

## **Association between social networks and substance use among male tribal adolescents in the North-East Indian state of Tripura**

**Benjamin Debbarma<sup>a</sup>; Ankita Srivastava<sup>b</sup>; and Nandita Saikia<sup>c</sup>**

<sup>a</sup>PhD Scholar, Centre for the Study of Regional Development (CSRD), School of Social Sciences (SSS-III), Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), New Delhi, India

<sup>c</sup> Professor at the Department of Mortality and Public Health Studies, International Institute for Population Sciences, Mumbai, India

### **Corresponding Author:**

**Ankita Srivastava**

Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), New Delhi

Contact: [ankita.srivastava148@gmail.com](mailto:ankita.srivastava148@gmail.com)

Mobile: +91-8898760295

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## Abstracts

**Purpose:** The prevalence of substance use among tribal adolescents in north-east India is higher than that of the rest of India.

**Objective:** The study aimed to investigate the association between social network measures and substance use among male tribal adolescents in the West district of Tripura, North-East India.

**Methods:** We used data on 12-19-year-old tribal adolescents (N=340) from a primary cross-sectional survey in selected schools in the study area. We carried out bivariate and logistic regression analysis to establish the association between substance use and social network.

**Results:** Out of the total sample 340, about 27.65% reported smoking, 26.18% reported using smokeless tobacco, and 30.59% reported drinking alcohol; 35.29% reported using any of these substances. The substance use status of social network members was highly correlated to the substance use status among adolescents. The odds of substance consumption among adolescents increase with having a friend who smokes (OR = 6.152, 95% CI = 1.80–21.09), having friends who instigate to smoke (OR = 5.41, 95% CI = 1.86–15.74), and having friends who say smoking as a sign of masculinity (OR = 5.19, 95% CI = 1.4–18.22). Adolescents were more likely to smoke when their family member uses a substance (OR = 3.39, 95% CI = 1.5–7.4,  $p = 0.002$ ) and who spent time with friends with the same behaviour (OR = 2.66, 95% CI = 1.5–4.5,  $p \leq 0.000$ ).

**Conclusions:** Intervention is needed to address adolescents' substance use habits and members belonging to close social networks.

**Keywords:** Substance use, social networks, determinants, male adolescents, tribal, Tripura, West district, North-East India

## **Introduction**

Substance use refers to the use of any psychoactive substance or drug, including licit and illicit drugs, other than when medically indicated (1,2). The adolescence period has the greatest window of vulnerability for high-risk behaviours, which may continue across the life span (3). Many studies established, early alcohol initiation of substance has been associated with the development of alcohol problems (4,5). Globally, 20 million people initiate substance use at a sensitive period of life (< 14, years of age) which creates a considerable risk for developing substance use disorder at later life (6). Furthermore, substance use poses a threat to an individual's health, social and economic fabric of families, communities, and nations. Several studies investigated the association of substance use during adolescence with various health and well-being indicators. Substance use during adolescence has been associated with alterations in brain structure, function, and neuro-cognition (7). It is commonly associated with unsafe sexual behaviour, school and social misbehaviour, poor academic performance, and may eventually lead to the continuation of drug use in adulthood (8). It is also the main contributor to the incidence of accidents and injuries during adolescence, representing the leading cause of morbidity and mortality in this age group(9).

Despite the severe threats posed by adolescent's substance use, substance use among adolescents and youth has remained grossly under-researched in India. As per National Family Health Survey 2015-2016 (NFHS-4), 18.5% boys aged 15-19 years reported tobacco use, and 9% reported alcohol use (10,11). Within India, substance use is higher in North-East regions (2). Studies show that north-eastern states like Arunachal Pradesh, Tripura have the the highest prevalence of alcohol use within India (2,12). A recent study revealed a notable increase in alcohol consumption in Goa, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, and Sikkim where Tripura ranked second

highest in the alcohol consumption (13). According to the NFHS-4, 67.8% of men (15-49 age group) in Tripura used any kind of tobacco, while 57.6% of men drink alcohol (10).

Further, previous studies show that the prevalence of alcohol consumption and smoking are high among scheduled tribes (STs) of India, a socio-economically backward population group with the distinct social, cultural, historical, and geographical background (14). Yet detailed study investigating substance use among tribal adolescents are minimum in these states.

Social networks play a crucial role in substance use behaviours (15). Social network refers to networking of individuals or small group in online or offline platforms. Such networks can operate at many levels from the level of families, school, religious organisations or levels of any specific population groups (16). It may refer to the relationship between the members in the network, such as intimate partners, work colleagues, drinking friends, and the level of trust and closeness between them(17). Recent research on alcohol consumption has primarily focused on social networks. Peer influence, specific social group membership, substance behaviour of close relatives, network position are identified as the significant risk factors that influence adolescent's substance use(18,19). Adolescents are more likely to drink alcohol if their close friends drink alcohol. Encouragement by peer groups, the lure of popularity, and early availability of substances make an adolescent an easy prey (20). Exposure to parental substance use disorder predicts adolescent's substance use disorder independently of other risk factors (21). However, there is limited literature on the association between substance use and social networks in adolescents from North-east India (2,22).

Our study examined the level of substance use among tribal male adolescents in in West district of Tripura. It also investigated the male tribal adolescent's social network and its relationship with substances use behaviours in the study area.

## **Materials and Methods**

## **Study design and sampling method**

We conducted a primary school-based survey in the selected schools of West district of Tripura between January- April 2019. We purposively selected the West district of Tripura. Out of all schools, we selected four schools having 90% Scheduled Tribe students. Out of total students in each class from IX to XII, 23 students were selected with Simple Random Sampling without replacement. Hence we targeted a total of 92 students from each school. The schools provided the sampling lists for the students from class IX to XII.

We interviewed male tribal adolescents aged 12-19-year-old. Out of the targeted 368 students, 340 students participated in the interview. For each substance, we asked about the use of smoking, smokeless tobacco, and alcohol 30 days prior to the survey. Substance use measures for each question were coded as 1 for use and 0 for no use. Besides, we computed “any substance use” if a student used any smoking, smokeless, or alcohol.

We also collected information on amount of substance use during a single day, age of starting and the duration of use. A 10% random checking of the accuracy of data collection was done by revisiting the study site. Analysis of this data showed no significant error in the data collection.

### **Inclusion criteria**

- a. Age group 12-19 years.
- b. Those youth who were willing to participate in the study.
- c. Only male Scheduled Tribe youth.

### **Exclusion criteria**

- a) Individuals below 12 years and above 19 years.
- b) Incompletely answered questionnaires.

- c) Those youth who were suffering from any significant physical/mental instability or unable to provide information.

### **Data collection tool**

A self-administered cross-sectional anonymous structured questionnaire validated in pilot test were distributed among students. Before filling the questionnaire, students were informed about the study's anonymity, objective, voluntary nature. The questionnaire was in the English language. We collected and analysed four indicators: smoking tobacco, smokeless tobacco, consuming alcohol, and using any of these three substances among males aged between 12 and 19 years. All of these indicators are dichotomous (Yes/No).

The study has selected four categories or domains of explanatory variables: friends substance use, family member substance use, friendships networks, and usages of social media. These four domains were regarded as social network variables. The details of social networks domain/components are discussed in Appendix Table.

**Friend's substance use includes** i) friend's substance use (yes; no); ii) friend's instigation (yes; no); iii) friend's substance use perceptions with multiple responses (sign of masculinity; helps in medication; ideal leader/actor does; boost confidence; good for health; reduces boredom).

**Family member substance use** was the information about the parental substance use in the prior to 30 days (yes; no).

**Friendships networks includes** i) groups of friends nominated by the respondents (No, school friends ; any other friends (friends from sports, theatre, dance, sect, and music activities); ii) spent time with friends (very often; frequent and Not at all); iii) reported close friends from (classmate; classmate's friends; locality); iv) stay together with friends (yes, no, not replied) v) work together with friends (yes, no)

**Usages of social media include** use of social networking sites (SNS) such as WhatsApp and Facebook.

We have controlled the role of other socio-economic factors such as father's education (illiterate, primary, secondary and higher), mother's education (illiterate, primary, secondary and higher), family income (do not know, 800-2000, 3000-6000), and type of ration card owned by the family. A ration card is the official document issued by the respective state governments, enabling eligible households to buy food grains at subsidized rates under the National Food Security Act (23). The document serves as a common form of identification for many individuals. Different types of ration cards in India includes Priority household (PHH) ration card, issued to those households which meet the eligibility criteria set by the state governments. These households entitled to 5 kilograms of food grains per member every month. Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAY) ration card is issued to those households which fall under the 'poorest of poor' category. AAY card holders are entitled to 35 kilograms of food grain every month. Below Poverty line (BPL) ration card was for those households living under the poverty line. Above Poverty line (APL) ration cards were issued to households living above the poverty line (as estimated by the Planning Commission). These households received 15 kilogram of food grain (based on availability) (24).

### **Statistical analysis**

Statistical analysis was carried out using STATA version 13.1. Categorical variables were presented as frequencies and percentage. The response variables—types of substances use were dichotomous variables categorized as yes and no. To measure the association between social

networks variables and substance use, we used binary logistic regression. Odds ratios and confidence intervals were computed. Statistical significance was set at  $P < 0.05$  for the study.

### **Ethics statement**

The present study is a primary school-based survey in the selected schools of West district of Tripura between January- April 2019, including male tribal adolescents aged 12-19-year-old. The survey protocol was approved by the Ethical Review Committees, Institutional Ethics Review Board of the Jawaharlal Nehru University (IERB-JNU). Informed assent and parental consent were obtained for male tribal adolescents aged 12–19 years, and written informed consent was obtained from the school authority.

## **Results**

### **Descriptive and bivariate characteristics**

#### **Age of initiation and prevalence of substances use**

Figure 1 shows the prevalence of smoking, smokeless tobacco, alcohol, and any substance use during one month prior to the survey. Out of the total sample 340, about 27.65% reported smoking, 26.18% reported using smokeless tobacco, and 30.59% reported drinking alcohol; about 35.29% reported using any substances.

**Figure 1 is here**

Figure 2 shows the age at initiation of substance use among the students. Substance use initiation has been measured by asking about the age of initiation for smoking, smokeless tobacco, and alcohol consumption. Out the total respondents, the most common age of



substance initiation was 14-18 years, the lowest proportion of substance initiation was reported in 7-14 years. While less than 22% students initiated alcohol or smoking in age 7-14, about 91.18 % of them initiated smokeless tobacco at the age of 7-14 years.

**Figure 2 is here**

### **Association between Social network and adolescent's substances consumption**

Table 1 presents the descriptive characteristics of the studied sample. About 73% of the respondent's fathers were secondary or above educated; whereas 53.53% of the respondents' mothers attained at least secondary level of education. About 52.06% of the respondent's household income was above Rs 7000 per month, and about 23.82% of the respondent's household lived below the poverty level.

About 48.24% of the respondent's friend consumed substances whereas 80.29% of the family members of the respondents' consumed substances. Nearly 80% of the students spent time with their friends very often or frequently; majority of them have friends from the class (75.59%). About 79% of the respondents used social media; 42.94% used social media platform called "WhatsApp" whereas 67.35% used "Facebook".

Table 1 also describes the association between substance use and socio-economic and demographic characteristics. Substance use generally increases with the increasing social network. Any substance use increased significantly when friends used substance (65.24 vs 11.48,  $p \leq 0.000$ ) and when friends instigated to do so (88.89 vs. 40.79,  $p = 0.000$ ). Substance use also increases when friends perceive it as a sign of masculinity (72.22 vs. 10.99,  $p \leq 0.000$ ). It was also significantly associated with family member's substance use (40.66) and time spent with school friends with same behavior (50.00),  $p \leq 0.000$ . Substance use is higher among social media users compared to non-users (40.59 vs. 16.13,  $p=0.000$ ).

Specifically, adolescents' smoking (or smokeless tobacco status or alcohol consumption) is significantly associated friend's substance use (52.44% vs. 9.84%,  $p \leq 0.000$ ). Besides it increased with instigation by friends for all three categories, say, in case of smoking, it is 72.22% vs. 32.46%,  $p \leq 0.000$ ; in case of smokeless tobacco, it is 38.89% vs. 6.38%,  $p \leq 0.000$ ) and in case of alcohol consumption, it is 0.00% vs. 8.51%,  $p \leq 0.000$ . Friend's perception to use the substance as a sign of masculinity also played a significant role in the consumption of alcohol, in smokeless tobacco and in smoking. Substance use of all types increased if the family member is a substance user. Adolescents who spent time with friends consume more substances than the rest; smoking (43.08% vs. 10.00%,  $p \leq 0.000$ ), smokeless tobacco (42.31% vs. 7.14%,  $p=0.000$ ), and alcohol consumption (44.62% vs. 17.14%). Substance use was also found significantly high when group of friends are from school. Furthermore, adolescent's using any social media has higher prevalence of substance consumption. (Table 1). Other study variables including mother's and father's education and family ration cards do not significantly affect adolescents' substances consumption behavior.

**Table 1 is here**

The binary logistic regression analysis results for each type of substance use (smoking, smokeless tobacco, alcohol or any substances use) are presented in Table 2. The results of logistics regression analysis demonstrate that social network characteristics of adolescent's are significantly associated with tobacco and alcohol consumption.

**Table 2 is here**

The result shows that smoking has six times higher odds if the user has a friend who smokes (OR = 6.152,  $p \leq 0.000$ ). Odds of smoking were five times higher if friends instigate to smokes

(OR = 5.41  $p = 0.002$ ). One highlight of the findings is that friend's perception of smoking as a sign of masculinity has five times higher odds (OR = 5.19  $p = 0.000$ ). Moreover, adolescents were more likely to smoke if family member smoked (OR = 3.39  $p = 0.002$ ), and spent time with friends of the same behaviour (OR = 2.66  $p \leq 0.000$ ) (see Table 2).

Smokeless tobacco consumption among adolescent men had lower risk, if his friends consume (OR= 0.61,  $p \leq 0.000$ ). Friends' instigation had precisely half the risk of smokeless tobacco consumption (OR= 0.59,  $p=0.000$ ). However, friends' perception of smokeless tobacco has 1.2 times higher odds (OR= 1.21,  $p = 0.000$ ), and adolescents with addicted family members had about 5 times higher odds of smokeless tobacco (OR= 4.80,  $p = 0.000$ ). Social media exposed user had 5 times higher risk of having smokeless tobacco (OR= 5.12,  $p = 0.000$ ). The odds of smokeless consumption with groups of friends, time spent, close friends, staying or working together with friends were not statistically significant.

The results for alcohol consumption showed friends' substance use (OR=6.16,  $p = 0.000$ ) and friend's perception (OR=6.45,  $p = 0.000$ ) had six times higher odds of alcohol consumption, while friend's instigation (OR= 0.97,  $p \leq 0.000$ ), any social media exposure (OR=0.14,  $p \leq 0.000$ ) have lower odds of alcohol consumption among adolescents; and with family members uses adolescent had 1.91 times higher odds (OR= 1.91,  $p \leq 0.000$ ). These effects were statistically significant. Male respondents with friends had five times higher odds of consuming any substance use (OR=5.29,  $p=0.000$ ). Respondents having any social media exposure and social media account were statistically significantly associated with any kind of substance use.

## **Discussion and conclusion**

Substance abuse is a major public health concern in the world (25). The effects of drug usage are often multifaceted. This habit affects health, education, and occupational career and incurs a huge financial and social burden that affects health, education, and occupational career and incurs a huge financial and social burden to society (8). Early substance use is typically associated with poor prognosis and a lifelong history of deception and reckless behaviour (26). It is therefore crucial to identify the risk factors of substance consumption among adolescents. The present study investigated the connection between social networks and substance use among male tribal secondary school students aged 12-19 in Tripura's West District.

The high prevalence of smoking, smokeless tobacco, alcohol and any of these substances among male tribal adolescents in Tripura is alarming. While 18.5% boys aged 15-19 years reported tobacco use, and 9% reported alcohol use at national level, the prevalence of any substance use among study population was as high as 35.29%. Previous studies conducted in other parts of the world have unequivocally established that initiation of drug use usually occurs between the ages of 12 and 24 years (27). Our study findings reiterate earlier findings among male tribal youths in Tripura.

Our results show that friend's substance use status is an influential factor in adolescent substance use behaviour as its effect remained significant even after controlling the role of other factors. Similar findings have been observed in other studies (28). As they mature, friends become increasingly crucial to teenagers (29). As adolescents become more autonomous, the peer group's influence becomes more important (30). A significant number of studies have reported that peers play major role in the growth of adolescents' risk behaviour. The study also supports the finding that adolescents who had friends using drugs had an effect on them, encouraging or discouraging risky behavior (31).

Among teenagers, the pressure to gain acceptance among friends is normal. Understanding peer influence would

encourage practitioner to design effective interventions to prevent youth from developing risky behaviour (32).

Besides social influence, peer or friends as determinants of substances use, modern information and communication technologies such as, SNS is highly popular among adolescents and played an important role (33). With SNS usage, adolescent were exposed to unhealthy substances and advertisement in digital media (34). In their formative years, social media addiction can have a deleterious impact on the user's physical health, psychological health, and behavioural issues. Researchers have found that 25-37 percent of older adolescents post information about their alcohol intake in social media(35).

The online exchanges with friends might mediate peer influence processes (regarding adolescent cigarette and alcohol use) by conveying information about peers' risk-taking behaviour (36). Extensive research has been undertaken to measure and understand the impact of social media portrayals of tobacco use on young people's tobacco related attitudes and behaviours (37). Especially within the context of adolescents, where exposure to social media are being a central to social order in many ways (38).The peer influence has been established as a leading correlation of adolescent drug use behavior (32).Previous research indicates the association between substance usage by friends who consume alcohol and use of social media, which may suggest that online interactions with friends could mediate peer control mechanisms (in terms of adolescents' cigarette and alcohol use) by sharing knowledge about the risk-taking behaviour of peers (36).

Family has a significant role in adolescents' psychological well-being and health risk behaviours (39). A wide range of family factors, including family structure, family process,

parenting styles, and family members' smoking habits be associated with adolescent smoking and drinking (40). This study shows that adolescents whose family members consume substances were more likely to influence them. Studies have found out that parental education and income were associated with higher rates of substances use. Higher parental education and income are correlated with higher rates of binge drinking in young adults (41).

There are a few limitations of this study. First, the study's population was not representative of the entire adolescent population in Tripura and West district. Participants were drawn from a tribal dominated district with rural and semi-urban families of low socio-economic status. Second, the study's cross-sectional nature limits our ability to make causal inferences on the assessed variables. Third, the analyses conducted were based on self-reported data, making response bias a possibility.

### **Policy implications**

Parents, school authorities and healthcare professionals in the study area should be cautioned about the rise of such activities. Youth drinking behaviors should be closely monitored via school, religious institutions and other non-governmental organization. In this study, the substances use status of social, family members, friends or peers and social media were all correlated in developing smoking and drinking habits among adolescents. Friends of smokers are far more likely to be substance user than friends of non-smokers/non-drinkers. Familial influences are also seen as essential factors in the development of adolescents. Children look up to their parents as role models. Therefore, intervention is needed to address adolescents' and substance use habits and close social networks members.

### **References**

1. WHO. Guide to drug abuse : epidemiology [Internet]. Geneva PP - Geneva: World Health

- Organization; 2000. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/63850>
2. Saikia N, Debbarma B. The socioeconomic correlates of substance use among male adults in Northeast India. *Clin Epidemiol Glob Heal* [Internet]. 2019;8(1):149–57. Available from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2213398418303403>
  3. Bingham CR, Bennion LD, Openshaw DK, Adams GR. An analysis of age, gender and racial differences in recent national trends of youth suicide. *J Adolesc* [Internet]. 1994;17(1):53–71. Available from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140197184710062>
  4. Maimaris W, McCambridge J. Age of first drinking and adult alcohol problems: systematic review of prospective cohort studies. *J Epidemiol Community Health* [Internet]. 2014 Mar 1;68(3):268 LP – 274. Available from: <http://jech.bmj.com/content/68/3/268.abstract>
  5. Petit G, Kornreich C, Verbanck P, Cimochovska A, Campanella S. Why is adolescence a key period of alcohol initiation and who is prone to develop long-term problem use?: A review of current available data. *Socioaffective Neurosci Psychol* [Internet]. 2013 Jan 1;3(1):21890. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3402/snp.v3i0.21890>
  6. Kehinde F, Oduyeye O, Mohammed R. Could the link between drug addiction in adulthood and substance use in adolescence result from a blurring of the boundaries between incentive and hedonic processes? *Subst Abuse Rehabil* [Internet]. 2019 Jul 12;10:33–46. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31372088>
  7. Squeglia LM, Jacobus J, Tapert SF. The influence of substance use on adolescent brain development. *Clin EEG Neurosci* [Internet]. 2009 Jan;40(1):31–8. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19278130>
  8. Daniel L, Krishnan G, Gupta S. A study to assess the prevalence and pattern of substance use among male adolescents in suburban area of Delhi. *Indian J Soc Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2017 Jul 1;33(3):208–12. Available from: <https://www.indjsp.org/article.asp?issn=0971-9962>
  9. Miller JW, Naimi TS, Brewer RD, Jones SE. Binge drinking and associated health risk behaviors among high school students. *Pediatrics*. 2007 Jan;119(1):76–85.
  10. IIPS. International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS) and Macro International. National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4), India, 2015–16: INDIA. Mumbai: IIPS; 2015. 2016.
  11. Dhawan A, Pattanayak R, Chopra A, Tikoo V, Kumar R. Pattern and profile of children using substances in India: Insights and recommendations. *Natl Med J India* [Internet]. 2017 Jul 1;30(4):224–9. Available from: <http://www.nmji.in/article.asp?issn=0970-258X>
  12. Ambekar A, Agrawal A, Rao R, Mishra A, Khandelwal S, Chadda R. On behalf of the group

- of investigators for the National Survey on Extent and Pattern of Substance Use in India (2019). Magnitude of Substance Use in India. New Delhi: Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Government of India. 2019.
13. Vasudevan U, Selvamani Y. Rise of Health Risks among Adults in India: A Quick Look at NFHS-4 Fact Sheets. *Soc Sci Spectr*. 2016;1:324–7.
  14. Sadath A, Jose K, Meethal ST, Mathai JK, Venugopal AP, Xavier N. Factors Associated with Alcohol Misuse among Indigenous Tribal Men in Wayanad: A Qualitative Study. *Indian J Psychol Med [Internet]*. 2019 Nov 11;41(6):516–22. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31772437>
  15. Neaigus A, Friedman SR, Curtis R, Des Jarlais DC, Terry Furst R, Jose B, et al. The relevance of drug injectors' social and risk networks for understanding and preventing HIV infection. *Soc Sci Med [Internet]*. 1994;38(1):67–78. Available from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0277953694903018>
  16. Masic I, Sivic S, Toromanovic S, Borojevic T, Pandza H. Social networks in improvement of health care. *Mater Sociomed [Internet]*. 2012;24(1):48–53. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23922516>
  17. Shen L, Assanangkornchai S, Liu W, Cai L, Li F, Tang S, et al. Influence of social network on drug use among clients of methadone maintenance treatment centers in Kunming, China. *PLoS One [Internet]*. 2018 Jul 3;13(7):e0200105–e0200105. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29969481>
  18. Aiken A, Clare PJ, Wadolowski M, Hutchinson D, Najman JM, Slade T, et al. Age of Alcohol Initiation and Progression to Binge Drinking in Adolescence: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res [Internet]*. 2018 Jan 1;42(1):100–10. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.13525>
  19. Mares SHW, van der Vorst H, Engels RCME, Lichtwarck-Aschoff A. Parental alcohol use, alcohol-related problems, and alcohol-specific attitudes, alcohol-specific communication, and adolescent excessive alcohol use and alcohol-related problems: An indirect path model. *Addict Behav*. 2011 Mar;36(3):209–16.
  20. Kokiwar PR, Jogdand GRS. Prevalence of substance use among male adolescents in an urban slum area of Karimnagar district, Andhra Pradesh. *Indian J Public Health*. 2011;55(1):42–5.
  21. Biederman J, Faraone S V, Monuteaux MC, Feighner JA. Patterns of alcohol and drug use in adolescents can be predicted by parental substance use disorders. *Pediatrics*. 2000 Oct;106(4):792–7.



22. Yadav J, Singh KJ, Gautam S. Correlates of substance use in Northeast States, India. *Int J Community Med Public Heal* Vol 3, No 6 June 2016 [Internet]. 2017; Available from: <https://www.ijcmph.com/index.php/ijcmph/article/view/478>
23. GOI. National Food Security Act [Internet]. 2013. Available from: [https://dfpd.gov.in/fgAvAHcAcgBpAHQAZQByAGUAYQBkAGQAYQB0AGEALwBQAG8AcgB0AGEAbAAvAE0AYQBnAGEAegBpAG4AZQAvAEQAbwBjAHUAbQBLAG4AdAAvAA==/1\\_43\\_1\\_NFS-Act-English.pdf](https://dfpd.gov.in/fgAvAHcAcgBpAHQAZQByAGUAYQBkAGQAYQB0AGEALwBQAG8AcgB0AGEAbAAvAE0AYQBnAGEAegBpAG4AZQAvAEQAbwBjAHUAbQBLAG4AdAAvAA==/1_43_1_NFS-Act-English.pdf)
24. GOI. Department of Food and Public Distribution, India [Internet]. 2019. Available from: [Dfpd.nic.in](http://Dfpd.nic.in). Retrieved 29 April 2019.
25. Ilhan MN, Arikan Z, Kotan Z, Tunçoğlu T, Pinarci M, Taşdemir A, et al. Prevalence and Socio-Demographic Determinants of Tobacco, Alcohol, Substance Use and Drug Misuse in General Population in Turkey. *Noro Psikiyatr Ars* [Internet]. 2016/02/15. 2016 Sep;53(3):205–12. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28373796>
26. Tsering D, Pal R, Dasgupta A. Substance use among adolescent high school students in India: A survey of knowledge, attitude, and opinion. *J Pharm Bioallied Sci* [Internet]. 2010 Apr;2(2):137–40. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21814448>
27. Olashore AA, Ogunwobi O, Totego E, Opondo PR. Psychoactive substance use among first-year students in a Botswana University: pattern and demographic correlates. *BMC Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2018;18(1):270. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1844-2>
28. West P, Sweeting H, Ecob R. Family and friends' influences on the uptake of regular smoking from mid-adolescence to early adulthood. *Addiction*. 1999 Sep;94(9):1397–411.
29. Ramirez R, Hinman A, Sterling S, Weisner C, Campbell C. Peer influences on adolescent alcohol and other drug use outcomes. *J Nurs Scholarsh an Off Publ Sigma Theta Tau Int Honor Soc Nurs*. 2012 Mar;44(1):36–44.
30. Bremnar P, Burnett J, Nunney F, Ravat M, Mistral W. Young people, alcohol and influences. A study of young people and their relationship with alcohol [Internet]. 2011. Available from: <https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/young-people-alcohol-full.pdf>
31. Maxwell KA. Friends: The Role of Peer Influence Across Adolescent Risk Behaviors. *J Youth Adolesc* [Internet]. 2002;31(4):267–77. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015493316865>
32. Valente TW, Gallaher P, Mouttapa M. Using social networks to understand and prevent substance use: a transdisciplinary perspective. *Subst Use Misuse*. 2004;39(10–12):1685–712.

33. Buja A, Gallimberti L, Chindamo S, Lion C, Terraneo A, Rivera M, et al. Problematic social networking site usage and substance use by young adolescents. *BMC Pediatr* [Internet]. 2018;18(1):367. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12887-018-1316-3>
34. Strasburger VC. Policy statement--children, adolescents, substance abuse, and the media. *Pediatrics*. 2010 Oct;126(4):791–9.
35. Moreno MA, Parks MR, Zimmerman FJ, Brito TE, Christakis DA. Display of health risk behaviors on MySpace by adolescents: prevalence and associations. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2009 Jan;163(1):27–34.
36. Huang GC, Unger JB, Soto D, Fujimoto K, Pentz MA, Jordan-Marsh M, et al. Peer influences: the impact of online and offline friendship networks on adolescent smoking and alcohol use. *J Adolesc Heal Off Publ Soc Adolesc Med*. 2014 May;54(5):508–14.
37. Sargent JD, Heatherton TF. Comparison of Trends for Adolescent Smoking and Smoking in Movies, 1990-2007. *JAMA* [Internet]. 2009 Jun 3;301(21):2211–3. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2009.745>
38. Becker AE, Fay KE, Agnew-Blais J, Khan AN, Striegel-Moore RH, Gilman SE. Social network media exposure and adolescent eating pathology in Fiji. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2011 Jan;198(1):43–50.
39. Avenevoli S, Merikangas KR. Familial influences on adolescent smoking. *Addiction*. 2003 May;98 Suppl 1:1–20.
40. Brown SL, Rinelli LN. Family Structure, Family Processes, and Adolescent Smoking and Drinking. *J Res Adolesc* [Internet]. 2010 Jun 1;20(2):259–73. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20543893>
41. Humensky JL. Are adolescents with high socioeconomic status more likely to engage in alcohol and illicit drug use in early adulthood? *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy* [Internet]. 2010 Aug 5;5:19. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20687935>

**Table 1 Bivariate analysis of substances consumption with descriptive characteristics, among young male youths aged 12-19 years (n=340), West district Tripura, 2019**

Socio-economic variables	N	%	Smoking	P value	Smokeless tobacco	P value	Alcohol	P value	Any substance use	P value
<b>Father education</b>				0.384		0.436		0.048		0.36
Illiterate	31	9.12	38.71		29.03		48.39		48.39	
Primary	59	17.35	22.03		30.51		28.81		32.2	
Secondary	204	60	26.96		23.04		26.47		33.33	
Higher	46	13.53	30.43		32.61		39.13		39.13	
<b>Mother education</b>				0.675		0.658		0.398		0.363
Illiterate	45	13.24	31.11		31.11		37.78		40	
Primary	113	33.24	27.43		25.66		29.2		36.28	
Secondary	168	49.41	27.98		26.19		30.95		35.12	
Higher	14	4.12	14.29		14.29		14.29		14.29	
<b>Family income</b>				0		0		0		0
Don't Know	101	29.71	9.9		6.93		8.91		9.9	
800-2000	23	6.76	26.09		39.13		34.78		47.83	
3000-6000	39	11.47	30.77		30.77		41.03		43.59	
>7000	177	52.06	37.29		34.46		40.11		46.33	
<b>Family ration card</b>				0.16		0.283		0.096		0.174
Antyodaya Anna	25	7.35	20		24		20		32	
Above Poverty Level	234	68.82	30.77		28.63		34.19		38.46	
Below Poverty Level	81	23.82	20.99		19.75		23.46		27.16	
<b>Social networks</b>										
<b>Friends substance</b>				0		0		0		0
No	61	17.94	9.84		4.92		8.2		11.48	
Yes	164	48.24	52.44		50		57.32		65.24	
Not replied	115	33.82	1.74		3.48		4.35		5.22	
<b>Friends instigation</b>				0		0		0		0
No	228	67.06	32.46		33.33		38.16		40.79	
Yes	18	5.29	72.22		38.89		50		88.89	
Not replied	94	27.65	7.45		6.38		8.51		11.7	
<b>Friends substance</b>				0		0		0		0
Not replied	191	56.18	6.81		6.81		8.38		10.99	
Sign of masculinity	36	10.59	58.33		69.44		72.22		72.22	
Others	113	33.24	53.1		45.13		54.87		64.6	
<b>Family members</b>				0.001		0		0.001		0
No	67	19.71	11.94		7.46		13.43		13.43	
Yes	273	80.29	31.5		30.77		34.8		40.66	
<b>Groups of friends</b>				0.045		0.02		0.006		0.008
No	21	6.18	4.76		9.52		9.52		9.52	
Friends from school	233	68.53	30.04		30.47		35.62		39.91	
Others	86	25.29	26.74		18.6		22.09		29.07	
<b>Spent time with</b>				0		0		0		0
Frequent	140	41.18	22.14		20.71		24.29		30.71	
Very often	130	38.24	43.08		42.31		44.62		50	
Not at all	70	20.59	10		7.14		17.14		17.14	
<b>Reported close</b>				0.012		0.026		0.043		0.003
Classmates	257	75.59	31.13		29.18		33.46		39.69	
From locality	83	24.41	16.87		16.87		21.69		21.69	
<b>Stay together with</b>				0.145		0.002		0.015		0.069
No	132	38.82	33.33		36.36		39.39		41.67	
Yes	191	56.18	24.61		20.42		25.65		32.46	
Not replied	17	5	17.65		11.76		17.65		17.65	
<b>Work together with</b>				0.23		0.464		0.618		0.212
No	88	25.88	21.59		25		29.55		30.68	
Yes	237	69.71	30.38		27.43		31.65		37.97	
Not replied	15	4.41	20		13.33		20		20	
<b>Use any social media</b>				0.007		0		0		0
No	62	18.24	14.52		8.06		12.9		16.13	

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.07.23289634>; this version posted May 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Yes	271	79.71	31.37		31	35.42	40.59	
Not replied	7	2.06	4.8		3.67	6.41	14.1	
<b>Type of social media</b>			50.69					
<b>Whatsapp</b>				0.562		0.193	0.178	0.084
No	194	57.06	28.87		28.87	33.51	39.18	
Yes	146	42.94	26.03		22.6	26.71	30.14	
<b>Facebook</b>				0.17		0.004	0.043	0.004
No	111	32.65	32.43		36.04	37.84	45.95	
Yes	229	67.35	25.33		21.4	27.07	30.13	
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>27.65</b>		<b>26.18</b>	<b>30.59</b>	<b>35.29</b>	

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.07.23289634>; this version posted May 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

**Table 2 Binary logistic regression analysis<sup>1</sup> of substances consumption with social networks characteristics in the West district of Tripura, India, 2019**

Social networks	Smoking OR (95% CI)	p-	Smokeless tobacco OR (95% CI)	p-	Alcohol OR (95% CI)	p-	Any substance OR (95% CI)	p-
<b>Friends' substance use</b>								
No®	1		1		1		1	
Yes	6.15(1.8-	0	0.61(1.78-	0	6.16(1.95-	0	8.62(2.74-	0
Not replied	0.2(0.03-	0.09	0.46(0.08-	0.39	0.34(0.07-	0.17	0.32(0.07-	0.12
<b>Friends' instigation of substance use</b>								
No®	1		1		1		1	
Yes	5.41(1.86-	0	0.6(0.16-	0	0.98(0.28-	0	5.11(0.8-	0.08
Not replied	0.17(0.07-	0	1.45(0.4-	0.57	1.52(0.47-	0.49	2.25(0.75-	0.15
<b>Friends' substance use perception</b>								
No®	1		1		1		1	
Sign of masculinity®	5.19(1.46-	0	1.22(2.57-	0	15.57(4.21-	0	6.36(1.7-	0.01
Not replied	4.79(1.78-	0	3.87(1.31-	0.01	6.46(2.62-	0	5.3(2.16-13)	0
<b>Family members substance use</b>								
No®	1		1		1		1	
Yes	3.39(1.55-	0	4.8(1.28-	0	1.91(0.67-	0	2.51(0.9-	0.08
<b>Groups of friends</b>								
No®	1		1		1		1	
Friends from school	8.59(1.13-	0.04	1.36(0.13-	0.8	7.43(0.78-	0.08	6.82(0.73-	0.09
Others	7.3(0.93-	0.06	1.58(0.17-	0.69	4.18(0.48-	0.2	4.65(0.54-	0.16
<b>Spent time with friends</b>								
Frequent®	1		1		1		1	
Very often	2.66(1.57-	0	2.04(0.89-	0.09	1.84(0.83-	0.13	1.36(0.59-	0.47
Not at all	0.39(0.16-	0.04	0.17(0.04-	0.02	0.59(0.2-1.74)	0.34	0.27(0.09-	0.02
<b>Reported close friends from</b>								
Classmates®	1		1		1		1	
From locality	0.45(0.24-	0.01	0.62(0.19-	0.44	1.43(0.48-	0.53	0.97(0.32-	0.96
<b>Stay together with friends</b>								
No®	1		1		1		1	
Yes	0.65(0.4-	0.09	0.45(0.27-	0	0.53(0.33-	0.01	0.67(0.43-	0.09
Not replied	0.43(0.12-	0.2	0.23(0.05-	0.06	0.33(0.09-1.2)	0.09	0.71(0.51-	0.06
<b>Work together with friends</b>								
No®	1		1		1		1	
Yes	1.59(0.89-	0.12	1.13(0.65-	0.66	1.1(0.65-1.88)	0.72	1.38(0.82-	0.23
Not replied	0.91(0.23-	0.89	0.46(0.1-	0.33	0.6(0.16-2.29)	0.45	0.57(0.15-	0.41
<b>Use any social media</b>								
No®	1		1		1		1	
Yes	2.69(1.27-	0.01	5.12(1.98-	0	3.7(1.69-8.1)	0	3.55(1.73-	0
Not replied	0.17(0.08-	0	0.09(0.04-	0	0.15(0.07-	0	0.19(0.1-	0
<b>Types of social media</b>								
<b>WhatsApp</b>								
No®	1		1		1		1	
Yes	1.27(0.57-	0.56	1.34(0.56-	0.51	0.92(0.41-	0.83	0.78(0.34-	0.55
<b>Facebook</b>								
No®	1		1		1		1	
Yes	1.29(0.55-3)	0.56	1.11(0.46-	0.81	1.12(0.48-	0.79	0.56(0.23-	0.21

<sup>1</sup> All models are controlled for the other socio-economic variables presented in table 2.


## Appendix Table Definition of the variable's substance use, social media and peer groups

Variables	Questions
<b>Friends' substance use</b>	Do you have friends who consume substances? (Yes/No)
	Do any of your friends instigate you to consume substances?
	How does your friends circle perceive about substances consumption?
<b>Family member substance use</b>	Do you have a family member who uses substances? (Yes/No)
<b>Friendships networks</b>	How often do you spend time with each other's? (1=Frequent, 2=Very often and 3= Not at all)
	Do you have a groups of friends with whom you roam around, spent time or do common activities? (No, Yes and school friends; yes and any other friends/friends from sports, theatre, dance, sect, and music activities)
	Who are your close friends? (1=classmate, 2= classmate friends and 3= from locality)
	Do you stay with any of them together? (Yes/No)
	Do you work together? (Yes/No)
<b>Usages of social media</b>	Do you use any social media? (Yes/No)
	Which are the social media you use? (Yes/No)
	Whats-app (Yes/No)
	Face-book (Yes/No)

**Source: Authors elaboration from field survey data, 2019.**


medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.07.23289634>; this version posted May 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

**Figure 1 Prevalence of substances used among adolescents aged 12-19 years, West District, Tripura, 2019.**



Source: Primary field survey, January-April 2019

**Figure 2 Age at first use of substances among male tribal adolescents in West district of Tripura, 2019**



Source: Primary field survey, January-April 2019