



ATTITUDE OF ADOLESCENTS TOWARDS ALCOHOL & DRUGS IN RELATION TO THEIR FAMILY ENVIRONMENT

Dr. Rajvir Singh¹ & Mangat Ram²

Abstract

Family is an organization in which members are connected by blood relations, it helps an individual to develop in every aspect of life and its reflection can be seen directly or indirectly in the form of socio-cultural and socio-economic bases. Families are involved in many practices and these may influence the personality of a child. Alcohol and drug consumption is a big crisis in society so the family environment is affected by abuse of substances. In the present study, 240 senior secondary school students of Sirsa District in Haryana were selected as a sample. It was found that the level of family environment was varying among adolescents and spread in high, moderate and low levels. It was found that the 'Family Environment of Adolescents' was significantly varied in Components of Family Environment on gender basis. No significant differences in 'Expressiveness', 'Organization' and 'Control' Components was found, but there exist significant differences in 'Cohesion', 'Conflict', 'Acceptance and Caring', 'Active Recreational Orientation' and 'Independence' Components of Family Environment among adolescents w.r.t. gender. A mild negative relationship of Cohesion, Expressiveness, Acceptance and Caring, Active Recreational Orientation and Independence Components of Family Environment with Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs was found; whereas a moderate positive relationship of Conflict Components of Family Environment was found with Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs. The findings of this study are supportive to some studies, so it is suggested to conduct more research in this area.

Keywords: Family Environment, Drug Abuse, Socio-cultural Aspects, Gender, Attitude Towards Alcohol and Drugs.

Introduction

A family is formed by combining two or more individuals who live together in a home and these persons may be related by blood, marriage, or adoption (Cherlin, 1981). Parents play a significant positive role in the prevention and awareness of drug abuse among adolescents (Nash et al, 2005), while negative parenting leads to develop a positive attitude towards alcohol and drug abuse (Singh & Niwas, 2015). Alcoholic substances and Drug abuse increased on factors like psychosomatic status and psychotropic drug consumption, boring family atmosphere, not living with both parents and health perception, while a mother working as a housewife acted as a protective factor (Brook, et al., 2001; & Challier et al., 2000). The family environment acts both as a protector or facilitator of drug abuse, lack of knowledge and support for drug abuse like coping habits and the repercussions increases drug abuse, while a positive family environment has a protective function in drug abuse (Henriques et al., 2016) also 'Incomplete and Pathological Families', 'Family Atmosphere', 'Strength of Family Ties', 'Sense of Family Happiness', 'Structure of Authority in the Family' and 'Alcoholism' are major causes of drug addictions (Jeedrzejczak, 2005).

The family environment affects adjustment patterns (Ramaprabou, 2014), academic achievement (Grewal, 2014), well-being (Sacks et al., 2014), child outcomes (Australian Government, 2014), and mental health (Sathyabama & Eljo, 2014).

Significance of the Study

¹ Faculty in 'Department of Education' at Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra (Haryana)

² M.Phil. (Student) in 'Department of Education' at Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra (Haryana)



Adolescents abuse drugs; commit rape, robbery; indulge in cultism and vandalism, which causes moral decadence; lead to violence, thuggery, assault; result in madness, murder; and these are posing dangers to the home, school; community, society, and ultimately to the nation. Drug control counseling centers, and drug awareness programs can be initiated to make drug-addicted persons social (Fareo, 2012). Taking into consideration the International Human Rights Standards, consistent ‘Drug Control Actions’ are must. The State must make efforts to protect children from drug abuse and it should continue to enforce strict penalties for ‘drug-related offences/ crimes’. In 2014, in India, in the last five years, the number of arrests for drug-related offences had been increased by 50 percent from 2013, and the number of convictions by 127 percent. The government of India on 5 February 2015 declared – ‘Mephedrone under Schedule I’ of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Rules (1985), - *‘prohibiting its production, manufacture, possession, sale, purchase, transportation, warehousing, usage, consumption, import, export and transshipment, except for medical and scientific purposes’* (International Narcotics Control Board, 2015).

It can be summarized that drug addiction has become an international-level challenge and it causes poor family environments, low socio-economic status of a family, and a dark future for adolescents. After reviewing the related literature, a large research gap was found, so it is extremely urgent to conduct this study.

Objectives of the Study

1. To study the level of ‘Family Environment’ of Adolescents of District Sirsa.
2. To gauge the relationship between ‘Family Environment’ and the ‘Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs’.

Hypotheses of the Study

1. There exists no significant difference in the level of ‘Family Environment’ of Adolescents of District Sirsa on gender basis.
2. There exists no significant relationship between ‘Family Environment’ and ‘Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs’.

Research Methodology

Descriptive Research Method was employed in this study, through a survey and a sample of 240 adolescents was selected from the Sirsa District. ‘Family Environment Scale’ developed by Bhatia and Chadha (1993) and the Alcohol and Drugs Attitude Scale developed by Sandeep Singh and Sunil Saini (2010) were used in this study.

Statistical Techniques

The statistical techniques – ‘Percentage’, ‘Mean’ & ‘Standard Deviation’ were used to study the level of ‘Family Environment’ of Adolescents; ‘t-test’ used to compare the components of ‘Family Environment’ of Adolescents on gender basis; and ‘Pearson’s Correlation’ was used to gauge the relationship between ‘Family Environment’ and the ‘Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs’ in this study.

Analysis and Interpretation

This is carried out by dividing the analysis and interpretation in the following three sections:

Section I: Level of Family Environment of Adolescents of District Sirsa

Section II: Comparison between the components of Family Environment of Adolescents of District Sirsa on gender basis

Section III: Relationship between Family Environment and Attitude of the Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs



Section I: Level of Family Environment of Adolescents of District Sirsa

Table No. 1: Level of Family Environment of Adolescents of District Sirsa

Sr. No.	Family Environment Component	Degree	N	Percentage
1	Cohesion	High	31	12.91
		Moderate	155	64.58
		Low	54	22.50
		Total	240	
2	Expressiveness	High	52	21.66
		Moderate	150	62.50
		Low	38	15.83
		Total	240	
3	Conflict	High	30	12.50
		Moderate	160	66.66
		Low	50	20.83
		Total	240	
4	Acceptance and Caring	High	27	11.25
		Moderate	97	40.41
		Low	116	48.33
		Total	240	
5	Active Recreational Orientation	High	138	57.50
		Moderate	92	38.33
		Low	10	4.16
		Total	240	
6	Independence	High	00	00.00
		Moderate	163	67.91
		Low	77	32.08
		Total	240	
7	Organization	High	54	22.50
		Moderate	127	52.91
		Low	59	24.58
		Total	240	
8	Control	High	82	34.16
		Moderate	59	24.58
		Low	99	41.25
		Total	240	

From Table No. 1, the following results were obtained:

Component wise status of adolescents w.r.t. Family Environment: In 'Cohesion' Component, 31 adolescents was at High, 155 at Moderate & 54 at Low level; in 'Expressiveness' Component, 52 adolescents was at High, 150 at Moderate & 38 at Low level; in 'Conflict' Component, 30 adolescents was at High, 160 at Moderate & 50 at Low level; in 'Acceptance and Caring' Component, 27 adolescents was at High, 97 at Moderate & 116 at Low level; in 'Active Recreational Orientation' Component, 138 adolescents was at High, 92 at Moderate & 10 at Low level; in 'Independence' Component, 0 adolescents was at High, 163 at Moderate & 77 at Low level; in 'Organization' Component, 54 adolescents was at High, 127 at Moderate & 59 at Low level; and in 'Control' Component, 82 adolescents was at High, 59 at Moderate & 99 at Low level.



Also, the percentage-wise distribution of adolescents in each level among all Components of Family Environment dimension was as follow: Cohesion - high 12.91%, moderate 64.58% & low 22.50%; Expressiveness - high 21.66%, moderate 62.50% & low 15.83%; Conflict - high 12.50%, moderate 66.66% & low 20.83%; Acceptance and Caring - high 11.25%, moderate 40.41% & low 48.33%; Active Recreational Orientation - high 57.50%, moderate 38.33% & low 4.16%; Independence - high 0%, moderate 67.91% & low 32.08%; Organization - high 22.50%, moderate 52.91% & low 24.58%; and Control - high 34.16%, moderate 24.58% & low 41.25%.

Section II: Comparison between the Components of Family Environment of Male and Female Adolescents of District Sirsa

Hypothesis 1. There exists no significant difference in the level of Family Environment of adolescents of District Sirsa on gender basis.

The results were interpreted for each component of Family Environment w.r.t. the formulated corresponding sub hypothesis, as below:

1. (a) There exists no significant difference in the level of Cohesion of adolescents of District Sirsa on gender basis.
1. (b) There exists no significant difference in the level of Expressiveness of adolescents of District Sirsa on gender basis.
1. (c) There exists no significant difference in the level of Conflict of adolescents of District Sirsa on gender basis.
1. (d) There exists no significant difference in the level of Acceptance and Caring of adolescents of District Sirsa on gender basis.
1. (e) There exists no significant difference in the level of Active Recreational Orientation of adolescents of District Sirsa on gender basis.
1. (f) There exists no significant difference in the level of Independence of adolescents of District Sirsa on gender basis.
1. (g) There exists no significant difference in the level of Organization of adolescents of District Sirsa on gender basis.
1. (h) There exists no significant difference in the level of Control of adolescents of District Sirsa on gender basis.

Table No.2. Comparison between the Components of Family Environment of male and female adolescents of District Sirsa

Variable	Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-ratio	Interpretation
Cohesion	Male	120	53.83	6.92	3.903	Significant
	Female	120	50.07	7.95		
Expressiveness	Male	120	35.71	5.60	1.686	Insignificant
	Female	120	34.48	5.72		
Conflict	Male	120	39.92	7.02	7.033	Significant
	Female	120	45.92	6.15		
	Male	120	44.55	8.84	4.906	Significant



Acceptance and Caring	Female	120	38.40	10.49		
Active Recreational Orientation	Male	120	38.45	4.92	8.622	Significant
	Female	120	32.44	5.83		
Independence	Male	120	34.08	4.64	3.372	Significant
	Female	120	32.43	4.43		
Organization	Male	120	7.66	1.87	0.098	Insignificant
	Female	120	7.64	2.05		
Control	Male	120	13.88	4.41	2.113	Insignificant
	Female	120	15.07	4.31		

Level of Significance 0.05*

From Table No. 2, the following results were inferred:

1. It was found that Cohesion had Mean 53.83 & 50.07 and SD 6.92 & 7.95 for male and female adolescents respectively. The calculated t-value was 3.903, which was higher than the table value of 't' at df 238 at 0.05 level of significance; and it was found significant. So, Hypothesis No. 1 (a), that – *'there exists no significant difference in the level of Cohesion of adolescents of District Sirsa'* was rejected.
2. It was found that Expressiveness had Mean 35.71 & 34.48 and SD 5.60 & 5.72 for male and female adolescents respectively. The calculated t-value was 1.686, which was less than the table value of 't' at df 238 at 0.05 level of significance; and it was found insignificant. So, Hypothesis No. 1 (b), that – *'there exists no significant difference in the level of Expressiveness of adolescents of District Sirsa'* was accepted.
3. It was found that Conflict had Mean 39.92 & 45.92 and SD 7.02 & 6.15 for male and female adolescents respectively. The calculated t-value was 7.033, which was higher than the table value of 't' at df 238 at 0.05 level of significance; and it was found significant. So, Hypothesis No. 1 (c), that – *'there exists no significant difference in the level of Conflict of adolescents of District Sirsa'* was rejected.
4. It was found that Acceptance and Caring had Mean 44.55 & 38.40 and SD 8.84 & 10.49 for male and female adolescents respectively. The calculated t-value was 4.906, which was higher than the table value of 't' at df 238 at 0.05 level of significance; and it was found significant. So, Hypothesis No. 1 (d), that – *'there exists no significant difference in the level of Acceptance and Caring of adolescents of District Sirsa'* was rejected.
5. It was found that Active Recreational Orientation had Mean 38.45 & 32.44 and SD 4.92 & 5.83 for male and female adolescents respectively. The calculated t-value was 8.622, which was higher than the table value of 't' at df 238 at 0.05 level of significance; and it was found significant. So, Hypothesis No. 1 (e), that – *'there exists no significant difference in the level of Active Recreational Orientation of adolescents of District Sirsa'* was rejected.
6. It was found that Independence had Mean 34.08 & 32.43 and SD 4.64 & 4.43 for male and female adolescents respectively. The calculated t-value was 3.372, which was higher than the table value of 't' at df 238 at 0.05 level of significance; and it was found significant. So, Hypothesis No. 1 (f),



that – ‘there exists no significant difference in the level of Independence of adolescents of District Sirsa’ was rejected.

7. It was found that Organization had Mean 7.66 & 7.64 and SD 1.87 & 2.05 for male and female adolescents respectively. The calculated t-value was 0.098, which was less than the table value of ‘t’ at df 238 at 0.05 level of significance; and it was found insignificant. So, Hypothesis No. 1 (g), that – ‘there exists no significant difference in the level of Organization of adolescents of District Sirsa’ was accepted.
8. It was found that Control had Mean 13.88 & 15.07 and SD 4.41 & 4.31 for male and female adolescents respectively. The calculated t-value was 2.113, which was higher than the table value of ‘t’ at df 238 at 0.05 level of significance; and it was found insignificant. So, Hypothesis No. 1 (h), that – ‘there exists no significant difference in the level of Control of adolescents of District Sirsa’ was accepted.

Hence, it was found that there exist no significant differences in Expressiveness, Organization and Control, but there exist significant differences in ‘Cohesion’, ‘Conflict’, ‘Acceptance and Caring’, ‘Active Recreational Orientation’ and ‘Independence’ Components of ‘Family Environment’ among adolescents w.r.t. gender.

Section III: Relationship between Family Environment and Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs.

Hypothesis 2. There exists no significant relationship between Family Environment and the Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs.

Table No. 3. Relationship between Family Environment and Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs

VARIABLES		Pearson's r	Interpretation	Significance
Attitude towards Alcohol & Drugs (N = 240)	Components of Family Environment of Adolescents (N = 240)			
	Cohesion	- 0.14	Mild Negative	Significant
	Expressiveness	-0.18	Mild Negative	Significant
	Conflict	0.39	Moderate Positive	Significant
	Acceptance and Caring	-0.20	Mild Negative	Significant
	Active Recreational Orientation	-0.12	Mild Negative	Significant
	Independence	-0.13	Mild Negative	Significant
	Organization	-0.03	Mild Negative	Insignificant
	Control	0.005	Mild Positive	Insignificant

From Table No. 3 shows the value of coefficient of correlation (Pearson's r) among ‘Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol & Drugs’ and ‘Components of Family Environment’ i.e. ‘Cohesion’, ‘Expressiveness’, ‘Conflict’, ‘Acceptance and Caring’, ‘Active Recreational Orientation’, ‘Independence’, ‘Organization’ and ‘Control’, as -0.14, -0.18, 0.39, -0.20, -0.12, -0.13, -0.03 and 0.005 respectively. There



was found a mild negative relationship between ‘Cohesion’, ‘Expressiveness’, ‘Acceptance and Caring’, ‘Active Recreational Orientation’, ‘Independence’ and ‘Organization’ Components of ‘Family Environment’ with ‘Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs’ whereas a moderate positive and mild positive relationship was respectively found between ‘Conflict’ and ‘Control’ Components of ‘Family Environment’ with ‘Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs’.

The calculated values ‘r’ of ‘Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol & Drugs’ with ‘Cohesion’, ‘Expressiveness’, ‘Conflict’, ‘Acceptance and Caring’, ‘Active Recreational Orientation’ and ‘Independence’ Components of ‘Family Environment’ were -0.14, -0.18, 0.39, -0.20, -0.12 and -0.13 respectively and these were found higher than the table value of ‘r’ i.e. 0.08 at 0.05 level of significance at $df = 478$; whereas that with ‘Organization’ and ‘Control’ Components of ‘Family Environment’ the calculated values of ‘r’ were -0.03 and 0.005 respectively and that was found less than the table value at 0.05 level of significance. So, null Hypothesis No 2, that - *there exists no significant relationship between Family Environment and the Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs*’ was rejected in most of the Components of ‘Family Environment’ except ‘Organization’ and ‘Control’ Components.

Findings

1. It was found that the level of ‘Family Environment’ of was varying among Adolescents and it was spread in high, moderate and low levels.
2. It was found that the ‘Family Environment’ of Adolescents was significantly varied in Components of ‘Family Environment’ on gender basis. No significant differences in ‘Expressiveness’, ‘Organization’ and ‘Control’ Components was found, but there exist significant differences in ‘Cohesion’, ‘Conflict’, ‘Acceptance and Caring’, ‘Active Recreational Orientation’ and ‘Independence’ Components of ‘Family Environment’ among adolescents w.r.t. gender.
3. A mild negative relationship of ‘Cohesion’, ‘Expressiveness’, ‘Acceptance and Caring’, ‘Active Recreational Orientation’ and ‘Independence’ Components of ‘Family Environment’ with ‘Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs’ was found; whereas a moderate positive relationship of ‘Conflict’ Components of ‘Family Environment’ was found with ‘Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs’. No significant relationship of ‘Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs’ was found with ‘Organization’ and ‘Control’ Components of ‘Family Environment’.

Educational Implications

1. The policy-makers can plan the curriculum keeping in view the family environment problems and attitudes of adolescents towards alcohol and drug abuse. They can suggest some remedies for students and teachers to resolve these issues.
2. The class teachers can use the findings of this study to resolve disciplinary problems based on the family environment and sensitize their students about alcohol and drug abuse.
3. Parents can also take insights through findings of this study in resolving family environment problems and be aware of their children's alcohol and drug abuse.
4. The students can also take advantage of this study’s findings to resolve their family environment problems and be cautious of alcohol and drug abuse.

Suggestions for Further Research

1. Similar studies can be conducted by taking large sample sizes in different technical, vocational, or higher education institutions.



2. Experimental or ethnographic studies can be conducted to explore more associations between the family environment and attitude of adolescents towards alcohol and drugs.

Conclusions

It can be concluded that the level of 'Family Environment' was varying among adolescents and spread in high, moderate and low levels. No significant differences in 'Expressiveness', 'Organization' and 'Control' Components was found, but there exist significant differences in 'Cohesion', 'Conflict', 'Acceptance and Caring', 'Active Recreational Orientation' and 'Independence' Components of 'Family Environment' among adolescents w.r.t. gender. Also a mild negative relationship of 'Cohesion', 'Expressiveness', 'Acceptance and Caring', 'Active Recreational Orientation' and 'Independence' Components of 'Family Environment' with 'Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs' was found; whereas a moderate positive relationship of 'Conflict' Components of 'Family Environment' was found with 'Attitude of Adolescents towards Alcohol and Drugs'. The findings of the study supports the results of studies conducted by Brateck, 2013; Brechting, 2004; Gruber & Taylor, 2006; Locke & Yim-Wah, 2013; Mwai et al., 2013; Mercer, 1978; Nicolas, 2016; & Johnson & Pandina, 1991.

References

- Australian Government. (2014). A safe and supportive family environment for children: Key components and links to child outcomes. Commonwealth of Australia 2014, Occasional Paper No. 52. https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/07_2014/op52_safe_families_0.pdf
- Bhatia, N. K., & Chadha, H. (1993). Family Environment Scale. New Delhi: Vikas
- Bratek, A., Beil, J., Banach, M., Jarzabek, K., & Krysta, K. (2013). The impact of family environment on the development of alcohol dependence. *Psychiatria Danubina*, 25 (2), 74–77.
- Brechting, E. H. (2004). Family environment and substance use in adolescent males. [Master thesis, University of Kentucky]. https://uknowledge.uky.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1391&context=gradschool_theses
- Brook, J. S., Brook, D. W., De La Rosa, M., Whiteman, M., Johnson, E., & Montoya, I. (2001). Adolescent illegal drug use: The impact of personality, family, and environmental factors. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 24 (2), 183-203. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1010714715534>
- Challier, B., Chau, N., Preydine, R., Choquet, M., & Legras, B. (2000). Associations of family environment and individual factors with tobacco, alcohol and illicit drug use in adolescents. *European Journal of Epidemiology*, 16, 33-42, 2000. <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1023/A:1007644331197.pdf>
- Cherlin, A. J. (1981). Marriage, divorce, remarriage. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fareo, D. O. (2012). Drug abuse among Nigerian adolescents strategies for counselling. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 5 (20), 341-347.
- Grewal, K. K. (2014). A study of academic achievement of adolescents in relation to family climate. *Scholarly Research Journal For Humanity Science and English Language*, 1 (4), 431-437.
- Gruber, K. J. & Taylor, M. F. (2006). A family perspective for substance abuse: Implications from the literature. *Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions*, 6 (½), 1-29. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/345078368.pdf>
- Henriques, B. D., Rocha, R. L., & dos Santos Reinaldo, A. M. (2016). Use of crack and other drugs among children and adolescents and its impact on the family environment: an integrative literature review. *Texto Contexto Enferm*, 25(3), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0104-07072016001100015>



- International Narcotics Control Board. (2015). Report of the international narcotics control board for 2015. United Nations: New York.
- Jeedrzejczak, M. (2005). Family and environmental factors of drug addiction among young recruits. *Military Medicine*, 170 (8), 688-690.
- Johnson, V., & Pandina, R. J. (1991). Effects of the family environment on adolescent substance use, delinquency, and coping styles. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse*, 17 (1), 71-88. doi: 10.3109/00952999108992811
- Loke, A. Y., & Yim-wah, M. (2013). Family process and peer influences on substance use by adolescents. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 10 (9), 3868-3885; <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph10093868>
- Mercer, G. W., Hundleby, J. D., & Carpenter, R. A. (1978). Adolescent drug use and attitudes toward the family. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 10 (1), 79-90. DOI:10.1037/h0081538
- Mwai, W., Wamue-Ngare, G., & Mwangi, A. W. (2013). Relationship between alcoholism and family cohesion: a gender analysis of Kigio location, Gatanga district, Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1 (7), 115-126. <https://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/server/api/core/bitstreams/7dc2fc10-027b-41ff-bb66-c44ca12b4c38/content>
- Nash, S. G., McQueen, A., & Bray, J. H. (2005). Pathways to adolescent alcohol use: family environment, peer influence, and parental expectations. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 37 (1), 19-28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2004.06.004>
- Nicolas, E. (2016). Toxic parents, addictions, and institutional psychotherapy. *Evolution Psychiatrique*, 81 (4), 891-907. DOI: 10.1016/j.evopsy.2016.05.005
- Ramaprabou, V. (2014). The effect of family environment on the adjustment patterns of adolescents. *International Journal of Current Research and Academic Review*, 2 (9), 25-29. <http://www.ijcrar.com/vol-2-10/V.%20Ramaprabou.pdf>
- Sacks, V., Moore, K. A., Shaw, A., & Cooper, P. M. (2014). The family environment and adolescent well-being. *Child Trends*. <https://nahic.ucsf.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/2014-52FamilyEnvironmentRB.pdf>
- Saini, S., & Singh, S. (2010). Alcohol and drug attitude scale (ADAS).
- Sathyabama, B., & Eljo, J. O. J. G. (2014). Family environment and mental health of adolescent girls. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 3 (9), 46-49. [https://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v3\(9\)/Version-2/J0392046049.pdf](https://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v3(9)/Version-2/J0392046049.pdf)
- Singh, M., & Niwas, R. (2015). Attitude of secondary school students towards alcohol and drugs in relation to their parenting. *Educational Quest: An Int. J. of Education and Applied Social Sciences*, 6 (3), 207-217. DOI: 10.5958/2230-7311.2016.00008.8