

2. Different group sizes have been used to accommodate the greater number of training schemes which have smaller number of approved spaces.

If all group sizes had been the same, then one of two situations would occur

- small group sizes of 20 would mean the table would be excessively long with over

500 different rows, to accommodate training schemes up to 1000 places in size

Many groups would potentially contain no schemes, especially for the larger places.

- large group size of, say, 100, would 'lump' together many schemes which were vastly different in size, which would add to levels of misinterpretation, and reduced 'resolution'.

3A no. 3.

3. over the five years the number of addicts under 20 has reduced gradually, then rapidly, from 118 (in 1971) to 18 (in 1976).

if we look at ages 20-25 in 1971, there are 772 of them. This 'large group' travels on down through the table to give 810 in 1976 (5 years later) for 25-30 year olds. So we can see that data in later years comes from data in earlier years, and it is often the case that for one 'age cohort' that 5 years later that age cohort has grown in size.

Combine this observation with the trend of fewer drug addicts entering at a young age, and we can reasonably conclude that fewer addicts are in society, but they were still steadily increasing in number as they got older.