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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Share of tobacco in household expense basket is alarmingly high among the people of lower economic strata of Bangladesh. It has been reported that Bangladeshi households with tobacco consuming members who fall in the poorest quintile spend 20.7 percent of their annual income on tobacco products. Thus, it can be observed that tobacco along with being a demerit good also acts as a barrier to elevation from the cycle of poverty due to the high opportunity cost of cigarette expense for households of the bottom quintile.

During the course of the advocacy campaign to raise taxes on tobacco before the budget session of the Bangladesh National Parliament (in May-June 2021), many stakeholders expressed their ‘concerns’ regarding the possibility of households curtailing their food commodity consumption to maintain tobacco consumption in case tobacco product prices increase suddenly. When tobacco users quit or reduce tobacco consumption in response to tobacco product price increases, their expenditure on tobacco products falls to zero or a lower level and the savings from tobacco expenditure can be diverted to spending on food and other necessary household items. On the other hand, tobacco users who are unable to quit or reduce tobacco consumption are expected to incur higher tobacco expenditure that may compromise consumption of necessities. The population level impact of tobacco product price increases on the consumption of necessities by tobacco consuming households would depend on whether the share of households quitting or reducing tobacco consumption is greater than the share of households not cutting down tobacco consumption. A larger share of households intending to quit or reduce tobacco consumption relative to the households not intending to reduce consumption would indicate that tobacco product price increase can bring forth net gain at the population level in the form of saving from tobacco expenditure that can be made available for other necessary expenses. This study investigates what proportion of tobacco consuming households intend to quit or reduce consumption of tobacco products while others plan to maintain the same level of consumption.

The Honourable Prime Minister of Bangladesh, Sheikh Hasina while speaking in the South Asian Speakers’ Summit in Dhaka in 2016 declared, inter alia, “Making our beloved country tobacco free by 2040. For realizing this coveted vision, we will take measures for adopting a strong tobacco tax policy simplifying the current tobacco tax structure aiming at decrease in affordability of all tobacco products in the country”. It indeed is a very strong commitment by head of the government and one that has encouraged anti-tobacco activists and researchers at home and abroad.

This study is required to assist policymakers to pursue a policy of significant increase in tobacco price by raising taxes as it provides them with substantial evidence of no impact (or very much negligible impact) on consumption of food commodity of tobacco consuming households as a spill-over effect of significant price increase of tobacco products.

Goal and Objectives of the study
This study was undertaken with the broad and overarching goal to assess possible impact of increase in tobacco product prices on overall commodity consumption of Bangladesh households. To this extent, this study focuses exclusively on cigarette (as cigarette accounts for the majority share of tobacco consumption in Bangladesh).

Methodology
In this particular study, mixed method was used to explore the evidence of household behavior of the necessary food consumption in case of cigarette price increased significantly by observing the responses. The study follows the explanatory
sequential design materializing in two phases- (1) an initial quantitative survey phase, followed by (2) a qualitative data collection phase, where the qualitative phase exploration was built on the queries that arose from the quantitative survey phase. For the household level investigation, total 650 sample from the targeted population were chosen for the study. In the qualitative phase, total 5 FGDs (one in each survey district) were conducted. The study only covers the lower income groups for the survey as per objectives. Households of 2nd and 3rd decile were the target for the urban and semi-urban residence while 2nd to 4th decile were for city corporation areas.

Findings
Respondents for the study were the tobacco using (cigarette) household heads. Total 665 respondents were selected randomly. While 650 respondents (97.7 percent) agreed to participate in the survey.

72 percent of the respondents were found to be using low-tier cigarettes (tier-wise tax category). The share of respondents using medium and high-tier cigarettes were 10 percent each. Finally, 6 percent were using premium-tier cigarettes.

When asked about the uses of other tobacco products (other than cigarette), more than 63 percent reported that they do not use any other tobacco products. Among the remaining respondents, about 80 percent were using smokeless tobacco ‘zarda’ and 37 percent were using ‘bidi’. Prevalence of use of ‘Gul’ and ‘Sadapata’ were found to be relatively low (3 percent each respectively).

A symmetric scale was used to determine the level of perceived necessity (‘most necessary’ to ‘not necessary at all’) of the food commodities and cigarette. It was revealed that perceived necessity of cigarettes is far below than other food commodities. Cigarettes scored (on an average) as the least necessary commodity. Cereal (rice, wheat etc.) got the highest score (4.96 out of 5) followed by edible oil (4.9 out of 5), spice (4.54) and vegetable (4.5). Then, protein (fish, meat, egg etc.), sugar and molasses, milk and fruits items received scores 3.8, 3.4 2.7 and 2.6 respectively. The mean score of cigarette was found to be only 1.7, which is 53 percent and 59 percent lower than the scores of fruits and milk (the second and third lowest scoring commodity in the list respectively).

Among the respondents, about 44 percent flagged cigarettes as ‘not necessary at all’, 42 percent dubbed cigarettes as ‘relatively less necessary’. However, about 10 percent considered the item as ‘necessary’ and remaining 4 percent rated it as ‘relatively more necessary’.

It was found that about 71 percent will not reduce food consumption in case of significant increase of cigarette prices. However, 29 percent opined that they may reduce consumption of other food commodities in case of significant tobacco (cigarette) price hike. Among them who would not reduce the food consumption, only 3 percent were likely to reduce the non-food expenditure due to the cigarette piece hike while majority (97%) will not reduce the non-food expenses. Of those who are likely to reduce non-food expenses (3%), about 75 percent would reduce expenses on financial services (savings, insurance etc.) followed by entertainment expenses (38%) and then, by health expenses (25%).

About 69 percent (among 650) respondents have stated that they will cope with the tobacco price hike by the choosing any of the options- A) think about quitting or try to quit; B) reducing tobacco consumption, C) consuming tobacco products that are less expensive, and D) a mixture of the last two options (B and C).

More than two-thirds of tobacco user households (69 percent) have expressed their intention to quit tobacco use or reduce tobacco consumption or switch to cheaper tobacco products in response to tobacco product price increase. Less than a third of tobacco user households (31 percent) do not intend to reduce tobacco consumption and hence would be induced
to cut down consumption of food and non-food necessities. The fact that most tobacco user households would be induced to cut down tobacco consumption and save tobacco expenditure for other necessary consumption in the household indicates that tobacco product price increases would be beneficial for tobacco consuming households overall. The households who would fail to reduce tobacco consumption and hence would incur higher tobacco expenditure would need cessation support from public health programs that can be financed by the Health Development Surcharge fund.

**Analysis**

Only around 14 percent of the respondents rated tobacco as either ‘Necessary’, ‘More Necessary’ or ‘Most necessary’ commodity (3 to 5 rating points). Among them 73.3 percent do not have any members aged under-15 years. The high degree of overlap among respondents with high rating for tobacco and households with no member aged under-15, indicates that the overlapping respondents are able to fund their tobacco expenses as they do not have dependents who are aged under-15.

Among, the sub-sample of respondents who rated tobacco highly and did not have any under-15 aged member in their household, it was found that 95 percent of these respondents have ‘High Dependence’ on nicotine according to Fagerstrom Test for Nicotine Dependence. High Nicotine dependence can be attributed to loneliness and depression which in this case can be attributed to lack of children (under-15) members in the household.

Moreover, intra-variation among the respondents (who are all part of low-income group) by income can be used to explain tobacco consumption pattern and possible impact of price hike. It was found that the average income of households (who rated tobacco as necessary and most necessary) is 8 percent more than the overall sample average of TRG. Therefore, affordability of tobacco products emerges as a key issue which can impact tobacco consumption pattern change.

**Remarks**

The findings here are aligned with the initial hypothesis and provided the basis for the study. Only 14 percent of the sample rated tobacco highly and it was also found a significant majority of them have high nicotine dependency which explains their high preference for tobacco. The study also found itself aligned with existing literature on crowding-out effect as it followed. Around 21 percent of respondents also revealed that they will quit smoking if there is significant price increase. Overall, it can be concluded that significant increase in tobacco prices will not impact household’s food commodity consumption.

When assessing the welfare impact of any policy change on the society as a whole, it needs to be recognized that there will always be some gainers and some losers of any policy change. In this case, the gainers are those who can cut down tobacco consumption in response to price increase and the losers are those who fail to cut down tobacco consumption. The total welfare change would depend on which group is bigger. This study shows that the gainers are the majority which justifies the tobacco price increase.
Use of tobacco continues to be the leading cause of preventable death in Bangladesh (The Bangladesh Cancer Society, 2020) as well as the global arena (WHO, 2011). According to The Bangladesh Cancer Society, 13.5 percent of all deaths in Bangladesh in 2018 were attributed to ailments concerned with the use of tobacco. Globally, 6 million people die suffering from diseases related to tobacco use (American Cancer Society & Vital Strategies, 2020). Tobacco has long been established as a demerit good causing damage to users’ own health as well as producing negative externalities for others via second-hand smoke (Besley, 1988).

Share of tobacco in household expense basket is alarmingly high among the people of lower economic strata of Bangladesh (Unnayan Shamannay, 2021). It has been reported that Bangladeshi households with tobacco consuming members who fall in the poorest quintile spend 20.7 percent of their annual income on tobacco products. Thus, it can be observed that tobacco along with being a demerit good also acts as a barrier to elevation from the cycle of poverty due to the high opportunity cost of cigarette expense for households of the bottom quintile. According to Unnayan Shamannay, substituting tobacco consumption expense of all the households in Bangladesh with investment in education can account for around 11 percent increased investment in education. With average global Return on Investment of education estimated to be around 9 percent (World Bank, 2018), the lost potential of utilizing the resource spent for tobacco consumption can have an impact in the economic mobility of the households living in the bottom quintile.

Unnayan Shamannay, as part of its tobacco taxation advocacy project conducted an impact assessment study to assess the impact of increase in tobacco product prices after the budget of Government of the People’s Republic of Bangladesh (GoB) for the 2021-22 fiscal year (FY) was passed at the National Parliament. It was expected that the budget-makers will significantly increase the declared retail prices of all tobacco products in the said budget proposal. Unfortunately, declared retail prices of the two upper tier cigarettes (high and premium) has been negligibly increased, while that of all other tobacco products (low and medium tier cigarettes, bidis, zarda and gul) has not been increased at all. The ad-valorem supplementary duties and all other taxes on all these tobacco products also remain unchanged from the previous fiscal year (FY2020-21).

During the course of the advocacy campaign to raise taxes on tobacco before the budget session of the Bangladesh National Parliament, many stakeholders expressed their ‘concerns’ regarding the possibility of households curtailing their food commodity consumption to maintain tobacco consumption in case tobacco product prices increase suddenly. Though there is presence of significant empirical evidence which prove that tobacco consumers generally reduce tobacco consumption when tobacco product prices are increased significantly (WHO, 2011). The need for creation of a comprehensive set of evidence, generated through a comprehensive survey, arose to explore the possible impact of significant tobacco price increase on household food commodity consumption to further reinforce the anti-tobacco advocacy agenda in Bangladesh. Assessing possible changes in overall commodity consumption of Bangladesh households in case of tobacco product price increase is being perceived to be of great relevance in the current context.
Moreover, the study was borne out of the necessity to better assess the perceived and subsequently quantify the reported preference of tobacco consumers strictly in comparison to food commodities. This study essentially provides a supporting guideline for policymakers and decision makers about potential cross-preference impact of tobacco taxation. With the overriding evidence presented in the study of negligible impact of significant increase of tobacco price on food commodity consumption, the study essentially substantiates the argument for significant increase in tobacco tax to inhibit tobacco consumption as the said policy has no spillover effect in the form of reducing food commodity consumption.

Realizing the harms for using tobacco products, Honorable Prime Minister of Bangladesh Sheikh Hasina announced in the closing session of an International Conference “South Asian Speakers’ Summit on Achieving the sustainable development goals (SDGs)” on 31st January 2016, “Although we have earned notable progress in tobacco control, we are not complacent, we still have to do some more to fully comply with the FCTC and to reduce tobacco use substantially in Bangladesh, making our beloved country tobacco free by 2040. For realizing this coveted vision, we will take measures for adopting a strong tobacco tax policy simplifying the current tobacco tax structure aiming at decrease in affordability of all tobacco products in the country”. It’s a very strong commitment by head of the government.

But with the responsibility of maintaining both short-term stability and long-term constructive reforms on their shoulders, policy makers tend to be concerned about all hypothetical implications of a policy decision. Due to the issue of nicotine dependence of tobacco users, a notion has emerged that even if tobacco prices are raised suddenly and significantly, tobacco users will attempt consumption smoothing by substituting the resources formerly allocated for other expenses (Ward et al., 1972).

This notion is particularly concerning for a policymaker of a developing economy with a large demography living below or on the poverty line as it means that such substitution will have to be made at the expense of essential commodities for a section of the demography who are poor because the poor essentially do not have any disposable income due to the severe resource constraints they already face.
Thus, the prime concern was that they might substitute their most important essential expense namely food commodity, to ensure consumption smoothing of tobacco.

Possibility of the aforementioned scenario being realized has substantial wide-ranging cross-sectoral implications including possible political repercussions and thus this issue concerns policymakers enormously as they felt that they need to pursue a strategy of vigilance and ensure short-term stability.

This study was required to assist policymakers to pursue a policy of significant increase in tobacco price by raising taxes as it provides them with substantial evidence of no impact on consumption of food commodity of tobacco consuming households as a spill-over effect of significant price increase of tobacco.
This study was undertaken with the broad and overarching goal to assess possible impact of increase in tobacco product prices on overall commodity consumption of Bangladesh households. To this extent, this study focuses exclusively on cigarette as cigarette accounts for the majority share of tobacco consumption in Bangladesh. The key research question answered in this study is how would Bangladesh households cope with price increase of tobacco products (cigarettes)?

The specific focal objective of the study was to map reported consumption preference of specific food commodities and tobacco (cigarette). Respondents rated their preference of the different food commodities and tobacco on a Likert-type scale of 1-5 with 1 standing for ‘Not Necessary’ and 5 for ‘Most Necessary’. This essentially helped the study produce a preference index of commodities in a consumption basket to understand the comparative preference of tobacco in comparison to food commodities.

The secondary objective was to investigate the magnitude of Bangladesh households who will reduce non-food expenses to compensate for price increase of tobacco.

The study also aimed to objectively quantify the manners in which the tobacco users will cope with significant increase of price of tobacco.

As this study aimed to assess the impact of tobacco price increase on households, TRG only included consumers of tobacco (we have considered only cigarette consumption in the definition of tobacco consumption to ensure comprehensive representation of the most used tobacco product in Bangladesh). Secondly, as the household head is the decisionmaker of the consumption expenditure in Bangladesh, only household heads were selected in TRG. Thirdly, as the number of cigarette smokers are disproportionately higher in urban setting in Bangladesh, we considered only those who resided in an urban and semi-urban environment in Bangladesh. Lastly, people living in the low-income groups are more vulnerable to price shock to consumption and are more likely to produce a substantial economic reaction to changes in price patterns.

Respondent Group (TRG) was selected with a specific set of criteria which are mentioned below:
- Respondent consumes tobacco (cigarette)
- Respondent is a household head
- Respondent is an urban and semi-urban dweller
- Respondent falls under the low-income group category with household income in the range between 11,000 to 25,000 (for urban and semi-urban areas, and upper income limit is 30,000 for city corporation)

TRG criterions were set after meticulous and rigorous literature review of the existing impact assessment studies along with the selection of localized and specialized features unique to Bangladesh.
3.1 Analytical Framework

As evident, the overarching goal of the study is to assess possible impact of increase in tobacco product prices on overall commodity consumption of Bangladesh households. This implies the key research question is- how would Bangladesh households cope with increase in tobacco product prices? If it is assumed that tobacco product prices increase will not affect household consumption of non-food commodities- then the research question can be further narrowed down. In that case the question to be answered would be- will Bangladesh households decrease consumption of food commodities in case there is a tobacco product price hike?

The above postulated the graphically representation of the analytical frameworks to be followed for the study. There are two possible answers to the said specific research question (SQ.1 in Figure 1). Either the respondents might adjust the other food-consumption expenditure (“yes”) or they might not be likely to curtail food commodity consumption in case of tobacco products prices increase (‘no’). Based on the hypothesis that people are unwilling to reduce their foods consumption in case of cigarette price hike, the quantitative survey was designed and qualitative assessment were felt required to make more justifications from ground level stories and opinions. The quantitative survey focused on the measuring the perceived needs of the food commodities to assess the shock of the tobacco price hike shocks in consideration. That is- which food commodities are perceived to be of lesser importance compared to tobacco consumption (this means seeking answer to the question no. SQ.2 of Figure 1).

Figure 1: Analytical frameworks at a glance

- **Research Question**: How will households cope with increased tobacco product prices?
- **Specific Question**
  - SQ.1) In case of increased tobacco product prices, will households decrease consumption of food commodities?
  - SQ.2) Consumption of which food commodities might be cut to cope with price increase of tobacco products?
  - SQ.3) How will households manage tobacco consumption to cope with the price increase?

Assumption:
- Tobacco product price increase will not affect household consumption of non-food commodities.
Once, the answer to SQ.1 is ‘no’, i.e., it is revealed that households are not likely to curtail consumption food commodities to maintain their tobacco consumption; then the analysis turned to focus on their household level characteristics, economic situation and behavioral motive. Besides that, the investigation tried to seek how households will manage their tobacco consumption in case tobacco product prices are increased significantly (SQ.3 of Figure 1).

3.2 Methodology
Purpose of the study is to explore the perceived impact of significant tobacco products (in our case cigarette only) price increases in the consumption of other necessary commodities’ consumption at the household level. The mixed method can be an ideal technique advancing the understanding of complex behavioral and sociocultural issues (Fryer et al., 2017). In this particular study, mixed method was used to explore the evidence of household behavior of the necessary food consumption in case of cigarette price increased significantly by observing the responses. The study follows the explanatory sequential design materializing in two phases- (1) an initial quantitative survey phase, followed by (2) a qualitative data collection phase, where the qualitative phase exploration was built on the queries arose from the quantitative survey phase.

3.2.1 Quantitative survey phase
Background and sampling stratification
To achieve the objectives, Unnayan Shamannay administered a quantitative survey considering the whole Bangladesh. The survey was confined to the household heads from with cigarette smoking practices and belonged to the lower-income group (i.e., decile-2 to decile-4). Hence, the household with tobacco uses and lying in the lower income groups in the urban and semi-urban areas are the prime consideration for the survey.

The study confined only to the explore the evidence with the consideration of significant national representative sample. Therefore, primary sampling unit was the randomly chosen wards under the administrative unit upazila/city corporation. It is noted that the study only considers the cigarette consuming households heads and residing in the urban set-up. In Bangladesh, households in the urban set-up can easily be considered in three residing states-(i) city corporation (those who living in city corporation areas), (ii) paurasabha/urban (those who living in upazila sadar municipality areas under the district HQ) and (iii) semi-urban (those who residing in upazila HQ but not district HQ). In the study, the stratification according to the mentioned urban set-up are considered for better representation of urban population. In the selection process of urban households under the wards of upazilas (municipalities), the whole households of Bangladesh were divided into five regions, namely (i) South-West, (ii) North-West, (iii) North-East, (iv) South-East, and (v) Central. From each of the regions, only one district was chosen from list of districts under the regions. From the central region, Dhaka districts was considered to cover the city corporation and from rest of the regions, the districts are selected purposively considering the location (at least the district might lie in the border of other division).

Determining the Survey Sample
To achieve the intent of the study, we will take on purposive sampling technique. The sample will cover the number of households having tobacco expenses. It is assumed that the household head is a smoker or tobacco users since the household has the tobacco expenses. Hence, due to the selection bias in the sampling, sample population will be the total population living in urban areas with tobacco expenses. Estimate on the population size is derived from the household and income expenditure survey 2016 (HIES 2016) statistics. Total number of households having tobacco related expenses is 42% percent. That statistic is the main determinant of the sample population. According to that percentage, more than 17.5 million households have expenditure on the tobacco consumption. Total population residing in the household with tobacco expenses is about 71 million. This will be the population size for the sample size determination.
Now, to determine a representative sample size, the sampling technique of Cochran, W.G. (1963) was used. First, the formula to determine sample size for an infinite population is used (see below):

\[
SS_{inf} = \frac{Z^2 \times p(1-p)}{C^2}
\]

`SS_{inf} = Sample Size for infinite population; 
Z = Corresponding value from the z-table; 1.96 for 95% confidence level; 
p = percentage of population (in our case, 42% was considered); 
C = confidence interval/margin of error,
`

Applying the above formula yields a sample size of 648 when the confidence level is 95 percent and margin of error is 3.8 percent.

As this survey has a finite population to cover (i.e., 71 million), sample size determining formula for a finite population can be applied here (see below):

\[
SS_f = \frac{SS_{inf}}{1+\left(\frac{SS_{inf} - 1}{Pop}\right)}
\]

`SS_f = Sample Size for finite population; 
SS_{inf} = Sample Size for infinite population; 
Pop = Population
`

Application of this formula yields a sample size close to 500. Hence, the study covered a sample of **650 respondents**.

We also applied alternatively the GATS data to determine the sample. According to GATS 2017 Report, total adult tobacco users are about 38 million. If we put the figure as population in the finite sample size formula, the sample size became 648 (same as the previous one). Finally, the determined sample size stood at 650.

### Sample Design, Criteria and Distribution

The study followed the multi-stages convenience sampling technique. At the first stage, we defined the sampling areas dividing the whole Bangladesh into five regions. The five regions are namely-(i) South-West, (ii) North-West, (iii) North-East, (iv) South-East, and (v) Central. Different number of districts lies within the five regions. A district from each region was purposively selected for the study. Total five districts from the five regions are chosen. Then, two upazilas within each of the district were selected purposively. One was the upazila of district HQ (i.e., district sadar upazila) and another was from relatively distant upazila but having semi-urban setup except central region. After that, either paurashava or semi-urban residence areas from each of the upazilas was selected for the survey. In case of Central zone, the survey area was city corporations of Dhaka City parting as North City Corporation and South City Corporation. Since, we targeted the households (household head is a tobacco consumer) having tobacco related expenditure in the consumption basket, the expected household was selected by applying the show-ball approach.

The selected households have been considered as sample respondent once they confirmed three criteria-(i) household heads is cigarette smokers, (ii) it resides in the urban and semi-urban areas and (iii) the households’ income is between 11,000 to 25,000 (for urban and semi-urban areas, and upper income limit is 30,000 for city corporation). As our sample respondents were from urban and semi-urban areas, the randomly wards (under upazila/city corporation) were chosen based on the sample respondents’ criteria. To complete the survey within the time, no listing of respondents prior to the survey was done.
The number of sample by districts and upazila/city corporation were shown in the above table (see Table-2)

The chosen wards number under the upazila and city corporations are shown in table (See Table-1).

From each of the upazila or city corporation, equal number of sample respondents were chosen. That means, 65*10=650 sample respondents were selected. Total 130 respondents from each of the districts were covered. It is noted that the enumerators went to total 665 respondents while only 650 respondents agreed to participate in the survey.

The survey locations points are shown in the map for better understanding of the coverage. Every point reported in the map were recorded during the survey by the enumerators (Note that there might be some errors in the exact GPS of the households due to the technical issues of the devices.).
Figure 2: Map indicating the survey areas and households’ locations
The draft survey questionnaire was developed by the study team and then it was finalized upon receiving the feedbacks from the relevant stakeholders by organizing meetings and workshop prior to the survey. The final draft questionnaire was pretested in different areas of Dhaka city and feedbacks were incorporated in the final survey questionnaire.

3.2.2 Qualitative data collection phase

Upon carrying out the quantitative survey, the preliminary analysis was performed to find out the gap of the information needs to be overcome. The study emphasized on qualitative data collection areas identifications and the relevant tool finalization for the focus group discussion (FGD). It was only confined to the FGDs for the qualitative data collection phase. For the FGDs, only the districts of the quantitative survey areas were selected. One FGD from each of the selected districts was conducted. Checklist of the FGD is given in the annex.

3.2.3 Data collection and analysis procedure

Data were collected using online pre-coded survey form (e-questionnaire). Total 10 trained enumerators were deployed and each of the enumerators was responsible for the each of the upazila or city corporation. Each of the enumerators were centrally monitored by the supervision team through time to time checking the data coming into the cloud-based data server. The e-questionnaire allowed enumerators to transfer data from the field almost in real time using mobile internet connection. Then, the data was transferred to statistical software for further cleaning and processing prior to analysis.

The quantitative data coming the survey are mainly taken into account for the descriptive analysis following the analytical frameworks as discussed in the previous sub-section. The household characteristics, perceived necessity of tobacco (cigarette), effect of tobacco price increases and coping tendency are shown based on the descriptive analysis. In addition, the qualitative responses from the FGDs are utilized to describing the facts for better understanding about the ground-level socio-economic factors which influences the decision of the concerned groups.
04 FINDINGS

In this section, the findings of the survey are discussed relying on the broad areas—household characteristics, perceived necessity of tobacco and other food commodities, possible effect on other consumption once cigarette prices increase, and the coping and adjusting behavior if cigarette users opt to maintain previous level cigarette use after the price increase.

4.1 Sample household characteristics

As explained earlier that the target respondents were the tobacco (cigarette) using household heads. Total 665 respondents were selected randomly from as per the targets. While 650 respondents (97.7 percent) agreed to participate in the survey. Among the respondents, 99.7 percent are male-headed household and only 0.3 percent are female-headed.

Figure 3: Households’ heads by gender

As per GATS (2017), prevalence of tobacco smoking is higher among male (36.3 percent) than female users (0.8 percent). In the survey coverage, the share of female-headed households remains limited due to such prevalence.

Average age of the household heads was found to be 41.8 years. GATS (2017) reported the average age of respondents is close to 39 years. In this current survey, more than 56 percent respondents are aged below 40 years (see Annex-01: Table A1).

Average household size obtained from the survey is 4.7 while more than one-third of the respondents reported their household size is 4 and 27 percent have 5 members (see Annex-01: Table A2). As per the HIES (2016), average household size for urban areas is 3.93. That means the comparatively the household with higher family members are included in the sample.

The average number of aged under 15 members of the household is 1.44 and average percentage of under 15 aged members in the household is around 30 percent (see Annex-01: Table A3). While, average number of female members aged above 15 was found 1.77 persons per household and 45 percent of the households having a female member in their family (see Annex-01: Table A4).

About 17 percent of respondents had no formal schooling; more than 40 percent has been to school but only up to primary level education. Not more than 40 percent had either completed secondary level schooling or higher secondary while only 3 percent had completed higher education level.

Figure 4: Educational status of household head (%)
Households’ head main occupational figure shows that the highest 28 percent respondents of the survey engaged as sales and service workers followed by 25 percent engaged as day-laborers, 15 percent engaged as transport workers. Then, more than 10 percent engaged in agricultural farming (as farmers). It is found in HIES (2016), more than 10 percent in urban areas are engaged in agriculture and fisheries. The same is true for the sales and service workers. This validates the findings of the current study as the representation of the urban population. Besides that, production and trade related workers, technicians and street vendors were aggregately 14 percent.

Now, we can focus on the household income range. this study only covers the lower income groups for the survey as per our objectives. Households of 2nd and 3rd decile were the target for the urban and semi-urban residence while 2nd to 4th decile were for city corporation areas. Only city corporations under Dhaka district were covered in the survey and urban and semi-urban municipalities were covered from the rest four districts namely, Bagerhat, Feni, Gaibandha and Netrokona. Monthly income range for the 2nd to 4th decile was BDT 11,000 to 25,000 and for 2nd to 4th decile was BDT 11,000 to 30,000.

Average income of Bagerhat, Gaibandha and Netrokona is relatively same (approximately BDT 15,900) while it is BDT 18,700 for the Dhaka and Feni district. Though, the income range for the respondents from Dhaka were targeted higher compared to Feni but the median income of Dhaka is relatively close to the rest of District average (see Annex-01: Table A5). Therefore, there is no much differences among the respondents considering the income. That might be helpful for the evidence of the lower income group. Average monthly income of the respondent households is BDT 17,004 while median income is BDT 16,000.
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4.2 Tobacco uses of the respondents

4.2.1 Tobacco uses by household heads
The study targeted only the cigarette smoking households. Hence, all household heads are the smokers in the sample. According to GATS (2017), total tobacco smokers in Bangladesh is 18 percent while 14 percent is cigarette smokers. It was also reported that daily cigarette smokers are 12.5 percent. That means the prevalence of cigarette uses is definitely affecting the daily expenditure.

As our target respondents were low-income group, it is found from the survey that 72 percent of low-income group is smoking low-segment (tier-wise tax category) cigarette followed by high-tier (10 percent). While 10 percent and 6 percent consumes middle-tier and premium tier respectively.
If we look into the tobacco smoking dependence of the household heads, it is found that moderate dependence on tobacco smoking is the highest (28.3 percent) followed by low to moderate (27.5 percent). Then, 27 percent have low dependence and 11 percent respondents have no dependence. While about 6 percent have high dependence on tobacco smoking. That means less than a-third of respondents have moderate to high dependence on tobacco.

---

1 The respondents were given the opportunity to select more than one response in this particular question.
4.2.2 Tobacco uses by other family members

Tobacco uses of the other family member is an important indicator to look into. It was revealed from the survey that average number of members (aged 15 and above) in the tobacco using household is above 1.7 (including household heads). While, on an average, 0.5 person of female members in the household is using tobacco. About 47.4 percent of other household members (other than household head) are consuming tobacco. Type of tobacco product uses for other family members are illustrated in the figure.

Less than 50 percent of the other family members is consuming tobacco products (including cigarette) while prevalence of zarda uses is 86 percent among them followed by sadapata (21 percent) and then by cigarette (8 percent). It appears that tobacco smoking habit of household heads can unintentionally motivate the other member of the family to consume tobacco.

4.3 Perceived necessity of tobacco (cigarette)

The list of food commodities usually consumed by Bangladesh which was developed prior to the survey from the BBS food consumption list used for the inflation calculation. A Likert-type scale was used to score each of the broad categories of the commodities in accordance with their perceived essentialness/necessity. Here a survey respondent (household head who consumes tobacco products) gave a score to each of the food commodities (including tobacco products) in accordance with their perceived necessity.

A symmetric scale was used to determine the level of perceived necessity. The perceived necessity was assessed by the five levels of necessity- 01) most necessary, 02) more necessary than most other, 03) necessary, 04) relatively less necessary, and 05) not necessary at all.

If a commodity is perceived by the respondent to be ‘most necessary’ (level 01) then the score for that commodity is 5. If it is perceived to be not most necessary, but still ‘more necessary than most other food commodities’ (level 02), then it gets a score of 4. In this manner, if a commodity is perceived by the respondent to be not necessary at all (level 05), it gets a score of 1 (the lowest possible score).
Among the respondents, about 44 percent flagged the tobacco items as the 'not necessary at all' followed by 42 percent revealed as 'relatively less necessary'. However, about 10 percent considered the item as necessary and rest 4 percent rated as the relatively more necessary. That means less than 14 percent have considered the item as necessary. It can be easily evident that more than 86 percent respondents considered that the tobacco items as relatively less necessary.

It is observed that the perceived necessity of tobacco (cigarette) is relatively low for the low-income group and that means they are unlikely to reduce food consumptions for maintaining tobacco consumption.
4.4 Possible effect on consumption/expenditure

It was quantified by Husain et al. (2018) that tobacco user households spent less on non-food items (such as clothing, housing, education and transportation) compared to tobacco non-user households. There is such possibility to reduce the consumption due to significant increases of tobacco prices.

When the respondents were asked, in case the price of tobacco products (cigarettes) increased significantly, is there any chances to reduce the foods consumption? Majority of the respondents (71 percent) perceived that they would not reduce the food consumption.

It is evident that about 71 percent will not reduce food consumption due to the possible significant increase of tobacco price. However, the 29 percent opined that they will reduce the food consumption in case of significant tobacco (cigarette) price hike. Among them who would not reduce the food consumption, only 3 percent will reduce the non-food expenditure due to the cigarette piece hike while majority (97 percent) will not reduce the non-food expenses (see Annex-01: Table A6).

Of those who would reduce non-food expenses (3 percent), about 75 percent will reduce the financial non-food items (savings, insurance etc.) followed by entertainment expenses (38 percent) and then, by health expenses (25 percent). Besides that, about 6 percent will reduce the transport and communication related expenses (see Annex-01: Table A7).

Figure 13: Perceived effects of significant cigarette price hike

![Figure 13: Perceived effects of significant cigarette price hike](image-url)
The respondents (71%) who wants to not reducing the food consumption were asked about their preference on curtailing the non-food expenses, while only 3 percent agreed that they will cut their non-food expenses. That means majority of the respondents will go for the other adjustment strategy in case of the significant tobacco price increases (see Annex-01: Table A8).

### 4.5 Coping with price hike

The tobacco price hike has some implication in the adjustment for those who wants to reduce the foods consumption or those who wants to reduce other non-food expenses for the adjustment. The questions for the household those who reduce the food consumption were not asked further.

The respondents (71%) who wants to not reducing the food consumption were asked about their preference on curtailing the non-food expenses, while only 3 percent agreed that they will cut their non-food expenses. That means majority of the respondents will go for the other adjustment strategy in case of the significant tobacco price increases (see Annex-01: Table A8).

---

2 The respondents were given the opportunity to select more than one response in this particular question.
The above figure shows the responses of respondents who would adjust with the cigarette price hike without reducing food or non-food expenses. About 30 percent will think about quitting or try to quit the cigarette due to the increase in the tobacco price. About 30 percent will reduce the tobacco uses and 5 percent will switch to low-price cigarette. While 36 percent will adjust by following both ways - reducing number of sticks consumed compared to earlier situation and by shifting to low-price cigarette to cope with the price hike. It is evident that significant price increase of tobacco will force the users to quit the smoking or reduce the tobacco uses. In our cases, 21 percent from the overall sample will quit the smoking or try to quit tobacco due to the significant price increases.
05 Analysis

Our study reported that the majority of TRG (around 71 percent) affirmed that even if the tobacco prices are increased significantly and suddenly, they won’t curtail their food consumption to hold on to their former level of tobacco consumption, supporting the hypothesis of the study.

Only around 14 percent of the respondents rated tobacco as either Necessary, More Necessary or Most necessary commodity (3 to 5 rating points). 73.3 percent of the households who rates tobacco high- do not have any members aged under-15. The high degree of overlap among respondents with high rating for tobacco and households with no member aged under-15, indicates that the overlapping respondents are able to fund their tobacco expenses as they don’t have dependents who are aged under-15. As they are not held back by expenses incurred for child’s nutritional and nourishment needs (which is the case for families with members aged under-15), it can be inferred that this space in the consumption expenditure basket is spent for tobacco by this group. As the resource constraint of this group is not as severe as it’s counterpart, thus the relatively high preference rating they provided for tobacco is much more related to the fact that they can afford to consumer more tobacco. Thus, a significant price hike in tobacco should result in decreasing tobacco consumption for the majority of household heads with household members aged under-15 which is the majority of TRG.

Another aspect of tobacco consumption pattern and price responsiveness was revealed in the nicotine dependence rating of individual household heads. Among, the sub-sample of respondents who rated tobacco highly and did not have any aged under-15 member in their household, it was found that 95% of these respondents have ‘High Dependence’ on nicotine according to Fagerstrom Test for Nicotine Dependence. High Nictoine dependence can be attributed to loneliness and depression which in this case can be attributed to lack of children (under-15) members in the household.

Moreover, intra-variation among the respondents (who are all part of low-income group) by income can be used to explain tobacco consumption pattern and possible impact of price hike. It was found that the average income of households (who rated tobacco as necessary and most necessary) is 8% more than the overall sample average of TRG. Therefore, affordability of tobacco products emerges as a key issue which can impact tobacco consumption pattern change.

Focused Group Discussions (FGD) provided essential qualitative inputs to bridge the knowledge gathered through quantitative survey for our study. The overarching and common input gathered from FGDs was a consensus among the respondents about their possible plan of action if tobacco prices increase significantly which is to either reduce smoking or switch to lower value brands.

An absolute majority of the participants expressed their firm conviction that food expenses won't be compromised, even if there is a significant price increase of tobacco products. As their proof, they cited that during the last time tobacco prices were significantly increased back in 2016-17, most of them switched to lower value brands of tobacco products. Some even reported that, they used to smoke around 15-20 cigarettes per day before that price hike and the number came down to below 10 after the hike. The participants also stated that even during that price hike, they didn’t compromise food commodity expense to fund tobacco consumption.

When it comes to how significant increase in tobacco price will impact the participants’ non-food expenditures, most of the participants expressed that nearly all of the non-food expenses they incorporate in their expenditure basket are
essential and thus there is no option for reducing these expenses. Nonetheless, a few of the participants also stated that due to the resource constraints faced by them, they already have little to no financial savings. If tobacco prices are increased sharply, then their savings might have to be decreased to a certain extent. Though, the participants who expressed this fear was very low.

Another important issue which emerged out of the FGD was the efficacy of strong policy actions to reduce the tobacco consumption. As nearly all of the participants of the FGDs equivocally voiced their support for the 2016 declaration made by Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina to establish a ‘Tobacco-Free Bangladesh’ by 2040. This revelation unveiled a surprising willing demeanor of the respondents to abide and support policy decisions against tobacco. They felt that they are trapped in tobacco consumption cycle due to their nicotine dependence and its relative affordability.
This study has produced substantial evidence to support significant price increase of tobacco through taxation to reduce tobacco consumption by disregarding the basis of the fear expressed by policy stakeholders of the negative impact of significant and sudden price increase of tobacco products on the food commodity consumption of households of Bangladesh. With tobacco coming at the bottom of consumption preference rating developed in the study, the lesser importance of tobacco in comparison to food commodities was reported.

This finding aligned with the initial hypothesis and provided the basis for the study. Only 14 percent of the sample rated tobacco highly (necessary to most necessary) and it was also found a significant majority of them have high nicotine dependency which explains their high preference for tobacco. The study also found itself aligned with existing literature on crowding-out effect as it followed. Around 21 percent of respondents also revealed that they will quit smoking if there is significant price increase. Overall, it can be concluded that significant increase in tobacco prices will not impact household’s food commodity consumption.

Study Limitation

Major drawback of the study is that it covered only a limited number of districts. Due to the resource constraints and time limitation, it covered only five districts (dividing whole Bangladesh into five regions/zones).
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## Annex 01: Frequency Tables

### A1. Sample respondents by age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 51</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>650</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A2. Household members of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 &amp; above</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>650</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A3. No. of members aged under 15 in the households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A4. No. of female members aged above 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A5. Households’ monthly income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bagerhat</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>15985.34</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>27000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhaka</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>17000</td>
<td>19142.31</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>30000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feni</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>18267.18</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaibandha</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>15580.15</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>26000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netrokona</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>13500</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>16031.78</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>13000</td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>17004.17</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>30000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A6. Responses about the significant tobacco prices increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduce Food Consumption (n=650)</th>
<th>Reduce Other Non-food consumption (n=463)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29% (187)</td>
<td>3% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% (463)</td>
<td>97% (447)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A7. Non-food sectors to be affected by price hike

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (savings, insurance)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>144%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A8. Coping strategy of tobacco price hike by the households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce food consumption</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce non-food expenses</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other adjustment</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A9. Respondents who adjust tobacco expenses by other ways other than reducing food or non-food expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Think about/try to quit</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Reduce tobacco use</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Consume low-price one</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Both Ways (B &amp; C)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 02: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

তামাকপণ্যের মূল্য বৃদ্ধির ফলে বাংলাদেশের পরিবারগুলোর খাদ্য পদ্ধ বাবদ ব্যয়ের ওপর সম্ভাব্য প্রভাব বিষয়ক জরিপের জন্য প্রশ্নপত্র

জরিপ এলাকা কোড (দুই ডিজিট) জরিপকারি কোড (দুই ডিজিট) উত্তরদাতার আর্থিক নং (তিন ডিজিট)

জরিপের তারিখ

দিন মাস বছর

প্রথম অংশ: উত্তরদাতা সম্পর্কিত প্রাথমিক তথ্য

[উত্তরদাতা ব্যক্তি (নারী/পুরুষ)-কে অবশিষ্ট (ক) পরিবার প্রধান হতে হবে, (খ) প্রধানত সিপাহীর ব্যবহারকারি হতে হবে (সাথে অন্য তামাক পদ্ধ ব্যবহার করতেও পারেন, নাও করতে পারেন), এবং (গ) উত্তরদাতার পরিবারের মাসিক আয় ঢাকা সিটির বাহিরে হলে মাসিক ১১ হাজার টাকা থেকে ২৫ হাজার টাকা মধ্যে হতে হবে, আর ঢাকা সিটির ভিতরে হলে মাসিক ১১ হাজার টাকা থেকে ৩০ হাজার টাকা হতে হবে।]

০১) নাম : 

০২) জেন্ডার : [নারী=১, পুরুষ=২, অন্য=৩]

০৩) বয়স : বছর

০৪) প্রধান পেশা : [তালিকা থেকে দেখে কোড বসাতে হবে]

০৫) শিক্ষাগত : [তালিকা থেকে দেখে কোড বসাতে হবে]

ঘরোয়া

০৬) পরিবারের মোট মাসিক আয় : টাকা

০৭) পরিবারের সদস্য সংখ্যা : জন

০৮) পরিবারের সদস্যদের মধ্যে ১৫ বছর : জন

বা অতুল্য বয়সীদের সংখ্যা
10) ১৫ বছর বা অধূর্ধ বয়সী সদস্যদের : জন
মধ্যে নারীর সংখ্যা

11) উত্তরদাতা কোন সাধারণত কোন ব্রান্ডের সিগারেট খান?

12) সিগারেটের পাশাপাশি অন্য তামাক পণ্য ব্যবহার করলে সেগুলো কি কি? [একাধিক উত্তর গ্রহণযোগ্য]
[অন্য তামাক পণ্য ব্যবহার না করলে “প্রয়োজ্য নয়” হবে]

- প্রয়োজ্য নয়
- বিড়ি
- জর্ডান
- গুল

সাদাপাতা
- অন্যান্য

13) পরিবারের ১৫ বছর বা অধূর্ধ বয়সী অন্য সদস্যদের মধ্যে
   জন
   কতে জন তামাক ব্যবহার করেন?
   [উত্তর খুলা হতে পারে]

14) পরিবারের ১৫ বছর বা অধূর্ধ বয়সী অন্য যে সদস্যরা
    জন
    তামাক ব্যবহার করেন তাদের মধ্যে নারীর সংখ্যা?
    [উত্তর খুলা হতে পারে]

15) পরিবারের ১৫ বছর বা অধূর্ধ বয়সী অন্য যে সদস্যরা তামাক ব্যবহার করেন তারা কোন কোন
    তামাক পণ্য ব্যবহার করেন?
    [একাধিক উত্তর বাছাই করার সুযোগ রয়েছে]

- সিগারেট
- বিড়ি
- জর্ডান
- গুল

- সাদাপাতা
- অন্যান্য
- প্রয়োজ্য
- নয়

35
দ্বিতীয় অংশ: তালিকাভুক্ত খাদ্যপণ্যের গুরুত্ব নির্ণায়ন

[১৬ থেকে ২৫ নং প্রায়ে তামাক পচান মোটদশটি খাদ্য পণ্য সম্পর্কে উত্তরদাতাকে প্রশ্ন করা হবে এবং তার পরিবারের ভোজের তালিকায় একই পণ্যের কোনটির গুরুত্ব কতোটা তা চিহ্নিত করা হবে। সবচেয়ে দরকারি পণ্যের স্তরের হবে ৫। তুলনামূলক বেশি দরকারি পণ্যের স্তর ৪। সাধারণ দরকারি পণ্যের ৩। তুলনামূলক কম দরকারি পণ্যের স্তর ২ এবং সবচেয়ে কম দরকারি পণ্যের স্তর ১।]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>নং</th>
<th>খাদ্যপণ্য</th>
<th>সবচেয়ে দরকারি (৪)</th>
<th>তুলনামূলক বেশি দরকারি (৪)</th>
<th>তুলনামূলক কম দরকারি (৩)</th>
<th>সবচেয়ে কম দরকারি (২)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>১৬</td>
<td>তামাক পচা</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>১৭</td>
<td>চাল, আটা, ময়দা</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>১৮</td>
<td>ভাল</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>১৯</td>
<td>আমিষ (মাছ, মাংস, ডিম)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>২০</td>
<td>ভোজ্য তেল</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>২১</td>
<td>মসলা*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>২২</td>
<td>সবজি</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>২৩</td>
<td>ফল</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>২৪</td>
<td>চিনি ও গুড়</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>২৫</td>
<td>দুধ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*মসলার তালিকা দেয়া থাকবে।
তৃতীয় অংশ: তামাক পণ্যের মূল্য বৃদ্ধির ক্ষেত্রে খাদ্য পণ্য ব্যবহারে পরিবর্তন

26) তামাক পণ্যের মূল্য যদি উল্লেখ্যযোগ্য মাত্রায় বৃদ্ধি পায় (যাতে পরিবারের ওপর অর্থনৈতিক চাপ সৃষ্টি হয়) তবে তামাক পণ্য ব্যবহার আগের মাত্রায় ধরে রাখার জন্য অন্য খাদ্য পণ্যের পেছনে ব্যায় কমিয়ে ফেলার সম্ভাবনা রয়েছে কি?

[ হ্যা [ ] না [ ] ]

আগের প্রশ্ন (অর্থাৎ 26 নং প্রশ্ন)-এর উত্তর যদি হয় তবে পরের অংশ অর্থাৎ 30 নং প্রশ্নে চলে যেতে হবে। আর যদি না হয়, তবে 27 নং প্রশ্নের উত্তর দিতে হবে।

27) তামাক পণ্যের মূল্য উল্লেখ্যযোগ্য মাত্রায় বৃদ্ধি পেলে তামাক ব্যবহার আগের মাত্রায় ধরে রাখার জন্য খাদ্য খাত ছাড়া অন্য খাতে (যেমন: শিক্ষা, স্বাস্থ্য, পরিবহন ও যোগাযোগ, আবাসন, বস্ত্র, বিনোদন, অর্থিক (ব্যাংক-বীমা) খাত) ব্যায় কমিয়ে ফেলার সম্ভাবনা আছে কি?

[ হ্যা [ ] না [ ] ]

�গের প্রশ্নের (অর্থাৎ 27 নং প্রশ্নের) উত্তর যদি হয় তবে 28 নং প্রশ্নে চলে যেতে হবে।

উত্তর যদি না হয়, তাহলে 29 নং প্রশ্নে চলে যেতে হবে।

28) উল্লেখ্যযোগ্য মাত্রায় মূল্য বৃদ্ধির পরও তামাক ব্যবহার আগের মাত্রায় ধরে রাখতে খাদ্য ছাড়া অন্য কোন খাতে ব্যায় কমাতে পারেন? [এককার্য উত্তরের সুযোগ থাকবে] [এরপর 29 বাদ দিয়ে 30 নং প্রশ্ন থাকবে]

[শিক্ষা [ ] স্বাস্থ্য [ ] পরিবহন ও যোগাযোগ [ ]
[আবাসন [ ] বস্ত্র [ ] বিনোদন [ ]
[অর্থিক [ ]

29) তামাক পণ্যের মূল্য উল্লেখ্যযোগ্য মাত্রায় বৃদ্ধি পেলে কি করবেন?

ছোট দিবেন বা ছাড়ার চিহ্ন করবেন [ ]

তামাক পণ্য ব্যবহার কমিয়ে দেবেন। [ ]

ব্যবহার আগের মতো রেখে কম দামের তামাক পণ্যের দিকে বুক করবেন। [ ]

আগের দুটি অপশনের সংমিশ্রণের দিকে যাবেন (অর্থাৎ কিছুটা ব্যবহার কমাবেন এবং মারা মরা কম দামি তামাক পণ্য ব্যবহার করবেন) [ ]
চতুর্থ অংশ: উত্তরদাতার সিগারেট আসক্তির মাত্রা নির্ধারন

30) ধুম থেকে জাগার কতক্ষন পর সাধারণত আপনি প্রথম সিগারেট খান?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 মিনিট</th>
<th>6 থেকে 30 মিনিট</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31 থেকে 60 মিনিট</th>
<th>60 মিনিটের বেশি</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

31) যেখানে ধূমপান করা নিষেধ, সেখানে সিগারেট খাওয়া থেকে নিজেকে বিরত রাখতে পারেন কি?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>হ্যাঃ</th>
<th>না</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

32) কোন সময়কার সিগারেট ছাড়তে আপনি একবারেই আগ্রহী নন?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>সকালের প্রথমটি</th>
<th>অন্যান্য</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

33) আপনি দিনে কয়টি সিগারেট খান?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>১০টি বা তার কম</th>
<th>১১ থেকে ২০টি</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>২১ থেকে ৩০টি</th>
<th>৩১টি বা তার বেশি</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

34) দিনের অন্যান্য সময়ের চেয়ে ধুম থেকে জাগার পরে কি বেশি সিগারেট খান?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>হ্যাঃ</th>
<th>না</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

35) আপনি অসুস্থ অবস্থায় সিগারেট খান কি?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>হ্যাঃ</th>
<th>না</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
ANNEX 03: FGD CHECKLIST

তামাক পন্যের মূল্য বৃদ্ধির ফলে বাংলাদেশের পরিবারগুলোর খাদ্য বাবদ বায়ের ওপর সজ্জা প্রভাব
বিষয়ক গবেষণার জন্য ফোকাস গ্রুপ ডিসকাশন (এফজিডি)-এর চেকলিস্ট

এফজিডি এলাকা
ওয়ার্ড, উপজেলা, জেলা (এর পাশাপাশি এলাকাটি নগর নাকি উপনগর অত উল্লেখ করতে হবে)

এফজিডি
নাম ও ফোন নম্বর উল্লেখ করতে হবে

পরিচালনাকারী

এফজিডি-তে অংশগ্রহণকারীর তালিকা
অংশগ্রহণকারীদের সকলকেই - ০১) উল্লিখিত এফজিডি এলাকার অধিবাসী হবে
(অন্য অংশের ব্যবহার করতেও পারেন, নাও করতে পারেন), ০২) পরিবার প্রধান হবে
অন্য অংশের ব্যবহার করতেও পারেন, নাও করতে পারেন), ০৩) প্রধানত সিগারেট ব্যবহারকারী হবে
অন্য অংশের ব্যবহার করতেও পারেন, নাও করতে পারেন)। ০৪) অংশগ্রহণকারীরা চাই সিগারেট এলাকার অধিবাসী হলে তাদের প্রত্যেকের
পরিবারের মাঝে আয়ু ১১ হাজার টাকা থেকে ৩০ হাজার টাকা রাখতে হবে
অন্য অংশের ব্যবহার করতেও পারেন, নাও করতে পারেন)

তালিকায় নামের পাশাপাশি প্রত্যেকের প্রধান পেশার এবং ফোন নম্বর থাকার
বাঙালি হয়ে।

নেয়া যাচ্ছে প্রশ্ন/ইস্যু উপস্থাপনের মাধ্যমে আলোচনা এগিয়ে নিতে হবে:
[উপস্থাপনের ফেনে এবং হয় ধরাধরীতিক হয়েছে তা সম্বাদনা করার বাধ্যতা নেই। প্রশ্নে এই প্রশ্ন/ইস্যুটিকে দেওয়া হয়েছে
গোটা দৃষ্টিতে আলোচনা করা হবে। তবে এর উপরে হবে যে কোন প্রশ্ন/ইস্যু সম্পর্কে আলোচনা হয় সেটি দৃষ্টিগৃহীত না হয়, কেনে কেনে করে চেকাবেন। এ ধরনের ক্ষেত্র পরে আলোচনার বিষয়টি উধাপন করার সুযোগের রাখতে হবে, এতে করে অংশগ্রহণকারীদের
আরও কোন মতামত ধারণা তা লিপিবদ্ধ করা যায়।]

০১) সিগারেটের দাম সফল যেখানে আরো অস্পষ্ট করে বাড়ি (অর্থাৎ এক টাকা দুইটা টাকা করে বাড়ি) তার
পরিবর্তে যদি অধিক বছর এক ধাক্কায় অনেক ধারী দাম বেঁধে যায় তাহলে কি করবেন?
� অংশগ্রহণকারিদের বুঝিয়ে দেওয়া হবে যে পণ্যের অনুযায়ী আরো অস্পষ্ট সিগারেটের দাম এক ধাক্কায় অনেক ধারী
বাড়ানো হয়ে তাদের সিগারেট ব্যবহারের ওপর কি ধরনের প্রভাব পড়বে। আমরা তারা সিগারেট ব্যবহার করিয়ে
দিতে পারবেন, অথবা কম দাম সিগারেট বা কম দাম অন্য অংশের ব্যবহার করতে পারবেন, এরকম কিভাবে
সিগারেট থেকে চেয়ে দেওয়ার চেয়েও করতে পারবেন। সেই অংশগ্রহণকারিদের নিউ অন সি টু করে রাখতে
তাই পরিবারের দলব্য করে যে সিগারেটের দাম এক ধাক্কায় বেঁধে গেলে অংশগ্রহণকারিদের কিভাবে
সিগারেট ব্যবহার একেবারে চেয়ে দেওয়া চেয়ে করতে হয়। এই প্রশ্নের কথা অংশগ্রহণকারিদের আজে
থেকে জানানোর দরকার নেই। তবু একজন পরিচালক কর্মচারীর মাধ্যমে এই প্রতিষ্ঠান বা হাইপারনিয়রের কথাটি থাকা জরুরি।]

02) সিগারেটের দাম এমন এক ধানায় বেঁটে গেলে অন্য খাদ্য পণ্য ব্যবহারের পূর্বে কেমন গ্রহণ পড়বে, অর্থাৎ সিগারেটের ব্যবহার আগের মাধ্যমে রাখতে অন্য খাদ্য পণ্য ব্যবহার করিয়ে দেয়ার সম্ভাবনা কেমন?

[একজনের অনুমানগণকারীদের জানাতে হবে: আগে পরিচালিত জরুরি থেকে দেখা গেছে যে সিংহ ভাল পেলেই উভয়ের মাঝামাঝি প্রচুর হয়েছে সিগারেটের কর্ম দেখানোর জন্য পরিবর্তনের খাদ্য পণ্য করার কাজ মনোর স্মরণ নেই কারণ দুই জরুরি সম্পর্কে জানিয়েছেন ধানায় দুই কর্ম প্রক্রি তারা সিগারেটের ব্যবহার করে মনে করেন। তবে কিছু কিছু উদ্বেগ অভিহিত হয় প্রেরণার সংস্থার (প্রথম পরিবর্তন সংস্থার) জানিয়েছেন যে তাদের দিকের যে অংশ ছড়িয়ে ফেলেন ফল, ধূম এবং পরিবর্তন তাদের উপর কম সম্ভাবনা করেন। এই উল্লেখ চালু পারে যে জরুরির উদ্বেগসূচক দ্বারা স্মরণ উপর ফেলেন। ধূম এবং পরিবর্তন তাদের দিকের সম্ভাবনা করে। তাই একজনের সিগারেটের চেয়ে কম প্রক্রিয়ায় মনে করেন। অথবা কারণ থাকতে পারে। আলোচনায় সে কারণ বা কারণগুলোই চিহ্নিত করা দরকার।]

03) সিগারেটের দাম এমন করে বাড়িল খাদ্য পণ্য ছাড়া নিয়ম দিনের খাদ্যের অন্য খান খায় তাকে খেলা খুলনোর পূর্বে চাপ পড়বে কি-না?

[এই আলোচনা করে আলোচনার অন্য অংশের অন্য দাম সেন্টারের একজন সম্পর্কে জানানো হয় চেজে পেলে সিগারেটের পূর্বে মূল খাদ্য পণ্য ছাড়া অন্য খাদ্য পণ্য করার জন্য একজনের অনুমান নেই। তবুও কিছু প্রতিষ্ঠান সিগারেটের দাম বাড়িল তারা হয়তো সিগারেটের ধান একজনের সিগারেটের চেয়ে আরও প্রক্রিয়ায়। এই কারণে তাদের সম্বন্ধের পূর্বে প্রক্রিয়ায় পারে। এ বিষয়ে একজনের যারা অংশ নিয়েছেন তাদের মতামত/অভিজ্ঞতা চিহ্নিত জানায় চাইতে হবে।]

04) কলকাতা বাঙ্গালী সিগারেটের দাম আক্রমিক অনেক খানি বাড়ানোর হয়েছিল (অর্থাৎ তার আগের বছর যোগ একক-মূল দুটি করার বাড়নো হিচালে নেপাল বেশি মাধ্যমে বাড়নোর হয়েছিল)।

[একজনের সিগারেটের প্রচুর দামের অনেক পরিবর্তন সিগারেটের ব্যবহারের পূর্বে কেমন গ্রহণ পড়বে কি-না?

[একজনের ছেলের আমেরিকান পেটেন্ট দামের মাধ্যমে এমন কেউ ধানায় পারেন যা হয়তো সে সময় সিগারেটের সিগারেটের ব্যবহারকারী হতে শক করেন। তারা কর্মসংস্থানে একজন কেল নিজের অভিজ্ঞতা না বলে তাদের আলোচনা এবং তাদের আর তাদের অনেক সিগারেট ব্যবহারকারী যারা সে সময় সিগারেট বাড়ানো করেন অথবা অন্য ব্যবহারকারী তারা দুই হলে হতেন।

পারে দুই ধানায় সে সময় নিজে আলোচনা একজন সিগারেট সিগারেটের অনেক কর্ম তাদের করেন। তাই এই ধানায় কর অন্য অন্য অনেক সিগারেটের সিগারেটের সিগারেটের যার কর্ম দাম সিগারেটের দিকে বৃদ্ধি হয়।

05) সিগারেটের ব্যবহারের কামানের জন্য জন-পরিসেবা (মেমোর: বল স্ট্যান্ড রেল স্টেশন লঙ্ক ঘর, রেলস্টেশন ইত্যাদি হাজার) যুগান্ত নিয়ম করার যে আইন রয়েছে তার প্রয়োগ সম্পর্কে অস্পষ্টতা কি?
[এক্ষেত্রে অংশগ্রহণকারিদের কাছে জানতে চাইতে হবে তাদের চারপাশে জনপরিসংসে এই আইনের কারণে ধূমপান
করতো কমেছে বা আদৌ কমেছে কি-না। এছাড়া অংশগ্রহণকারিতা নিজেরা এ কারণে মাঝে ধূমপান না করে
থাকতে বাধা বল কি-না। ওটাও জানা দরকার। গণেষ্ঠ দলের ধারণা (হাইপারভিষিক্স) যে, দরকার আয় শ্রেণীর মানুষের
কে সমস্ত জায়গায় যাতে হয় তে হয় এই আইনের প্রয়োগ দূর করা হচ্ছে না, অথবা তাদের ধূমপানের ওপর এই
আইনের পুনর প্রভাব পড়েছে না। আগের মতোই, এই ধারণা করা একটিনি অংশগ্রহণকারিদের তালিকানোর সরকার নেই,
কিষের পরিচালনাকারীর মাধ্যমে থাকা দরকার।]

06) পরোক্ষ ধূমপানের কু-প্রভাব সম্পর্কে সচেতনতার সময় হয়ত অংশগ্রহণকারিতা বাড়িতে বা কমেছে
বিশেষত শিশুদের সামনে ধূমপান থেকে বিরত থাকেন কি-না?

[এক্ষেত্রে পরিচালনাকারী অংশগ্রহণকারিদের কাছে প্রথমে জানতে চাইতে ধূমপানের পুনরারোহ সম্পর্কে তারা
জানেন কি-না। তারপর জানতে চাইতে সেই সচেতনতার সময় থেকে তারা বাড়িতে বা কমেছে বা অন্য কোন
জায়গায় ধূমপান করা থেকে বিরত থাকেন কি-না। এদিনও হতে পারে কেনটা করেন বিরত থাকেন, আর কেনকে
করেনো থাকেন না। এ বিষয়টি সম্পর্কে সকলের মতামত শিখিয়ে দেতে হবে।]

07) সরকারের পক্ষ থেকে ২০৪০ সালের মধ্যে দেশকে ধূমপান মুক্ত করার যে লক্ষ্য নির্ধারণ করা হয়েছে
এ বিষয়ে অংশগ্রহণকারিদের অনুমতি কি?

[এক্ষেত্রে সাধারণভাবে সকল মতমতই জনতে ও লিপিকাল করতে হবে। তবে আদালা করে জেরে দিতে হবে
অংশগ্রহণকারিতা এলগ্রেস সচেতনতাকে একটি তার হ্রাস হবে। বিশেষত নিজেরা ধূমপান করলেও আংশিক প্রচেষ্টা
করতে বলা চিন্তা হবে তারা এ পক্ষের সময় কেন করে তারা এ পক্ষের সচেতনতাকে একটি হতে পারে সেটা জানা দরকার। পাশাপাশি এ পক্ষ
বাণিজ্য করে ফি ধরের উপনোগ সরকারের পক্ষ থেকে এবং অথবা এনরিচসের পক্ষ থেকে যেখা সচেতনচার করকর হবে
বলে তারা মনে করেন সেটা জানা দরকার।]
Mapping Possible Impact of Increase in Tobacco Product Prices on Overall Commodity Consumption of Bangladesh Households