

The association between social media use and substance use behaviour among adolescents: The ABCD-Study



Amsterdam Born Children and their Development

Hanan Bozhar, MSc

<u>Supervisors</u>: dr. Susanne de Rooij; dr. Tanja Vrijkotte; dr. Anja Lok; dr. Helle Larsen

 \checkmark The authors declare no conflicts of interest





0

Background



- Anonymous and free environment \rightarrow The wild west?
- Online norms and values regarding substance use
- Evolving landscape





Objectives

Exploring:

- Frequency of daily social media use (SMU) and problematic SMU in relation to various substances.
- Moderation by parental rules on alcohol, drugs, smoking, and screen time?

→ Understanding problematic substance use in current (digital) peer and parental contexts of adolescents.



Data: The ABCD-study

- Start cohort 2003-2004
- 8000+ pregnant women in Amsterdam
- Early-life factors
- Different social and ethnic groups







Data



Population sample

- Amsterdam Born Children and their Development study (Phase-5).
- N=1787 adolescents aged 15-16 years

504 adolescents excluded No data available on either the frequency of social media use or social media disorder scale-items



Methods

Main analysis

- We specifically investigated whether both <u>frequent</u> and <u>problematic</u> social media use (SMU) predicted the <u>frequency</u> and <u>intensity</u> of tobacco, alcohol, hashish/marijuana, and laughing gas intake
- Additionally, we examined whether the presence of parental rules moderated these associations (p ≤ 0.013 after Bonferonni correction)

 \rightarrow Ordinal logistic regression models



Research model





Predictors: Frequency SMU

Daily use (viewing, responding, sharing/posting) of social network sites

(0=never; 1=1-2 times a day; 2=3-5 times a day; **3=6-10 times a day**; 4=11-20 times a day; 5=21-40 times a day; 6=more than 40 times a day).



Daily use of social network sites



600

400

200

0

0

1

2

3

Predictors: Problematic SMU

Mean = 1.33

Std. Dev. = 1,437 N = 1,787

4

5

SMDS total score

6

7

8



Dimensions: preoccupation; tolerance; withdrawal; persistence; displacement; problems; deception; escape; conflict

▶ Yes/no

9



Outcome measures

Smoking behaviour

- Frequency of smoking cigarettes/cut tobacco (0 = never to 6=daily)
- Intensity of weekly smoking cigarettes/ cut tobacco (0= none; to 7= more than 60 per week (>3 packages))
- Frequency of smoking water pipe (0=never to 4= more than 19 times)

Alcohol consumption

(Last month)

- Intensity weekly consumption of glasses, bottles or cans of alcohol (0=0 to 7=more than 30)
- Frequency of binge drinking (5+ glasses per occasion) (0=not to 4=10 times or more

Soft drug use

- Frequency of (ever) using hashish or marijuana (0=never to 4=more than 19 times).
- Frequency of (ever) using laughing gas (nitrous oxide) (0=never to 4=more than 19 times).



Moderators: Parental rules

Rules substance use

Do your parents allow you to:

- Smoke
- Use drugs
- Drink alcohol

0= "Yes" or "I don't know" 1= No

Rules screen time

Do your parents have rules about how many hours a day you can watch TV, play (online) games, and use a laptop/tablet or mobile phone?

0=No 1=Yes



Results

Daily frequency SMU OR (95% CI)	Problematic SMU (SMDS) OR (95% CI)	
1.17 (1.09-1.26)	1.20 (1.10-1.30)	Freq. Smoking cigarettes/cut tobacco
1.22 (1.10-1.35)	1.16 (1.04-1.29)	Q Weekly smoking (x cigarettes)
1.10 (1.00-1.21)	1.17 (1.05-1.30)	Freq. Smoking water pipe
1.24 (1.15-1.34)	1.11 (1.02-1.20)	Freq. Binge drinking (5+ glasses)
1.21 (1.14-1.29)	1.10 (1.02-1.18)	Q Weekly alcohol (x glasses)
1.18 (1.11-1.26)	1.10 (1.02-1.19)	Freq. Hashish/marijuanna use
1.15 (1.031-1.29)	1.15 (1.03-1.30)	Freq. Laughing gas use

*Adjustment for: age, gender, secondary educational level, ethnicity, peer problems (SDQ)



Results



*p ≤ 0.013 after Bonferonni correction



Conclusion

► Frequent and problematic SMU → broad spectrum of substances

- **Rules** on <u>alcohol</u> and <u>drugs</u> \rightarrow less effective?
- Higher problematic SMU
- Parental monitoring in an early stage?



Limitations

- Representative sample? (possible selection effects)
- Cross-sectional design
- Categorical/dichotomous nature of the data
- Absence content-based data



Future implications

Understanding underlying mechanisms

(e.g. susceptibility to social approval; rewarding feedback; peer norms)

► Social media use → trans-diagnostic factor?

Potential tool for tackling problematic substance use behaviours?

Ansterdam Forn Children and their Veren Thank you for your attention!

Thanks to my team: dr. Susanne de Rooij dr. Tanja Vrijkotte dr. Anja Lok dr. Helle Larsen



h.bozhar@amsterdamumc.nl



Centre for Urban Mental Health



UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM