
Quest Journals Journal of Medical and Dental Science Research Volume 11~ Issue 5 (2024) pp: 17-23 ISSN(Online) : 2394-076X ISSN (Print):2394-0751 www.questjournals.org





# The role of society ,peer pressure and parents in the consumption of tobacoo among adults – A cross sectional study

Dr krishnakanta Aribam

*Received 04 May, 2024; Revised 13 May, 2024; Accepted 15 May, 2024* © *The author(s) 2024. Published with open access at www.questjournals.org* 

#### **INTRODUCTION:**

Tobacco use, a well-established etiological factor for oral cancer, is a highly prevalent habit in India. By 2030, mortality related to this habit is expected to rise to more than 8.3 million globally<sup>1</sup>. The most common form of tobacco use practiced by over 26% of the Indian population is smokeless tobacco and many studies have shown that Paan (betel quid with or without tobacco) is one of the most prevalent forms of smokeless tobacco, with 199.4 million users in the country<sup>2</sup>.

AIM: To assess the role of society, peer pressure and parents in the consumption of tobacoo among adults *Methods:* 

A structured proforma will be used to collect the data. It will be divided into different sections: The first part consist of sociodemiographic variables such as age, gender, parents' education, occupation and total income of the family. Socioeconomic status will be assessed by using Kuppuswamy scale 2020. The second part consist of preset, pretested closed-ended questions to collect information about parental and participant's habit of tobacco usage Tobacco usage information will be categorized into smoked and smokeless forms

Data were analyzed using chi-squared test, and logistic regression analysis with SPSS software (v. 25).

**Results :** Majority of the participants were males with a mean age of  $30.4\pm8.5$  years. Tobacco use was prevalent among less educated males. Parental smokeless tobacco use, paternal alcohol and maternal paan chewing was significantly associated with participants adverse habits. Multinomial logistic regression showed a significant association between parental and participant's tobacco usage. Perceived parental bonding were also significantly associated with participant's tobacco usage habit.

**CONCLUSION:** According to our findings, tobacco consumers received more social support from family parents and others compared to non-consumers. Considering the important role of perceived support in tobacco consumption, this variable should receive copious attention in developing interventions and trainings, especially family education workshops.

#### **KEYWORDS:**

Adults,tobacoo,smoking, social

*Received 04 May, 2024; Revised 13 May, 2024; Accepted 15 May, 2024* © *The author(s) 2024. Published with open access at www.questjournals.org* 

# I. INTRODUCTION

Tobacco use, a well-established etiological factor for oral cancer, is a highly prevalent habit in India. By 2030, mortality related to this habit is expected to rise to more than 8.3 million globally<sup>1</sup>. The most common form of tobacco use practiced by over 26% of the Indian population is smokeless tobacco and many studies have shown that Paan (betel quid with or without tobacco) is one of the most prevalent forms of smokeless tobacco, with 199.4 million users in the country<sup>2</sup>.

Youths are the most liable population to start tobacco use. It is presently entrenched that a large portion of the adult tobacco consumers begin tobacco use in youth or childhood<sup>3</sup>. Global Adult Tobacco Survey 2010, India discovered that more than 35% of grown-up children in India use tobacco in some form or the other<sup>4</sup>.

A recent systematic review on the social context of smokeless tobacco use showed that the mean age of initiation in the South Asian population was 15 years. Reasons for starting the habit included social and cultural acceptance, low cost and easy availability, peer pressure, taste, and mental relaxation effects<sup>5</sup>. In addition, the most common social context of tobacco chewing was paan use by family members as children grow up, their most important social context is constituted by the family which makes parents the most influential people in a child's socialization process<sup>6</sup>.

Many researches also suggested that parents' smoking history is an important predictor of adolescent smoking<sup>7,8</sup>. So, a more profound comprehension of how parental practices influence adolescent's tobacco practices will help to build more powerful intervention campaigns by concentrating on particular family risk groups.

# **OBJECTIVES**

The objective of the study is to assess the level of the knowledge, .To assess the role of society ,peer pressure and parents in the consumption of tobacoo among adults

# II. METHODOLOGY

#### Study Design

Descriptive cross-sectional study

#### **Study population**

Patients attending the outpatient department of Kripadashini advanced hospital, Imphal

#### Sampling unit and sample size

Pilot study was conducted among 20 subjects before the main study to check the feasibility and validity of the study. Pilot study assessments were utilized for proper planning and execution of the main study and also to finalize the procedure, method and analysis of the samples.

Based on the results of pilot study, a total sample size attained was 130 using hypothesis testing (proportion) formula.

### Sampling methodology

Sampling method: Simple random Sampling And will be recruited patients attending the out patient department kripadashini advance hospital,Imphal

#### Selection criteria

Inclusion criteria

- i) Patients aged more than 18 years.
- ii) Patients who consume any form of tobacco.
- iii) Past tobacco users who continued their habit at least for one year

#### Exclusion criteria

- i) Patients who are not willing to participate.
- ii) Patients who do not consume tobacco

## Method & tool for data collection

A structured proforma will be used to collect the data. It will be divided into three sections: The first part consist of sociodemiographic variables such as age, gender, parents' education, occupation and total income of the family. Socioeconomic status will be assessed by using Kuppuswamy scale 2020. The second part consist of preset, pretested closed-ended questions to collect information about parental and participant's habit of tobacco usage information will be categorized into smoked and smokeless forms. Participants who had the habit of tobacco chewing for at least one year or more than one year at any point in their life will be considered as 'ever users' of tobacco consumption and participants who had chewed tobacco for less than one year in their lifetime will be considered as 'never users'. Pilot study will be conducted before the study to assess the comprehension and reliability of the questionnaire and necessary modifications will be made.

A total of 130 adults participated in the study with an age range of 18-50 years (mean $\pm$ SD; 30.4 $\pm$ 8.5). Majority of the participants were males 97 (74.6%), Hindus 115 (88.5%), married 97 (74.6%) and were from upper socioeconomic status 59 (45.4%). Parental education status revealed that majority of mothers were illiterate 61 (46.9%) and fathers were educated till secondary level 35 (26.9%).

| [Table/Fig-1]:<br>Demographic characteristics of study participants and their parents. |     |      |  |
|--|-----|------|--|
| Variable   | N   | %    |  |
| Age (Years)  |     |      |  |
| 18-27  | 47  | 36.2 |  |
| 28-38  | 59  | 45.4 |  |
| 39-49  | 24  | 18.5 |  |
| Gender   |     |      |  |
| Male   | 97  | 74.6 |  |
| Female   | 33  | 25.4 |  |
| Education  |     |      |  |
| Primary  | 19  | 14.6 |  |
| Secondary  | 47  | 36.2 |  |
| Higher secondary   | 25  | 19.2 |  |
| Graduate   | 28  | 21.5 |  |
| Postgraduate   | 4   | 3.1  |  |
| Illiterate   | 7   | 5.4  |  |
| Socioeconomic status   |     |      |  |
| Upper  | 59  | 45.4 |  |
| Upper middle   | 28  | 21.5 |  |
| Middle   | 26  | 20   |  |
| Lower middle   | 11  | 8.5  |  |
| Lower  | 6   | 4.6  |  |
| Marital status   |     |      |  |
| Married  | 97  | 74.6 |  |
| Unmarried  | 33  | 25.4 |  |
| Religion   |     |      |  |
| Hindu  | 115 | 88.5 |  |
| Muslim   | 15  | 11.5 |  |
| Maternal education   |     |      |  |
| Primary  | 17  | 13.1 |  |
| Secondary  | 32  | 24.6 |  |
| Higher Secondary   | 12  | 9.2  |  |
| Graduate   | 8   | 6.2  |  |
| Postgraduate   | 0   | 0    |  |
| Illiterate   | 61  | 46.9 |  |
| Paternal education   |     |      |  |
| Primary  | 13  | 10   |  |
| Secondary  | 35  | 26.9 |  |
| Higher secondary   | 33  | 25.4 |  |
| Graduate   | 21  | 16.2 |  |
| Postgraduate   | 2   | 1.5  |  |
| Illiterate   | 26  | 20   |  |

| Variable | Ν   | %   |
|----------|-----|-----|
| Total    | 130 | 100 |

depicts participants and parental tobacco usage habits. Most of the participants were consuming tobacco in the smoking form. Parental smoking and smokeless tobacco usage was more prevalent in case of paternal side i.e., 89 (68.5%) and 62 (47.7%) respectively.

|                                 | Table/Fig-2]:                     |                   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Tobacco usage hat               | pits among study participant's an | nd their parents. |
| <b>Tobacco Use</b>              | Ν                                 | %                 |
| Participant's smoking tobacco   |                                   |                   |
| Ever                            | 91                                | 70                |
| Never                           | 39                                | 30                |
| Participant's smokeless tobacco |                                   |                   |
| Ever                            | 76                                | 58.5              |
| Never                           | 54                                | 41.5              |
| Paternal smoking                |                                   |                   |
| Ever                            | 89                                | 68.5              |
| Never                           | 41                                | 31.5              |
| Maternal smoking                |                                   |                   |
| Ever                            | 12                                | 9.2               |
| Never                           | 118                               | 90.8              |
| Paternal tobacco chewing        |                                   |                   |
| Ever                            | 62                                | 47.7              |
| Never                           | 68                                | 52.3              |
| Maternal tobacco chewing        |                                   |                   |
| Ever                            | 21                                | 16.2              |
| Never                           | 109                               | 83.8              |

Fig-3: shows the association of demographic variables with participants tobacco use. A statistically significant association was found between gender, education and socioeconomic status and participant's tobacco use  $(p \le 0.05)$ .

[Table/Fig-3]:

Association of demographic variables with study participant's tobacco use.

| <b>X</b> 7 <b>?</b> - <b>h h</b> | VariablesTotal NSmoking Tobacco UseEver n (%)Never N (%) |           | Smokeless Tobacco Use |            |             |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------|-----------------------|------------|-------------|
| variables                        |  |           | Never N (%)           | Ever N (%) | Never N (%) |
| Age                              |  |           |                       |            |             |
| 18-27                            | 47   | 29 (61.7) | 18 (38.3)             | 29 (61.7)  | 18 (38.3)   |
| 28-38                            | 59   | 46 (78)   | 13 (22)               | 34 (57.6)  | 25 (42.4)   |
| 39-49                            | 24   | 16 (66.7) | 8 (33.3)              | 13 (54.2)  | 11 (45.8)   |
| p-value                          |  | 0.        | 178                   | 0.3        | 818         |
| Gender                           |  |           |                       |            |             |
| Male                             | 97   | 75 (77.3) | 22 (22.7)             | 49 (50.5)  | 48 (49.5)   |
| Female                           | 33   | 16 (48.5) | 17 (51.5)             | 27 (81.8)  | 6 (18.2)    |
| p-value                          |  | 0.0       | 002*                  | 0.0        | 002*        |
| Education                        |  |           |                       |            |             |
| Primary                          | 19   | 5 (26.3)  | 14 (73.7)             | 19 (100)   | 0           |
| Secondary                        | 47   | 33 (70.2) | 14 (29.8)             | 31 (66)    | 16 (34)     |
| Higher                           | 25   | 18 (72)   | 7 (28)                | 13 (52)    | 12 (48)     |

\*Corresponding Author: Dr krishnakanta Aribam

| The role of society, peer pressure   | , ·              |                              |                  |
|--|------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| $I \mu\rho r \rho \rho \rho \rho r r \rho \rho r r \rho \rho r r r \rho r r r \rho r r r \rho r r r r \rho r$ | o ana naronte in | 1 the consumption of topacoo | among adults - A |
|  |                  |                              |                  |
|  |                  |                              |                  |

| <b>X</b> 7          | T - 4 - 1 N | Smoking Tobacco Use |             | Smokeless Tobacco Use |             |  |
|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|--|
| Variables           | Total N     | Ever n (%)          | Never N (%) | Ever N (%)            | Never N (%) |  |
| Secondary           |             |                     |             |                       |             |  |
| Graduate            | 28          | 27 (96.4)           | 1 (3.6)     | 4 (14.3)              | 24 (85.7)   |  |
| Postgraduate        | 4           | 4 (100)             | 0           | 2 (50)                | 2 (50)      |  |
| Illiterate          | 7           | 4 (57.1)            | 3 (42.9)    | 7 (100)               | 0           |  |
| p-value             |             | <0.                 | 001*        | <0.                   | <0.001*     |  |
| Socioeconomic st    | atus        |                     |             |                       |             |  |
| Upper               | 59          | 41 (69.5)           | 18 (30.5)   | 34 (57.6)             | 25 (42.4)   |  |
| Upper Middle        | 28          | 19 (67.9)           | 9 (32.1)    | 20 (71.4)             | 8 (28.6)    |  |
| Middle              | 26          | 22 (84.6)           | 4 (15.4)    | 10 (38.5)             | 16 (61.5)   |  |
| Lower middle        | 11          | 7 (63.6)            | 4 (36.4)    | 6 (54.5)              | 5 (45.5)    |  |
| Lower               | 6           | 2 (33.3)            | 4 (66.7)    | 6 (100)               | 0           |  |
| p-value             |             | 0.                  | 149         | 0.0                   | )32*        |  |
| Marital status      |             |                     |             |                       |             |  |
| Married             | 97          | 68 (70.1)           | 29 (29.9)   | 59 (60.8)             | 38 (39.2)   |  |
| Unmarried           | 33          | 23 (69.7)           | 10 (30.3)   | 17 (51.5)             | 16 (48.5)   |  |
| p-value             |             | 0.                  | 965         | 0.                    | 349         |  |
| Religion            |             |                     |             |                       |             |  |
| Hindu               | 115         | 83 (72.2)           | 32 (27.8)   | 64 (55.7)             | 51 (44.3)   |  |
| Muslim              | 15          | 8 (53.3)            | 7 (46.7)    | 12 (80)               | 3 (20)      |  |
| p-value             |             | 0.                  | 134         | 0.                    | 072         |  |
| est applied: Chi-sq | uare test,  |                     |             |                       |             |  |
|                     |             |                     |             |                       |             |  |

 $p \le 0.05$  statistically significant

Fig-4:A statistically significant association was found between parental smokeless tobacco use and participants smoking and smokeless tobacco usage (p=0.014 and 0.001) respectively. In case of smoking tobacco use, only maternal smoking was significantly associated with participant's smoking use (p=0.017).

| Table/Fig-4]:  |
|--|
| Association of parental tobacco use with participants tobacco use. |
|  |

|                      | -       | Participant's Tobacco Use |            |
|----------------------|---------|---------------------------|------------|
| Parental Tobacco Use | Total N | Smoking                   | Smokeless  |
|                      |         | <b>Ever N (%)</b>         | Ever N (%) |
| Paternal Smoking     |         |                           |            |
| Ever                 | 89      | 64 (71.9)                 | 58 (65.2)  |
| Never                | 41      | 27 (65.9)                 | 18 (43.9)  |
| p-value              |         | 0.484                     | 0.022*     |
| Maternal Smoking     |         |                           |            |
| Ever                 | 12      | 12 (100)                  | 9 (75)     |
| Never                | 118     | 79 (66.9)                 | 67 (56.8)  |
| p-value              |         | 0.017*                    | 0.222      |
| Paternal Smokeless   |         |                           |            |
| Ever                 | 62      | 37 (59.7)                 | 49 (79)    |
| Never                | 68      | 54 (79.4)                 | 27 (39.7)  |
| p-value              |         | 0.014*                    | 0.001*     |
| Maternal Smokeless   |         |                           |            |
| Ever                 | 21      | 15 (71.4)                 | 19 (90.5)  |

\*Corresponding Author: Dr krishnakanta Aribam

|                                |         | Participant's Tobacco Use |            |  |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------------------------|------------|--|
| Parental Tobacco Use           | Total N | Smoking                   | Smokeless  |  |
|                                |         | Ever N (%)                | Ever N (%) |  |
| Never                          | 109     | 76 (69.7)                 | 57 (52.3)  |  |
| p-value                        |         | 0.876                     | 0.001*     |  |
|                                |         |                           |            |  |
| Test applied: Chi-square test, |         | 0.070                     | 0.001      |  |

 $p \le 0.05$  statistically significant

Fig-5:depicts the findings of multinomial logistic regression analyses with odd's ratios (95% CI). There were significant effects for different parental smoking habit on participant's adverse habits. The risk of smoking among participants increased when mothers smoke (OR 8.3, 95% CI 0.6-0.9). The risk of participants tobacco use was also significantly increased with the paternal smokeless habit (OR 4.5, 95% CI 2-10.1) and maternal smokeless habit (OR 4.5, 95% CI 0.9-22.2).

Table/Fig-5]: Multinomial logistic regression analysis with participant's tobacco use as dependent variables.

| Parameters         | N (%)      | Participant's Smoking<br>Habit | Participant's Smokeless<br>Habit |  |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|                    |            | <b>OR</b> (9                   | 95% CI)                          |  |
| Paternal Smoking   |            |                                |                                  |  |
| Ever               | 89 (68.5)  | 1.3 (0.58-3.31)                | 1.5 (0.66-3.60)                  |  |
| Never              | 41 (31.5)  | 1.5 (0.58-5.51)                | 1.5 (0.00-5.00)                  |  |
| Maternal Smoking   |            |                                |                                  |  |
| Ever               | 12 (9.2)   | 8.3 (0.6-0.91)*                | 1.4 (0.28-7.03)                  |  |
| Never              | 118 (90.8) | 8.3 (0.0-0.91)*                | 1.4 (0.28-7.03)                  |  |
| Paternal Smokeless |            |                                |                                  |  |
| Ever               | 62 (47.7)  | 3.2 (0.14-0.75)*               | 4.5 (2.0-10.1)*                  |  |
| Never              | 68 (52.3)  | 5.2 (0.14-0.75)*               | 4.5 (2.0-10.1)*                  |  |
| Maternal Smokeless |            |                                |                                  |  |
| Ever               | 21 (16.2)  | 9 9 (0 26 2 9)                 | 4.5 (0.92-22.2)*                 |  |
| Never              | 109 (83.8) | 8.8 (0.26-2.8)                 | $+.3(0.72-22.2)^{\circ}$         |  |

\*

 $p \le 0.05$  statistically significant

#### Statistical analysis

The data will be analyse by biostatistician by using statistical package for social service (SPSS) Software Program(VERSION 22.0).descriptive statistics will be used to summarize the demographic information and the survey data will be analyse by using the chi square test. Multiple logistic regression analysis will be carried out to check association between parental and participant's tobacco usage. level of significance will be set at p<0.05.

# III. RESULTS:

Results suggested that parental tobacco usage habits had a direct effect on participant's tobacco habits. Moreover, parental bonding was also associated with participant's tobacco usage. The fact that parenting style was highly associated with adult tobacco usage might suggest that they are useful target for preventive intervention. Rather intervention should focus on both parental tobacco specific practices and parental behaviour. These findings suggest that interventions targeted solely at tobacco-specific parenting practices may not be sufficient to deter adolescent tobacco usage and that attempts to change more general parent acceptance and behavioural control may be warranted, even though they may be more difficult to achieve.

# **IV. CONCLUSION**

Parents can play a very important role in initiation of tobacco use by a young child or adolescent if they use tobacco products in front of their children. This might be due to that children consider their parents and adults as role models and try to imitate them. When children observe their parents are consuming tobacco, they may indirectly perceive the psychological and physiological rewards of the habit and this coupled with children's natural tendency to imitate parents, that could lead to initiation of habit.. So, it requires serious consideration of the effect of parental influence in the design of prevention programmes addressed at the early adolescent population. An assessment of the role of society ,peer pressure and parents in consumption of tobacco among adults may help to build more powerful intervention campaigns by concentrating on particular family risk groups

#### References

- [1]. Mathers CD, Loncar D. Projections of global mortality and burden of disease from 2002 to 2030. PLoS Med 2006;3:2011–30.
- [2]. Global adult tobacco survey fact sheet ,India. 2016-17. Available at https://www.tobaccofreekids.org/assets/global/ddfs/en/GATS India 2016-17 FactSheet.pdf. [Accessed on 10th September 2022].
- (3). Asawa K et al. Relationship between Parental Bonding and Tobacco Specific Practices as Predictors of Tobacco Usage in Adults. J Clin Diagn Res. 2017 Jul;11(7):ZC36-ZC41.
- [4]. IIPS. Global Adult Tobacco Survey India 2009–2010 [Internet]. GATS. Deonar, Mumbai: International Institute for population sciences (IIPS); 2010. Available at: http://mohfw.nic.in/WriteReadData/1892s/ 1455618937GATS India.pdf [Accessed on 10th September 2022].
- [5]. Kakde S, Bhopal RS, Jones CM. A systematic review on the social context of smokeless tobacco use in the South Asian population: implications for public health. Public Health. Elsevier Ltd; 2012;126:635–45.
- [6]. Madathil SA et al. Maternal and paternal contribution to intergenerational psychosocial transmission of paan chewing. Community Dent Oral Epidemiol 2015; 43: 289–297.
- [7]. DenExter EA, Engels ME, Hale WW, Meeus W, Willemsen MC. Lifetime parental smoking history and cessation and early adolescent smoking behaviour. Prev Med. 2004;38(3):359–68.
- [8]. Otten R, Engels RC, VanDen JM. Parental Smoking and Smoking Behaviour in Asthmatic and Non-Asthmatic Adolescents. J Asthma. 2005;42(5):349–55.