LaGrange	3	9.00	1.732	1.000	4.70	13.30	7	10
Lake	6	5.83	1.835	.749	3.91	7.76	4	8
LaPorte	7	4.57	2.637	.997	2.13	7.01	1	9

Lawrence*		7.94							
Madison	1	7.00	7	7	
Marion	5	6.60	2.302	1.030	3.74	9.46	3	9	
Marshall	7	8.86	1.464	.553	7.50	10.21	6	10	
Martin	1	10.00	10	10	
Miami	1	10.00	10	10	
Monroe	10	6.00	2.449	.775	4.25	7.75	3	10	
Montgomery*		8.30							
Morgan	1	8.00	8	8	
Newton	9	5.11	2.261	.754	3.37	6.85	2	9	
Noble	30	9.53	.730	.133	9.26	9.81	8	10	
Ohio	0	
Orange	1	9.00	9	9	
Owen	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10	
Parke	1	10.00	10	10	
Perry	1	10.00	10	10	
Pike*		9.17							
Porter	7	2.86	1.215	.459	1.73	3.98	2	5	
Posey*		9.17							
Pulaski	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10	
Putnam	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10	
Randolph	0	
Ripley	2	5.00	2.828	2.000	-20.41	30.41	3	7	
Rush*		7.16							
St. Joseph	12	5.17	1.850	.534	3.99	6.34	3	9	
Scott	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10	
Shelby*		6.59							
Spencer	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10	
Starke	1	10.00	10	10	
Steuben	5	8.00	1.871	.837	5.68	10.32	5	10	
Sullivan	1	10.00	10	10	

Rating of prescription drug problems	Switzerland	1	7.00	7	7
	Tippecanoe	1	10.00	10	10
	Tipton	1	6.00	6	6
	Union	1	9.00	9	9
	Vanderburgh	5	9.00	1.225	.548	7.48	10.52	7	10
	Vermillion	1	9.00	9	9
	Vigo	3	9.67	.577	.333	8.23	11.10	9	10
	Wabash	1	7.00	7	7
	Warren*		8.30						
	Warrick	4	8.75	2.500	1.250	4.77	12.73	5	10
	Washington*		7.94						
	Wayne	2	6.00	.000	.000	6.00	6.00	6	6
	Wells	7	6.57	.976	.369	5.67	7.47	5	8
	White	1	10.00	10	10
	Whitley	13	7.92	1.320	.366	7.13	8.72	5	10
	Total	327	7.55	2.335	.129	7.30	7.80	1	10
	Adams	8	6.75	1.581	.559	5.43	8.07	4	9
	Allen	32	6.78	1.845	.326	6.12	7.45	3	10
	Bartholomew	3	8.00	1.732	1.000	3.70	12.30	7	10
	Benton*		7.73						
	Blackford	3	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10
	Boone	2	6.50	.707	.500	.15	12.85	6	7
	Brown	1	5.00	5	5
	Carroll*		7.73						
	Cass	1	9.00	9	9
	Clark	3	9.00	1.000	.577	6.52	11.48	8	10
	Clay	5	7.40	1.949	.872	4.98	9.82	5	10
	Clinton	1	9.00	9	9
	Crawford*		7.67						
	Daviess	8	8.75	1.165	.412	7.78	9.72	7	10
Dearborn	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10	

Decatur	1	7.00	7	7
DeKalb	3	7.67	.577	.333	6.23	9.10	7	8
Delaware	4	8.25	1.708	.854	5.53	10.97	6	10
Dubois	7	7.86	1.676	.634	6.31	9.41	5	10
Elkhart	11	7.18	.982	.296	6.52	7.84	6	9
Fayette	3	9.00	1.000	.577	6.52	11.48	8	10
Floyd	2	8.00	2.828	2.000	-17.41	33.41	6	10
Fountain	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8
Franklin	11	7.64	1.912	.576	6.35	8.92	4	10
Fulton	4	8.25	2.363	1.181	4.49	12.01	5	10
Gibson	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10
Grant	1	9.00	9	9
Greene	1	8.00	8	8
Hamilton	1	5.00	5	5
Hancock	4	7.00	2.708	1.354	2.69	11.31	3	9
Harrison	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8
Hendricks	2	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8
Henry	3	7.33	1.528	.882	3.54	11.13	6	9
Howard	1	8.00	8	8
Huntington	3	6.33	2.887	1.667	-.84	13.50	3	8
Jackson	1	6.00	6	6
Jasper	8	6.75	1.669	.590	5.35	8.15	5	10
Jay	1	10.00	10	10
Jefferson	3	8.33	.577	.333	6.90	9.77	8	9
Jennings*		7.67						
Johnson	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9
Knox	9	7.44	2.920	.973	5.20	9.69	2	10
Kosciusko	1	6.00	6	6
LaGrange	3	7.00	2.000	1.155	2.03	11.97	5	9
Lake	6	7.00	2.000	.816	4.90	9.10	4	10
LaPorte	7	7.57	1.397	.528	6.28	8.86	5	9

Lawrence*		7.67							
Madison	1	8.00	8	8	
Marion	5	7.00	1.581	.707	5.04	8.96	5	9	
Marshall	6	6.00	2.000	.816	3.90	8.10	3	8	
Martin	1	10.00	10	10	
Miami	1	3.00	3	3	
Monroe	10	7.70	1.829	.578	6.39	9.01	5	10	
Montgomery*		7.73							
Morgan	1	9.00	9	9	
Newton	9	6.78	1.093	.364	5.94	7.62	5	8	
Noble	27	6.89	2.006	.386	6.10	7.68	3	10	
Ohio	1	8.00	8	8	
Orange	1	8.00	8	8	
Owen	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10	
Parke	1	5.00	5	5	
Perry	1	9.00	9	9	
Pike*		8.08							
Porter	7	6.00	2.082	.787	4.07	7.93	4	9	
Posey*		8.08							
Pulaski	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8	
Putnam	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10	
Randolph	0	
Ripley	2	3.50	3.536	2.500	-28.27	35.27	1	6	
Rush*		8.42							
St. Joseph	12	6.75	1.658	.479	5.70	7.80	4	9	
Scott	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10	
Shelby*		7.24							
Spencer	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8	
Starke	1	9.00	9	9	
Steuben	5	6.40	1.140	.510	4.98	7.82	5	8	
Sullivan	1	8.00	8	8	

Rating of rave drug problems	Switzerland	1	5.00	5	5
	Tippecanoe	1	9.00	9	9
	Tipton	1	9.00	9	9
	Union	1	4.00	4	4
	Vanderburgh	5	7.80	1.095	.490	6.44	9.16	6	9
	Vermillion	1	7.00	7	7
	Vigo	3	7.33	1.155	.667	4.46	10.20	6	8
	Wabash	1	7.00	7	7
	Warren*		7.73						
	Warrick	3	7.67	2.517	1.453	1.42	13.92	5	10
	Washington*		7.67						
	Wayne	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9
	Wells	9	8.00	1.118	.373	7.14	8.86	6	9
	White	1	5.00	5	5
	Whitley	13	7.62	1.325	.368	6.81	8.42	5	10
	Total	323	7.36	1.809	.101	7.16	7.55	1	10
	Adams	8	4.50	1.927	.681	2.89	6.11	2	7
	Allen	32	5.81	2.147	.380	5.04	6.59	1	10
	Bartholomew	3	4.00	3.606	2.082	-4.96	12.96	1	8
	Benton*		4.50						
	Blackford	3	5.00	.000	.000	5.00	5.00	5	5
	Boone	2	5.00	2.828	2.000	-20.41	30.41	3	7
	Brown	1	3.00	3	3
	Carroll*		4.50						
	Cass	1	2.00	2	2
	Clark	2	6.00	2.828	2.000	-19.41	31.41	4	8
	Clay	5	2.40	.894	.400	1.29	3.51	1	3
	Clinton	1	7.00	7	7
	Crawford*		4.61						
	Daviess	8	3.75	2.188	.773	1.92	5.58	1	8
	Dearborn	2	6.00	1.414	1.000	-6.71	18.71	5	7

Decatur	1	6.00	6	6
DeKalb	3	6.00	1.000	.577	3.52	8.48	5	7
Delaware	4	6.75	1.258	.629	4.75	8.75	5	8
Dubois	7	4.57	1.902	.719	2.81	6.33	1	7
Elkhart	10	5.60	1.350	.427	4.63	6.57	3	7
Fayette	3	3.33	2.517	1.453	-2.92	9.58	1	6
Floyd	2	4.50	2.121	1.500	-14.56	23.56	3	6
Fountain	2	6.00	.000	.000	6.00	6.00	6	6
Franklin	11	4.00	1.483	.447	3.00	5.00	2	6
Fulton	4	3.00	1.826	.913	.09	5.91	1	5
Gibson	2	4.00	1.414	1.000	-8.71	16.71	3	5
Grant	1	7.00	7	7
Greene	0
Hamilton	1	2.00	2	2
Hancock	4	3.25	2.630	1.315	-.93	7.43	1	6
Harrison	2	6.50	2.121	1.500	-12.56	25.56	5	8
Hendricks	2	4.50	.707	.500	-1.85	10.85	4	5
Henry	3	3.33	1.528	.882	-.46	7.13	2	5
Howard	1	6.00	6	6
Huntington	3	3.67	2.309	1.333	-2.07	9.40	1	5
Jackson	1	4.00	4	4
Jasper	7	4.71	1.254	.474	3.55	5.87	3	7
Jay	1	7.00	7	7
Jefferson	2	4.50	2.121	1.500	-14.56	23.56	3	6
Jennings*		4.61						
Johnson	2	5.50	.707	.500	-.85	11.85	5	6
Knox	9	5.00	2.784	.928	2.86	7.14	2	9
Kosciusko	1	2.00	2	2
LaGrange	3	3.67	2.887	1.667	-3.50	10.84	2	7
Lake	6	5.83	2.483	1.014	3.23	8.44	1	8
LaPorte	7	4.57	2.440	.922	2.32	6.83	1	8

Lawrence*		4.61							
Madison	1	3.00	3	3	
Marion	5	6.80	1.924	.860	4.41	9.19	4	9	
Marshall	6	4.50	1.643	.671	2.78	6.22	2	6	
Martin	1	4.00	4	4	
Miami	1	1.00	1	1	
Monroe	10	5.00	2.494	.789	3.22	6.78	2	10	
Montgomery*		4.50							
Morgan	1	4.00	4	4	
Newton	8	3.38	1.923	.680	1.77	4.98	2	8	
Noble	27	4.48	2.026	.390	3.68	5.28	1	9	
Ohio	0	
Orange	1	6.00	6	6	
Owen	2	6.00	2.828	2.000	-19.41	31.41	4	8	
Parke	1	5.00	5	5	
Perry	0	
Pike*		4.65							
Porter	7	4.00	1.528	.577	2.59	5.41	3	7	
Posey*		4.65							
Pulaski	2	4.50	2.121	1.500	-14.56	23.56	3	6	
Putnam	2	3.00	2.828	2.000	-22.41	28.41	1	5	
Randolph	0	
Ripley	2	2.50	2.121	1.500	-16.56	21.56	1	4	
Rush*		4.84							
St. Joseph	12	4.50	1.314	.379	3.66	5.34	2	6	
Scott	2	7.00	4.243	3.000	-31.12	45.12	4	10	
Shelby*		4.88							
Spencer	2	6.50	.707	.500	.15	12.85	6	7	
Starke	1	6.00	6	6	
Steuben	5	2.60	1.517	.678	.72	4.48	1	5	
Sullivan	1	4.00	4	4	

Rating of tobacco problems	Switzerland	1	3.00	3	3
	Tippecanoe	1	5.00	5	5
	Tipton	1	3.00	3	3
	Union	1	2.00	2	2
	Vanderburgh	5	4.80	1.643	.735	2.76	6.84	3	7
	Vermillion	1	5.00	5	5
	Vigo	3	5.33	1.155	.667	2.46	8.20	4	6
	Wabash	1	6.00	6	6
	Warren*		4.50						
	Warrick	3	5.33	4.041	2.333	-4.71	15.37	1	9
	Washington*		4.61						
	Wayne	2	5.50	.707	.500	-.85	11.85	5	6
	Wells	8	5.88	.835	.295	5.18	6.57	5	7
	White	1	1.00	1	1
	Whitley	13	5.46	2.332	.647	4.05	6.87	1	10
	Total	314	4.74	2.084	.118	4.50	4.97	1	10
	Adams	8	9.00	1.069	.378	8.11	9.89	7	10
	Allen	32	8.03	2.087	.369	7.28	8.78	2	10
	Bartholomew	3	7.00	3.606	2.082	-1.96	15.96	3	10
	Benton*		8.87						
	Blackford	3	9.00	1.000	.577	6.52	11.48	8	10
	Boone	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10
	Brown	1	8.00	8	8
	Carroll*		8.87						
	Cass	1	10.00	10	10
	Clark	3	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10
	Clay	5	8.80	.447	.200	8.24	9.36	8	9
	Clinton	1	10.00	10	10
	Crawford*		8.86						
	Daviess	9	8.67	1.732	.577	7.34	10.00	5	10
	Dearborn	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10

Decatur	1	6.00	6	6
DeKalb	3	9.00	1.000	.577	6.52	11.48	8	10
Delaware	4	9.00	1.155	.577	7.16	10.84	8	10
Dubois	8	9.38	.744	.263	8.75	10.00	8	10
Elkhart	11	9.00	1.844	.556	7.76	10.24	5	10
Fayette	3	9.00	1.000	.577	6.52	11.48	8	10
Floyd	2	9.00	1.414	1.000	-3.71	21.71	8	10
Fountain	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9
Franklin	11	9.09	1.136	.343	8.33	9.85	7	10
Fulton	4	9.00	1.155	.577	7.16	10.84	8	10
Gibson	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10
Grant	1	8.00	8	8
Greene	1	10.00	10	10
Hamilton	1	7.00	7	7
Hancock	4	8.00	1.826	.913	5.09	10.91	6	10
Harrison	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10
Hendricks	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10
Henry	3	8.00	1.732	1.000	3.70	12.30	7	10
Howard	1	9.00	9	9
Huntington	3	9.00	1.000	.577	6.52	11.48	8	10
Jackson	1	7.00	7	7
Jasper	8	8.88	.835	.295	8.18	9.57	8	10
Jay	1	10.00	10	10
Jefferson	3	8.33	2.082	1.202	3.16	13.50	6	10
Jennings*		8.86						
Johnson	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10
Knox	9	7.33	2.915	.972	5.09	9.57	1	10
Kosciusko	1	10.00	10	10
LaGrange	3	8.67	1.155	.667	5.80	11.54	8	10
Lake	6	9.00	.894	.365	8.06	9.94	8	10
LaPorte	7	9.57	.535	.202	9.08	10.07	9	10

Lawrence*		8.86							
Madison	1	10.00	10	10	
Marion	5	9.20	1.304	.583	7.58	10.82	7	10	
Marshall	7	7.86	1.773	.670	6.22	9.50	5	10	
Martin	1	10.00	10	10	
Miami	1	10.00	10	10	
Monroe	10	8.00	2.449	.775	6.25	9.75	3	10	
Montgomery*		8.87							
Morgan	1	10.00	10	10	
Newton	9	7.78	1.856	.619	6.35	9.20	4	10	
Noble	30	8.50	2.097	.383	7.72	9.28	1	10	
Ohio	1	10.00	10	10	
Orange	1	10.00	10	10	
Owen	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10	
Parke	1	10.00	10	10	
Perry	1	10.00	10	10	
Pike*		8.62							
Porter	7	7.43	3.101	1.172	4.56	10.30	2	10	
Posey*		8.62							
Pulaski	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10	
Putnam	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10	
Randolph	1	10.00	10	10	
Ripley	3	8.33	1.528	.882	4.54	12.13	7	10	
Rush*		8.90							
St. Joseph	12	7.42	2.575	.743	5.78	9.05	1	10	
Scott	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10	
Shelby*		9.12							
Spencer	2	10.00	.000	.000	10.00	10.00	10	10	
Starke	1	9.00	9	9	
Steuben	5	8.20	2.168	.970	5.51	10.89	5	10	
Sullivan	1	10.00	10	10	

Switzerland	1	10.00	10	10
Tippecanoe	1	10.00	10	10
Tipton	1	10.00	10	10
Union	1	9.00	9	9
Vanderburgh	5	7.60	2.702	1.208	4.25	10.95	3	10
Vermillion	1	10.00	10	10
Vigo	3	8.67	1.155	.667	5.80	11.54	8	10
Wabash	1	9.00	9	9
Warren*		8.87						
Washington*		8.86						
Warrick	4	8.75	1.500	.750	6.36	11.14	7	10
Wayne	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9
Wells	9	8.67	1.118	.373	7.81	9.53	6	10
White	1	9.00	9	9
Whitley	13	9.46	.776	.215	8.99	9.93	8	10
Total	332	8.66	1.758	.096	8.47	8.85	1	10

*Denotes counties with missing data: county-level mean based on regional mean and not considered for 'total' computation.

Table 9: Respondents' Self-Rating of Knowledge of Substance Abuse Prevention Efforts in the County (Calculated Means by Region)

What is your knowledge of substance abuse prevention efforts?

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
					Central	17		
East	20	7.20	1.881	.421	6.32	8.08	5	10
North Central	48	7.40	1.634	.236	6.92	7.87	4	10
Northeast	106	7.19	1.938	.188	6.82	7.56	1	10
Northwest	33	6.85	1.986	.346	6.14	7.55	3	10
West	30	7.27	1.617	.295	6.66	7.87	3	10
Southeast	38	7.39	2.150	.349	6.69	8.10	2	10
Southwest	41	7.85	1.838	.287	7.27	8.43	3	10
Total	333	7.30	1.853	.102	7.10	7.50	1	10

Table 10: Respondents' Self-Rating of Knowledge of Substance Abuse Prevention Efforts in the County (Calculated Means by County)

What is your knowledge of substance abuse prevention efforts?

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
					Adams	8		
Allen	32	6.03	2.416	.427	5.16	6.90	1	10
Bartholomew	3	8.00	1.000	.577	5.52	10.48	7	9
Benton*		7.27						
Blackford	3	7.00	2.000	1.155	2.03	11.97	5	9
Boone	2	6.50	.707	.500	.15	12.85	6	7
Brown	1	9.00	9	9
Carroll*		7.27						

Cass	1	6.00	6	6
Clark	3	5.67	2.517	1.453	-.58	11.92	3	8
Clay	5	7.60	1.140	.510	6.18	9.02	6	9
Clinton	1	9.00	9	9
Crawford*		7.39						
Daviess	8	7.63	2.066	.730	5.90	9.35	5	10
Dearborn	3	9.00	.000	.000	9.00	9.00	9	9
Decatur	1	9.00	9	9
DeKalb	3	6.33	1.528	.882	2.54	10.13	5	8
Delaware	4	8.25	1.708	.854	5.53	10.97	6	10
Dubois	8	7.75	2.188	.773	5.92	9.58	4	10
Elkhart	12	6.92	1.676	.484	5.85	7.98	4	9
Fayette	3	7.33	2.082	1.202	2.16	12.50	5	9
Floyd	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10
Fountain	2	7.00	1.414	1.000	-5.71	19.71	6	8
Franklin	11	6.91	2.166	.653	5.45	8.36	3	10
Fulton	4	8.00	.816	.408	6.70	9.30	7	9
Gibson	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8
Grant	1	5.00	5	5
Greene	1	10.00	10	10
Hamilton	1	7.00	7	7
Hancock	4	8.00	.000	.000	8.00	8.00	8	8
Harrison	2	9.50	.707	.500	3.15	15.85	9	10
Hendricks	2	6.50	.707	.500	.15	12.85	6	7
Henry	3	8.00	2.646	1.528	1.43	14.57	5	10
Howard	1	8.00	8	8
Huntington	3	8.33	1.528	.882	4.54	12.13	7	10
Jackson	1	8.00	8	8
Jasper	8	6.25	1.832	.648	4.72	7.78	3	9
Jay	1	8.00	8	8
Jefferson	3	7.33	2.517	1.453	1.08	13.58	5	10

Jennings*		7.39							
Johnson	2	5.50	2.121	1.500	-13.56	24.56	4	7	
Knox	9	7.89	1.900	.633	6.43	9.35	5	10	
Kosciusko	1	8.00	8	8	
LaGrange	3	8.00	2.000	1.155	3.03	12.97	6	10	
Lake	6	8.17	1.722	.703	6.36	9.97	5	10	
LaPorte	7	7.86	2.116	.800	5.90	9.81	5	10	
Lawrence*		7.39							
Madison	1	6.00	6	6	
Marion	5	7.40	.894	.400	6.29	8.51	7	9	
Marshall	7	7.14	2.035	.769	5.26	9.03	4	10	
Martin	1	8.00	8	8	
Miami	1	10.00	10	10	
Monroe	10	7.80	1.229	.389	6.92	8.68	6	10	
Montgomery*		7.27							
Morgan	1	9.00	9	9	
Newton	10	5.70	1.829	.578	4.39	7.01	3	8	
Noble	30	7.73	1.258	.230	7.26	8.20	5	10	
Ohio	1	7.00	7	7	
Orange	1	7.00	7	7	
Owen	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8	
Parke	1	8.00	8	8	
Perry	1	10.00	10	10	
Pike*		7.85							
Porter	6	7.17	1.722	.703	5.36	8.97	5	10	
Posey*		7.85							
Pulaski	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9	
Putnam	2	4.00	1.414	1.000	-8.71	16.71	3	5	
Randolph	1	5.00	5	5	
Ripley	3	3.67	1.528	.882	-.13	7.46	2	5	
Rush*		7.20							

St. Joseph	12	7.50	1.446	.417	6.58	8.42	5	10
Scott	2	8.50	.707	.500	2.15	14.85	8	9
Shelby*		7.18						
Spencer	2	7.50	.707	.500	1.15	13.85	7	8
Starke	1	10.00	10	10
Steuben	5	7.80	.837	.374	6.76	8.84	7	9
Sullivan	1	9.00	9	9
Switzerland	1	9.00	9	9
Tippecanoe	1	8.00	8	8
Tipton	1	6.00	6	6
Union	1	5.00	5	5
Vanderburgh	5	8.00	.707	.316	7.12	8.88	7	9
Vermillion	1	4.00	4	4
Vigo	3	7.33	1.528	.882	3.54	11.13	6	9
Wabash	1	7.00	7	7
Warren*		7.27						
Warrick	4	7.50	3.109	1.555	2.55	12.45	3	10
Washington*		7.39						
Wayne	2	7.50	2.121	1.500	-11.56	26.56	6	9
Wells	9	6.78	1.716	.572	5.46	8.10	3	9
White	1	5.00	5	5
Whitley	13	7.69	1.601	.444	6.72	8.66	5	10
Total	333	7.30	1.853	.102	7.10	7.50	1	10

*Denotes counties with missing data: county-level mean based on regional mean and not considered for 'total' computation.

Table 11: Need to Expand Substance Abuse Prevention Efforts, by Region

			Is there a need to expand the substance abuse prevention efforts			Total
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	
Region	Central	Count	0	17	0	17
		% within Region	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	East	Count	0	20	0	20
		% within Region	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	North Central	Count	0	45	4	49
		% within Region	.0%	91.8%	8.2%	100.0%
	Northeast	Count	4	95	8	107
		% within Region	3.7%	88.8%	7.5%	100.0%
	Northwest	Count	1	30	3	34
		% within Region	2.9%	88.2%	8.8%	100.0%
	West	Count	0	28	2	30
		% within Region	.0%	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
	Southeast	Count	0	35	3	38
		% within Region	.0%	92.1%	7.9%	100.0%
	Southwest	Count	0	42	0	42
		% within Region	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	5	312	20	337
		% within Region	1.5%	92.6%	5.9%	100.0%

Table 12: Planning for Additional Substance Abuse Prevention Services, by Region

			Is there planning for additional substance abuse prevention services			Total
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	
Region	Central	Count	0	9	8	17
		% within Region	.0%	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
	East	Count	2	10	8	20
		% within Region	10.0%	50.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	North Central	Count	6	22	21	49
		% within Region	12.2%	44.9%	42.9%	100.0%
	Northeast	Count	8	55	44	107
		% within Region	7.5%	51.4%	41.1%	100.0%
	Northwest	Count	3	22	9	34
		% within Region	8.8%	64.7%	26.5%	100.0%
	West	Count	0	11	20	31
		% within Region	.0%	35.5%	64.5%	100.0%
	Southeast	Count	4	24	10	38
		% within Region	10.5%	63.2%	26.3%	100.0%
	Southwest	Count	3	25	14	42
		% within Region	7.1%	59.5%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	26	178	134	338
		% within Region	7.7%	52.7%	39.6%	100.0%

Table 13: Local Leadership Support for Additional Programs, by Region

			Would the leadership in your county support additional efforts			Total
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	
Region	Central	Count	0	15	2	17
		% within Region	.0%	88.2%	11.8%	100.0%
	East	Count	0	19	1	20
		% within Region	.0%	95.0%	5.0%	100.0%
	North Central	Count	1	31	17	49
		% within Region	2.0%	63.3%	34.7%	100.0%
	Northeast	Count	2	64	39	105
		% within Region	1.9%	61.0%	37.1%	100.0%
	Northwest	Count	0	23	10	33
		% within Region	.0%	69.7%	30.3%	100.0%
	West	Count	0	19	12	31
		% within Region	.0%	61.3%	38.7%	100.0%
	Southeast	Count	0	31	7	38
		% within Region	.0%	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
	Southwest	Count	1	30	9	40
		% within Region	2.5%	75.0%	22.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	4	232	97	333
		% within Region	1.2%	69.7%	29.1%	100.0%

Table 14: Knowledge of Substance Abuse Prevention Leadership in County, by Region

			Do you know who the substance abuse prevention leaders are in your county			Total
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	
Region	Central	Count	1	14	2	17
		% within Region	5.9%	82.4%	11.8%	100.0%
	East	Count	3	15	2	20
		% within Region	15.0%	75.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	North Central	Count	2	30	16	48
		% within Region	4.2%	62.5%	33.3%	100.0%
	Northeast	Count	9	75	22	106
		% within Region	8.5%	70.8%	20.8%	100.0%
	Northwest	Count	2	27	4	33
		% within Region	6.1%	81.8%	12.1%	100.0%
	West	Count	5	18	8	31
		% within Region	16.1%	58.1%	25.8%	100.0%
	Southeast	Count	3	24	11	38
		% within Region	7.9%	63.2%	28.9%	100.0%
	Southwest	Count	2	33	6	41
		% within Region	4.9%	80.5%	14.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	27	236	71	334
		% within Region	8.1%	70.7%	21.3%	100.0%

Table 15: Tolerance of Substance Abuse in County, by Region

			Is there ever a time or circumstance where substance abuse is tolerated			Total
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	
Region	Central	Count	9	6	1	16
		% within Region	56.3%	37.5%	6.3%	100.0%
	East	Count	15	2	3	20
		% within Region	75.0%	10.0%	15.0%	100.0%
	North Central	Count	28	13	8	49
		% within Region	57.1%	26.5%	16.3%	100.0%
	Northeast	Count	69	16	22	107
		% within Region	64.5%	15.0%	20.6%	100.0%
	Northwest	Count	21	5	7	33
		% within Region	63.6%	15.2%	21.2%	100.0%
	West	Count	14	13	4	31
		% within Region	45.2%	41.9%	12.9%	100.0%
	Southeast	Count	14	11	12	37
		% within Region	37.8%	29.7%	32.4%	100.0%
	Southwest	Count	24	7	10	41
		% within Region	58.5%	17.1%	24.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	194	73	67	334
		% within Region	58.1%	21.9%	20.1%	100.0%

Table 16: Need to Expand Substance Abuse Prevention Efforts, by County

			Is there a need to expand the substance abuse prevention efforts			Total
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	
FIPS County Code	Adams	Count	0	7	1	8
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	Allen	Count	2	28	2	32
		% within FIPS County Code	6.3%	87.5%	6.3%	100.0%
	Bartholomew	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Benton*	% within region	.0%	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
	Blackford	Count	0	3	0	3
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Boone	Count	0	2	0	2
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Brown	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Carroll*	% within region	.0%	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
	Cass	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Clark	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%

Clay	Count	0	5	0	5
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Clinton	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Crawford*	% within region	.0%	92.1%	7.9%	100.0%
Daviess	Count	0	9	0	9
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Dearborn	Count	0	3	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Decatur	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
DeKalb	Count	1	2	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%
Delaware	Count	0	4	0	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Dubois	Count	0	8	0	8
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Elkhart	Count	0	10	3	13
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%
Fayette	Count	0	3	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Floyd	Count	0	2	0	2

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Fountain	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Franklin	Count	0	11	0	11
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Fulton	Count	0	4	0	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Gibson	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Grant	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Greene	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hamilton	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hancock	Count	0	4	0	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Harrison	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hendricks	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Henry	Count	0	3	0	3

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Howard	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Huntington	Count	0	3	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jackson	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jasper	Count	0	8	0	8
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jay	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jefferson	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Jennings*	% within region	.0%	92.1%	7.9%	100.0%
Johnson	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Knox	Count	0	9	0	9
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Kosciusko	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
LaGrange	Count	0	3	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%

Lake	Count	0	6	0	6
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
LaPorte	Count	0	7	0	7
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Lawrence*	% within region	.0%	92.1%	7.9%	100.0%
Madison	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Marion	Count	0	5	0	5
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Marshall	Count	0	7	0	7
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Martin	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Miami	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Monroe	Count	0	9	0	9
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Montgomery*	% within region	.0%	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Morgan	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Newton	Count	0	7	3	10
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
Noble	Count	0	29	1	30

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	96.7%	3.3%	100.0%
Ohio	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Orange	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Owen	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Parke	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Perry	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Pike*	% within region	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Porter	Count	1	6	0	7
	% within FIPS County Code	14.3%	85.7%	.0%	100.0%
Posey*	% within region	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Pulaski	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Putnam	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Randolph	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Ripley	Count	0	3	0	3

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Rush*	% within region	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
St. Joseph	Count	0	12	0	12
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Scott	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Shelby*	% within region	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Spencer	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Starke	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Steuben	Count	1	4	0	5
	% within FIPS County Code	20.0%	80.0%	.0%	100.0%
Sullivan	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Switzerland	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Tippecanoe	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Tipton	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Union	Count	0	1	0	1

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Vanderburgh	Count	0	5	0	5
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Vermillion	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Vigo	Count	0	3	1	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Wabash	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Warren*	% within region	.0%	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Warrick	Count	0	4	0	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Washington*	% within region	.0%	92.1%	7.9%	100.0%
Wayne	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Wells	Count	0	8	1	9
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
White	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Whitley	Count	0	11	3	14
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	78.6%	21.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	5	312	20	337

% within FIPS County Code	1.5%	92.6%	5.9%	100.0%
---------------------------	------	-------	------	--------

*Denotes counties with missing data: percentage computed within region and not considered for 'total' computation.

Table 17: Planning for Additional Substance Abuse Prevention Services, by County

			Is there planning for additional substance abuse prevention services			Total
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	
FIPS County Code	Adams	Count	0	7	1	8
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	Allen	Count	0	12	20	32
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	Bartholomew	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Benton*	% within region	.0%	35.5%	64.5%	100.0%
	Blackford	Count	1	1	1	3
		% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
	Boone	Count	0	0	2	2
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Brown	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Carroll*	% within region	.0%	35.5%	64.5%	100.0%

Cass	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Clark	Count	0	1	2	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Clay	Count	0	2	3	5
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Clinton	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Crawford*	% within region	10.5%	63.2%	26.3%	100.0%
Daviess	Count	2	5	2	9
	% within FIPS County Code	22.2%	55.6%	22.2%	100.0%
Dearborn	Count	0	3	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Decatur	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
DeKalb	Count	1	0	2	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%
Delaware	Count	0	2	2	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Dubois	Count	0	5	3	8
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
Elkhart	Count	0	3	10	13

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	23.1%	76.9%	100.0%
Fayette	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Floyd	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Fountain	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Franklin	Count	1	8	2	11
	% within FIPS County Code	9.1%	72.7%	18.2%	100.0%
Fulton	Count	2	1	1	4
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Gibson	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Grant	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Greene	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hamilton	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hancock	Count	0	3	1	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Harrison	Count	0	1	1	2

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Hendricks	Count	0	0	2	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Henry	Count	1	1	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
Howard	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Huntington	Count	0	1	2	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Jackson	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jasper	Count	0	7	1	8
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
Jay	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jefferson	Count	1	1	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
Jennings*	% within region	10.5%	63.2%	26.3%	100.0%
Johnson	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Knox	Count	0	7	2	9
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%

Kosciusko	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
LaGrange	Count	1	2	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%
Lake	Count	0	3	3	6
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
LaPorte	Count	1	3	3	7
	% within FIPS County Code	14.3%	42.9%	42.9%	100.0%
Lawrence*	% within region	10.5%	63.2%	26.3%	100.0%
Madison	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Marion	Count	0	3	2	5
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Marshall	Count	0	5	2	7
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
Martin	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Miami	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Monroe	Count	0	6	4	10
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Montgomery*	% within region	.0%	35.5%	64.5%	100.0%
Morgan	Count	0	1	0	1

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Newton	Count	2	4	4	10
	% within FIPS County Code	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Noble	Count	1	20	9	30
	% within FIPS County Code	3.3%	66.7%	30.0%	100.0%
Ohio	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Orange	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Owen	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Parke	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Perry	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Pike*	% within region	7.1%	59.5%	33.3%	100.0%
Porter	Count	0	7	0	7
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Posey*	% within region	7.1%	59.5%	33.3%	100.0%
Pulaski	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Putnam	Count	0	1	1	2

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Randolph	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Ripley	Count	0	1	2	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Rush*	% within region	10.0%	50.0%	40.0%	100.0%
St. Joseph	Count	1	8	3	12
	% within FIPS County Code	8.3%	66.7%	25.0%	100.0%
Scott	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Shelby*	% within region	.0%	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
Spencer	Count	0	0	2	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Starke	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Steuben	Count	2	2	1	5
	% within FIPS County Code	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Sullivan	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Switzerland	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Tippecanoe	Count	0	0	1	1

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Tipton	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Union	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Vanderburgh	Count	0	4	1	5
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Vermillion	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Vigo	Count	0	0	4	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Wabash	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Warren*	% within region	.0%	35.5%	64.5%	100.0%
Warrick	Count	1	1	2	4
	% within FIPS County Code	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Washington*	% within region	10.5%	63.2%	26.3%	100.0%
Wayne	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Wells	Count	1	4	4	9
	% within FIPS County Code	11.1%	44.4%	44.4%	100.0%
White	Count	0	0	1	1

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Whitley	Count	2	7	5	14
	% within FIPS County Code	14.3%	50.0%	35.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	26	178	134	338
	% within FIPS County Code	7.7%	52.7%	39.6%	100.0%

*Denotes counties with missing data: percentage computed within region and not considered for 'total' computation.

Table 18: Local Leadership Support for Additional Programs, by County

			Would the leadership in your county support additional efforts			Total
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	
FIPS County Code	Adams	Count	0	5	2	7
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
	Allen	Count	0	18	14	32
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	56.3%	43.8%	100.0%
	Bartholomew	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Benton*	% within region	.0%	61.3%	38.7%	100.0%
	Blackford	Count	0	3	0	3
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Boone	Count	0	2	0	2

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Brown	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Carroll*	% within region	.0%	61.3%	38.7%	100.0%
Cass	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Clark	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Clay	Count	0	2	3	5
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Clinton	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Crawford*	% within region	.0%	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Daviess	Count	0	8	1	9
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
Dearborn	Count	0	3	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Decatur	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
DeKalb	Count	0	1	2	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Delaware	Count	0	4	0	4

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Dubois	Count	0	7	1	8
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
Elkhart	Count	0	5	8	13
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	38.5%	61.5%	100.0%
Fayette	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Floyd	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Fountain	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Franklin	Count	0	9	2	11
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%
Fulton	Count	1	3	0	4
	% within FIPS County Code	25.0%	75.0%	.0%	100.0%
Gibson	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Grant	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Greene	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hamilton	Count	0	1	0	1

	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Hancock	Count	0	4	0	4
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Harrison	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Hendricks	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Henry	Count	0	3	0	3
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Howard	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Huntington	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within FIPS	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	County Code				
Jackson	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Jasper	Count	0	4	3	7
	% within FIPS	.0%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	County Code				
Jay	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Jefferson	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within FIPS	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	County Code				
Jennings*	% within region	.0%	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%

Johnson	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Knox	Count	0	6	3	9
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Kosciusko	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
LaGrange	Count	0	0	3	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Lake	Count	0	5	1	6
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
LaPorte	Count	0	6	1	7
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
Lawrence*	% within region	.0%	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Madison	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Marion	Count	0	4	1	5
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Marshall	Count	0	4	3	7
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
Martin	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Miami	Count	0	1	0	1

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Monroe	Count	0	8	2	10
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Montgomery*	% within region	.0%	61.3%	38.7%	100.0%
Morgan	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Newton	Count	0	6	4	10
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Noble	Count	0	21	8	29
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	72.4%	27.6%	100.0%
Ohio	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Orange	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Owen	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Parke	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Perry	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Pike*	% within region	2.5%	75.0%	22.5%	100.0%
Porter	Count	0	7	0	7

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Posey*	% within region	2.5%	75.0%	22.5%	100.0%
Pulaski	Count	0	0	2	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Putnam	Count	0	0	2	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Randolph	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Ripley	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Rush*	% within region	.0%	95.0%	5.0%	100.0%
St. Joseph	Count	0	10	2	12
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
Scott	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Shelby*	% within region	.0%	88.2%	11.8%	100.0%
Spencer	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Starke	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Steuben	Count	2	0	3	5
	% within FIPS County Code	40.0%	.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Sullivan	Count	0	1	0	1

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Switzerland	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Tippecanoe	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Tipton	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Union	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Vanderburgh	Count	1	3	1	5
	% within FIPS County Code	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Vermillion	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Vigo	Count	0	0	4	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Wabash	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Warren*	% within region	.0%	61.3%	38.7%	100.0%
Warrick	Count	0	1	2	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Washington*	% within region	.0%	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Wayne	Count	0	2	0	2

		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Wells		Count	0	6	3	9
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
White		Count	0	1	0	1
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Whitley		Count	0	11	3	14
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	78.6%	21.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	4	232	97	333
		% within FIPS County Code	1.2%	69.7%	29.1%	100.0%

*Denotes counties with missing data: percentage computed within region and not considered for 'total' computation.

Table 19: Knowledge of Substance Abuse Prevention Leadership in County, by County

			Do you know who the substance abuse prevention leaders are in your county			Total
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	
FIPS County Code	Adams	Count	0	7	0	7
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Allen	Count	6	13	13	32
		% within FIPS County Code	18.8%	40.6%	40.6%	100.0%
	Bartholomew	Count	0	2	1	3

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Benton*	% within region	16.1%	58.1%	25.8%	100.0%
Blackford	Count	0	3	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Boone	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Brown	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Carroll*	% within region	16.1%	58.1%	25.8%	100.0%
Cass	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Clark	Count	1	0	2	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%
Clay	Count	1	4	0	5
	% within FIPS County Code	20.0%	80.0%	.0%	100.0%
Clinton	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Crawford*	% within region	7.9%	63.2%	28.9%	100.0%
Daviess	Count	0	6	3	9
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Dearborn	Count	0	3	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Decatur	Count	0	1	0	1

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
DeKalb	Count	2	1	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%
Delaware	Count	0	3	1	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Dubois	Count	0	7	1	8
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
Elkhart	Count	1	7	5	13
	% within FIPS County Code	7.7%	53.8%	38.5%	100.0%
Fayette	Count	0	3	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Floyd	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Fountain	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Franklin	Count	1	7	3	11
	% within FIPS County Code	9.1%	63.6%	27.3%	100.0%
Fulton	Count	0	4	0	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Gibson	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Grant	Count	0	1	0	1

	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Greene	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Hamilton	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Hancock	Count	0	3	1	4
	% within FIPS	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Harrison	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Hendricks	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Henry	Count	1	2	0	3
	% within FIPS	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Howard	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Huntington	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within FIPS	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	County Code				
Jackson	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Jasper	Count	0	6	1	7
	% within FIPS	.0%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
	County Code				
Jay	Count	0	1	0	1

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jefferson	Count	1	2	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%
Jennings*	% within region	7.9%	63.2%	28.9%	100.0%
Johnson	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Knox	Count	1	7	1	9
	% within FIPS County Code	11.1%	77.8%	11.1%	100.0%
Kosciusko	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
LaGrange	Count	0	3	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Lake	Count	0	6	0	6
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
LaPorte	Count	0	5	2	7
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
Lawrence*	% within region	7.9%	63.2%	28.9%	100.0%
Madison	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Marion	Count	0	5	0	5
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Marshall	Count	1	2	4	7

	% within FIPS County Code	14.3%	28.6%	57.1%	100.0%
Martin	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Miami	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Monroe	Count	2	7	1	10
	% within FIPS County Code	20.0%	70.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Montgomery*	% within region	16.1%	58.1%	25.8%	100.0%
Morgan	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Newton	Count	1	7	2	10
	% within FIPS County Code	10.0%	70.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Noble	Count	0	27	3	30
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Ohio	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Orange	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Owen	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Parke	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perry	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Pike*	% within region	4.9%	80.5%	14.6%	100.0%
Porter	Count	0	7	0	7
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Posey*	% within region	4.9%	80.5%	14.6%	100.0%
Pulaski	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Putnam	Count	0	0	2	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Randolph	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Ripley	Count	0	0	3	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Rush*	% within region	15.0%	75.0%	10.0%	100.0%
St. Joseph	Count	0	9	3	12
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Scott	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Shelby*	% within region	5.9%	82.4%	11.8%	100.0%
Spencer	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Starke	Count	0	1	0	1

	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Steuben	Count	0	5	0	5
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Sullivan	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Switzerland	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Tippecanoe	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Union	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Vanderburgh	Count	0	4	1	5
	% within FIPS	.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Vermillion	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Vigo	Count	2	1	1	4
	% within FIPS	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Wabash	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	County Code				
Warren*	% within region	16.1%	58.1%	25.8%	100.0%
Warrick	Count	0	4	0	4
	% within FIPS	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	County Code				

Washington*	% within region	7.9%	63.2%	28.9%	100.0%
Wayne	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Wells	Count	1	8	0	9
	% within FIPS County Code	11.1%	88.9%	.0%	100.0%
White	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Whitley	Count	0	9	5	14
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	64.3%	35.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	27	236	71	334
	% within FIPS County Code	8.1%	70.7%	21.3%	100.0%

*Denotes counties with missing data: percentage computed within region and not considered for 'total' computation.

Table 20: Tolerance of Substance Abuse in County, by County

			Is there ever a time or circumstance where substance abuse is tolerated			Total
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	
FIPS County Code	Adams	Count	4	3	1	8
		% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	37.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	Allen	Count	22	2	8	32
		% within FIPS County Code	68.8%	6.3%	25.0%	100.0%
	Bartholomew	Count	3	0	0	3
		% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Benton*	% within region	45.2%	41.9%	12.9%	100.0%
	Blackford	Count	2	1	0	3
		% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Boone	Count	2	0	0	2
		% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Brown	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Carroll*	% within region	45.2%	41.9%	12.9%	100.0%
	Cass	Count	1	0	0	1
		% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Clark	Count	1	0	2	3
		% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%

Clay	Count	2	3	0	5
	% within FIPS County Code	40.0%	60.0%	.0%	100.0%
Clinton	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Crawford*	% within region	37.8%	29.7%	32.4%	100.0%
Daviess	Count	7	1	1	9
	% within FIPS County Code	77.8%	11.1%	11.1%	100.0%
Dearborn	Count	1	2	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%
Decatur	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
DeKalb	Count	2	1	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%
Delaware	Count	4	0	0	4
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Dubois	Count	1	4	3	8
	% within FIPS County Code	12.5%	50.0%	37.5%	100.0%
Elkhart	Count	9	3	1	13
	% within FIPS County Code	69.2%	23.1%	7.7%	100.0%
Fayette	Count	2	0	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%
Floyd	Count	0	0	1	1

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Fountain	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Franklin	Count	1	6	4	11
	% within FIPS County Code	9.1%	54.5%	36.4%	100.0%
Fulton	Count	1	3	0	4
	% within FIPS County Code	25.0%	75.0%	.0%	100.0%
Gibson	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Grant	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Greene	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hamilton	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hancock	Count	2	2	0	4
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	100.0%
Harrison	Count	2	0	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hendricks	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Henry	Count	3	0	0	3

	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Howard	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Huntington	Count	2	1	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%
Jackson	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jasper	Count	3	1	3	7
	% within FIPS County Code	42.9%	14.3%	42.9%	100.0%
Jay	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jefferson	Count	3	0	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jennings*	% within region	37.8%	29.7%	32.4%	100.0%
Johnson	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Knox	Count	6	1	2	9
	% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	11.1%	22.2%	100.0%
Kosciusko	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
LaGrange	Count	1	2	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%

Lake	Count	4	1	1	6
	% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	16.7%	16.7%	100.0%
LaPorte	Count	3	3	1	7
	% within FIPS County Code	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	100.0%
Lawrence*	% within region	37.8%	29.7%	32.4%	100.0%
Madison	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Marion	Count	3	2	0	5
	% within FIPS County Code	60.0%	40.0%	.0%	100.0%
Marshall	Count	3	0	4	7
	% within FIPS County Code	42.9%	.0%	57.1%	100.0%
Martin	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Miami	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Monroe	Count	4	5	1	10
	% within FIPS County Code	40.0%	50.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Montgomery*	% within region	45.2%	41.9%	12.9%	100.0%
Morgan	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Newton	Count	4	3	3	10
	% within FIPS County Code	40.0%	30.0%	30.0%	100.0%
Noble	Count	20	3	7	30

	% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	10.0%	23.3%	100.0%
Ohio	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Orange	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Owen	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Parke	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Perry	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pike*	% within region	58.5%	17.1%	24.4%	100.0%
Porter	Count	7	0	0	7
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Posey*	% within region	58.5%	17.1%	24.4%	100.0%
Pulaski	Count	2	0	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Putnam	Count	1	1	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	100.0%
Randolph	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Ripley	Count	0	0	3	3

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Rush*	% within region	75.0%	10.0%	15.0%	100.0%
St. Joseph	Count	8	3	1	12
	% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	25.0%	8.3%	100.0%
Scott	Count	1	1	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	100.0%
Shelby*	% within region	56.3%	37.5%	6.3%	100.0%
Spencer	Count	2	0	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Starke	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Steuben	Count	2	3	0	5
	% within FIPS County Code	40.0%	60.0%	.0%	100.0%
Sullivan	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Switzerland	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Tippecanoe	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Tipton	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Union	Count	0	0	1	1

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Vanderburgh	Count	5	0	0	5
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Vermillion	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Vigo	Count	2	1	1	4
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Wabash	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Warren*	% within region	45.2%	41.9%	12.9%	100.0%
Warrick	Count	2	0	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%
Washington*	% within region	37.8%	29.7%	32.4%	100.0%
Wayne	Count	2	0	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Wells	Count	5	1	3	9
	% within FIPS County Code	55.6%	11.1%	33.3%	100.0%
White	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Whitley	Count	11	0	3	14
	% within FIPS County Code	78.6%	.0%	21.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	194	73	67	334

% within FIPS County Code	58.1%	21.9%	20.1%	100.0%
---------------------------	-------	-------	-------	--------

*Denotes counties with missing data: percentage computed within region and not considered for 'total' computation.

Table 21: Availability of Local Data, by Region

			Is local data on substance abuse available in your county			
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	Total
Region	Central	Count	2	11	4	17
		% within Region	11.8%	64.7%	23.5%	100.0%
	East	Count	2	11	7	20
		% within Region	10.0%	55.0%	35.0%	100.0%
	North Central	Count	5	27	16	48
		% within Region	10.4%	56.3%	33.3%	100.0%
	Northeast	Count	1	80	26	107
		% within Region	.9%	74.8%	24.3%	100.0%
	Northwest	Count	1	18	13	32
		% within Region	3.1%	56.3%	40.6%	100.0%
	West	Count	2	21	8	31
		% within Region	6.5%	67.7%	25.8%	100.0%
	Southeast	Count	1	23	13	37
		% within Region	2.7%	62.2%	35.1%	100.0%
	Southwest	Count	1	34	7	42
		% within Region	2.4%	81.0%	16.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	15	225	94	334
		% within Region	4.5%	67.4%	28.1%	100.0%

Table 22: Availability of Sufficient Local Data, by Region

			Is <u>enough</u> data on substance abuse available in your county			Total
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	
Region	Central	Count	8	3	6	17
		% within Region	47.1%	17.6%	35.3%	100.0%
	East	Count	12	3	5	20
		% within Region	60.0%	15.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	North Central	Count	29	2	17	48
		% within Region	60.4%	4.2%	35.4%	100.0%
	Northeast	Count	37	25	45	107
		% within Region	34.6%	23.4%	42.1%	100.0%
	Northwest	Count	18	3	12	33
		% within Region	54.5%	9.1%	36.4%	100.0%
	West	Count	17	3	11	31
		% within Region	54.8%	9.7%	35.5%	100.0%
	Southeast	Count	16	7	14	37
		% within Region	43.2%	18.9%	37.8%	100.0%
	Southwest	Count	16	6	19	41
		% within Region	39.0%	14.6%	46.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	153	52	129	334
		% within Region	45.8%	15.6%	38.6%	100.0%

Table 23: Availability of Local Data, by County

			Is local data on substance abuse available in your county			Total
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	
FIPS County Code	Adams	Count	0	6	2	8
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Allen	Count	0	22	10	32
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	68.8%	31.3%	100.0%
	Bartholomew	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Benton*	% within region	6.5%	67.7%	25.8%	100.0%
	Blackford	Count	0	3	0	3
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Boone	Count	0	2	0	2
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Brown	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Carroll*	% within region	6.5%	67.7%	25.8%	100.0%
	Cass	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Clark	Count	0	2	1	3

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Clay	Count	1	4	0	5
	% within FIPS County Code	20.0%	80.0%	.0%	100.0%
Clinton	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Crawford*	% within region	2.7%	62.2%	35.1%	100.0%
Daviess	Count	0	8	1	9
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
Dearborn	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Decatur	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
DeKalb	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Delaware	Count	0	3	1	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Dubois	Count	0	8	0	8
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Elkhart	Count	1	7	4	12
	% within FIPS County Code	8.3%	58.3%	33.3%	100.0%
Fayette	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%

Floyd	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Fountain	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Franklin	Count	0	5	6	11
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
Fulton	Count	0	2	2	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Gibson	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Grant	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Greene	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hamilton	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hancock	Count	0	3	1	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Harrison	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hendricks	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Henry	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Howard	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Huntington	Count	0	3	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jackson	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jasper	Count	0	7	0	7
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jay	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Jefferson	Count	0	1	2	3
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Jennings*	% within region	2.7%	62.2%	35.1%	100.0%
Johnson	Count	0	0	2	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Knox	Count	0	7	2	9
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
Kosciusko	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
LaGrange	Count	0	3	0	3

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Lake	Count	1	4	1	6
	% within FIPS County Code	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	100.0%
LaPorte	Count	1	6	0	7
	% within FIPS County Code	14.3%	85.7%	.0%	100.0%
Lawrence*	% within region	2.7%	62.2%	35.1%	100.0%
Madison	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Marion	Count	1	4	0	5
	% within FIPS County Code	20.0%	80.0%	.0%	100.0%
Marshall	Count	0	3	4	7
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
Martin	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Miami	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Monroe	Count	0	10	0	10
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Montgomery*	% within region	6.5%	67.7%	25.8%	100.0%
Morgan	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Newton	Count	0	3	6	9

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Noble	Count	0	27	3	30
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Ohio	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Orange	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Owen	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Parke	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Perry	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Pike*	% within region	2.4%	81.0%	16.7%	100.0%
Porter	Count	0	2	5	7
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
Posey*	% within region	2.4%	81.0%	16.7%	100.0%
Pulaski	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Putnam	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Randolph	Count	1	0	0	1

	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Ripley	Count	1	0	2	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%
Rush*	% within region	10.0%	55.0%	35.0%	100.0%
St. Joseph	Count	2	6	4	12
	% within FIPS County Code	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	100.0%
Scott	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Shelby*	% within region	11.8%	64.7%	23.5%	100.0%
Spencer	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Starke	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Steuben	Count	1	2	2	5
	% within FIPS County Code	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Sullivan	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Switzerland	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Tippecanoe	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Tipton	Count	1	0	0	1

	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Union	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Vanderburgh	Count	0	3	2	5
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Vermillion	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Vigo	Count	0	2	2	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Wabash	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Warren*	% within region	6.5%	67.7%	25.8%	100.0%
Warrick	Count	1	2	1	4
	% within FIPS County Code	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Washington*	% within region	2.7%	62.2%	35.1%	100.0%
Wayne	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Wells	Count	0	5	4	9
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
White	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Whitley	Count	0	10	4	14

Total	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
	Count	15	225	94	334
	% within FIPS County Code	4.5%	67.4%	28.1%	100.0%

*Denotes counties with missing data: percentage computed within region and not considered for 'total' computation.

Table 24: Availability of Sufficient Local Data, by County

			Is <u>enough</u> data on substance abuse available in your county			Total
			No	Yes	Do not know/Not sure	
FIPS County Code	Adams	Count	4	1	3	8
		% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	12.5%	37.5%	100.0%
	Allen	Count	14	7	11	32
		% within FIPS County Code	43.8%	21.9%	34.4%	100.0%
	Bartholomew	Count	0	1	2	3
		% within FIPS County Code	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Benton*	% within region	54.8%	9.7%	35.5%	100.0%
	Blackford	Count	2	0	1	3
		% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%
	Boone	Count	1	0	1	2
		% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Brown	Count	0	0	1	1

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Carroll*	% within region	54.8%	9.7%	35.5%	100.0%
Cass	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Clark	Count	1	0	2	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%
Clay	Count	5	0	0	5
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Clinton	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Crawford*	% within region	43.2%	18.9%	37.8%	100.0%
Daviess	Count	5	1	3	9
	% within FIPS County Code	55.6%	11.1%	33.3%	100.0%
Dearborn	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Decatur	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
DeKalb	Count	1	1	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
Delaware	Count	2	1	1	4
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Dubois	Count	2	1	5	8

	% within FIPS County Code	25.0%	12.5%	62.5%	100.0%
Elkhart	Count	8	1	3	12
	% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	8.3%	25.0%	100.0%
Fayette	Count	1	2	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%
Floyd	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Fountain	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Franklin	Count	7	1	3	11
	% within FIPS County Code	63.6%	9.1%	27.3%	100.0%
Fulton	Count	3	0	1	4
	% within FIPS County Code	75.0%	.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Gibson	Count	0	0	2	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Grant	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Greene	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hamilton	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Hancock	Count	2	1	1	4

	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Harrison	Count	0	1	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Hendricks	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Henry	Count	3	0	0	3
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Howard	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Huntington	Count	1	1	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
Jackson	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jasper	Count	1	1	5	7
	% within FIPS County Code	14.3%	14.3%	71.4%	100.0%
Jay	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Jefferson	Count	1	0	2	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%
Jennings*	% within region	43.2%	18.9%	37.8%	100.0%
Johnson	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Knox	Count	2	2	5	9
	% within FIPS County Code	22.2%	22.2%	55.6%	100.0%
Kosciusko	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
LaGrange	Count	1	0	2	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%
Lake	Count	5	1	0	6
	% within FIPS County Code	83.3%	16.7%	.0%	100.0%
LaPorte	Count	5	1	1	7
	% within FIPS County Code	71.4%	14.3%	14.3%	100.0%
Lawrence*	% within region	43.2%	18.9%	37.8%	100.0%
Madison	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Marion	Count	2	2	1	5
	% within FIPS County Code	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Marshall	Count	3	0	4	7
	% within FIPS County Code	42.9%	.0%	57.1%	100.0%
Martin	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Miami	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Monroe	Count	7	1	2	10

	% within FIPS County Code	70.0%	10.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Montgomery*	% within region	54.8%	9.7%	35.5%	100.0%
Morgan	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Newton	Count	4	0	6	10
	% within FIPS County Code	40.0%	.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Noble	Count	8	11	11	30
	% within FIPS County Code	26.7%	36.7%	36.7%	100.0%
Ohio	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Orange	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Owen	Count	2	0	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Parke	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Perry	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Pike*	% within region	39.0%	14.6%	46.3%	100.0%
Porter	Count	6	1	0	7
	% within FIPS County Code	85.7%	14.3%	.0%	100.0%
Posey*	% within region	39.0%	14.6%	46.3%	100.0%
Pulaski	Count	1	0	1	2

	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Putnam	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Randolph	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Ripley	Count	2	0	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%
Rush*	% within region	60.0%	15.0%	25.0%	100.0%
St. Joseph	Count	8	0	4	12
	% within FIPS County Code	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%
Scott	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Shelby*	% within region	47.1%	17.6%	35.3%	100.0%
Spencer	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Starke	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Steuben	Count	2	0	3	5
	% within FIPS County Code	40.0%	.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Sullivan	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Switzerland	Count	1	0	0	1

	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Tippecanoe	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Tipton	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within FIPS County Code	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Union	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Vanderburgh	Count	4	0	1	5
	% within FIPS County Code	80.0%	.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Vermillion	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Vigo	Count	0	0	4	4
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Wabash	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Warren*	% within region	54.8%	9.7%	35.5%	100.0%
Warrick	Count	1	1	1	3
	% within FIPS County Code	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
Washington*	% within region	43.2%	18.9%	37.8%	100.0%
Wayne	Count	1	0	1	2
	% within FIPS County Code	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Wells	Count	0	1	8	9

	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
White	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within FIPS County Code	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Whitley	Count	6	3	5	14
	% within FIPS County Code	42.9%	21.4%	35.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	153	52	129	334
	% within FIPS County Code	45.8%	15.6%	38.6%	100.0%

*Denotes counties with missing data: percentage computed within region and not considered for 'total' computation.

REFERENCES

- Butterfoss, F. D., Goodman, R. M., & Wandersman, A. (1993). Community coalitions for prevention and health promotion. *Health Education Research, 8*(3), 315-330.
- Butterfoss, F. D., Goodman, R. M., & Wandersman, A. (1996). Community coalitions for prevention and health promotion: factors predicting satisfaction, participation, and planning. *Health Education and Behavior, 23*(1), 65-79.
- Edwards, R. W., Jumper-Thurman, P., Plested, B. A., Oetting, E. R., & Swanson, L. (2000). Community readiness: research to practice. *Journal of Community Psychology, 28*(3), 291-307.
- Goodman, R. M., Speers, M. A., McLeroy, K., Fawcett, S., Kegler, M., Parker, E., et al. (1998). Identifying and defining the dimensions of community capacity to provide a basis for measurement. *Health Education and Behavior, 25*(3), 258-278.
- Plested, B. A., Jumper-Thurman, P., Edwards, R. W., & Oetting, E. R. (1998). Community readiness: A tool for effective community-based prevention. *The Prevention Researcher, 5*(2), 5-7.
- U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. (2006). State Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant.