

## Accepted Manuscript

Is there any evidence of changes in patterns of concurrent drug use among young Australians 18-29 years between 2007 and 2010?

Adrian B. Kelly, Gary C.K. Chan, Angela White, John B. Saunders, Peter J. Baker, Jason P. Connor

PII: S0306-4603(14)00111-7

DOI: doi: [10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.04.009)

Reference: AB 4221

To appear in: *Addictive Behaviors*

Received date: 6 February 2014

Revised date: 6 March 2014

Accepted date: 2 April 2014



Please cite this article as: Kelly, A.B., Chan, G.C.K., White, A., Saunders, J.B., Baker, P.J. & Connor, J.P., Is there any evidence of changes in patterns of concurrent drug use among young Australians 18-29 years between 2007 and 2010?, *Addictive Behaviors* (2014), doi: [10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.04.009)

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

# Is there any evidence of changes in patterns of concurrent drug use among young Australians 18-29 years between 2007 and 2010?

Adrian B. Kelly<sup>a\*</sup>, Gary C. K. Chan<sup>a</sup>, Angela White<sup>a</sup>, John B. Saunders<sup>a</sup>, Peter J. Baker<sup>a</sup> &  
Jason P. Connor<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Centre for Youth Substance Abuse Research, Faculty of Health Sciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia, 4072.

<sup>b</sup> School of Medicine, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia, 4072.

**Email addresses:** Adrian Kelly (a.kelly@uq.edu.au), Gary Chan (chan4@uq.edu.au), Angela White (angela.white@uq.edu.au), John Saunders (mail@jbsaunders.net), Jason Connor (Jason.connor@uq.edu.au)

**Word count:** [1879]

**Running head:** [Concurrent drug use in young adults]

**Correspondence:** Assoc. Professor Adrian B. Kelly, Centre for Youth Substance Abuse Research, The University of Queensland, K Floor, Mental Health Centre, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Herston QLD 4029, Australia. Email: a.kelly@uq.edu.au.

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** A significant minority of Australians engage in concurrent drug use (using more than one drug in a given period). We examined clusters and correlates of concurrent drug use using the latest available nationally representative survey data on Australian young adults.

**Sample.** 3836 participants aged 18-29 years (mean age 24 years) from the 2010 National Drug Strategy Household Survey (NDSHS).

**Method:** Clusters were distilled using latent class analysis of past year use of alcohol, tobacco, cannabis, cocaine, hallucinogens, ecstasy, ketamine, GHB, inhalants, steroids, barbiturates, meth/amphetamines, heroin, methadone/buprenorphine, other opiates, painkillers and tranquillizers/sleeping pills.

**Results:** Concurrent drug use in this sample was best described using a 4-class solution. The majority (87.5%) of young adults predominantly used alcohol only (50.9%) or alcohol and tobacco (36.6%). 10.2% reported using alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and ecstasy, and 2.3% reported using an extensive range of drugs.

**Conclusion:** Most drug use clusters were robust in their profile and stable in their prevalence, indicating little meaningful change at the population level from 2007. The targeting of alcohol and tobacco use remains a priority, but openness to experiencing diverse drug-related effects remains a significant concern for 12.5% of young people in this age group.

**Key words:** [young adults, concurrent drug use, polydrug use, latent class analysis, cluster, risk and protective factors]

## INTRODUCTION

Concurrent use (here defined as the use of more than one drug in a specified period, typically 1-12 months) is highly prevalent in young adulthood (Carter et al., 2013; Chen, Yi, & Moss, 2013; Chiauzzi, DasMahapatra, & Black, 2013; Chung, Kim, Hipwell, & Stepp, 2013; Font-Mayolas et al., 2013; Reyes, Perez, Colon, Dowell, & Cumsille, 2013; White et al., 2013). When drugs are combined, there are risks of cumulative and synergistic effects on brain function (Connor, Gullo, White, & Kelly, 2014; Licata & Renshaw, 2010) and mental health problems (Quek et al., 2013; Smith, Farrell, Bunting, Houston, & Shevlin, 2011; White et al., 2013). In an analysis of the 2007 national survey data (AIHW, 2008), we examined the extent to which a nationally representative sample young adults aged 18-29 years used different combinations of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs. We established five clusters of substance use: the majority of young adults predominantly used alcohol only (52.3%), or alcohol and tobacco (34.2%). The other classes were cannabis, ecstasy, and licit drug use (9.4%), cannabis, amphetamine derivative, and licit drug use (2.8%), and sedative and alcohol use (1.3%).

In this paper we replicated this analysis for the 2010 national survey data (AIHW, 2011) to assess the robustness of drug use clusters, and whether there had been changes from 2007 to 2010 in patterns and correlates of concurrent drug use. As in our analysis of the 2007 data and related research (Carter et al., 2013; Chung et al., 2013; Smith et al., 2011), we examined the use of one or more substances in the previous year. The use of this time frame means that proximity of the use of different substances is closer than studies that use lifetime prevalence data on polydrug use (Agrawal, Lynskey, Madden, Bucholz, & Heath, 2007; Connor et al., 2014; Lynskey et al., 2006; White et al., 2013), and cell sizes for clusters are sufficiently large to permit analysis of predictors of cluster membership.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

### *Sample*

The sample consisted of 3836 participants in the 2010 National Drug Strategy Household Survey (AIHW, 2011) who were aged 18- 29 years (42.3% male; mean age = 23.97; SD = 3.49). Of these, 335 (8.7%) were excluded due to non-response on any of the drug-related items and 26 were excluded because they reported completing the questionnaire in the presence of another person where the honesty of their answers may have been affected. These exclusion criteria were the same as those applied to 2007 NDSHS data.

### *Measures*

The measures were identical to those applied in our prior study of 2007 data (Quek et al., 2013).

*Concurrent drug use* was based on >1 drug used in the past year [alcohol/tobacco/marijuana/ecstasy/tranquillisers or sleeping pills/cocaine/hallucinogens/meth or amphetamine/pain-killers or analgesics, for non-medical purposes in the last 12 months]. Responses for each drug were coded as 0 “No” and 1 “Yes”. For the purposes of examining similarities across and within clusters, a range of potential covariates were measured. *Covariates* including in the analysis were: sex, couple relationship status (0 “Not partnered” and 1 “partnered”), high school completion (0 “completed”, 1 “not completed”), income levels (0 “\$41600 or above”, 1 “\$13000-41599”, 2 “\$12999 or below”, 3 “prefer not to say/ don’t know”), language spoken at home (0 “English”, 1 “non-English”), regionality (1 “major cities”, 2 “inner regional”, 3 “outer regional/ remote/ very remote”) (ABS, 2009), and depressive symptoms measured by the Kessler 10 scale (Kessler et al., 2003).

### *Survey Procedure*

Participants were from all Australian States and Territories, and were randomly selected using a stratified design based on statistical local area (AIHW, 2011). Access to the survey data was approved by the Australian Social Science Data Archive and by the University of Queensland Human Research Ethics Committee.

### ***Analysis***

As per our analysis of 2007 data, Latent Class Analysis (LCA) was used to analyse drug use. The number of classes was determined using: Bayesian Information Criteria (BIC) (Schwarz, 1978), Sample size adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion (SSABIC) (Sclove, 1987), and the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) (Akaike, 1974), with lower values for each indicating optimal balance of model parsimony and model fit. The Lo-Mendell-Rubin adjusted likelihood ratio test (Lo, Mendell, & Rubin, 2001) was used to compare the fit of a model with  $k$  classes to a model with  $k-1$  classes. Entropy and average posterior probabilities were used to evaluate the classification quality. The number of significant bivariate residuals was used to access the validity of the local independence assumption of LCA. Once the optimal number of classes was determined, covariates were added to the model to examine their associations with latent classes. All analyses were performed with Mplus 6.01 (Muthén & Muthén, 2011).

## **RESULTS**

A six-class solution attained the lowest value of AIC, a four-class solution attained the lowest value of BIC and a five-class solution attained the lowest value of SSABIC. Results from the LMR-LRT suggested that a four-class solution fitted the data significantly better than the three-class solution and not significantly worse than a five-class solution. Simulation suggested that the performance SSABIC and LMR-LRT were better than other criteria in model selection

(Nylund, Asparouhov, & Muthén, 2007; Yang, 2006). However, since these two statistics pointed to two different solutions, both were examined on the basis of interpretability and usefulness of the classification (Muthén & Muthén, 2000). In the four-class solution, an extended range concurrent drug using class was identified. This group was further broken down into two sub-classes in the five class solution each with a very small prevalence estimates, namely, a class with very high probabilities of using all the drugs, and a class with a very high probability of using all alcohol, tobacco, marijuana and pain killers, and a moderate probability of using tranquilisers. A comparison of the participants in these two classes indicated that they had very similar demographic profiles. The four-class solution was chosen as the optimal solution as it yielded classifications that was clearly distinct and interpretable, and had adequate class sizes with high average posterior probabilities. Average posterior probabilities were over 0.80 for all classes.

Each of the four classes was described below using the probabilities of drugs use in the past 12 months (see Figure 1). Nomenclature for each class was based on the type and range of substances with posterior probabilities greater than 0.65. *Class 1 (“Alcohol only”)*: Participants in this cluster (50.9%) were predominantly alcohol users (0.78 probability of alcohol use), with a small probability (0.07) of tobacco use and nearly zero probabilities of other drug use. *Class 2 (“Alcohol and tobacco”)*: Participants in this class (36.6%) reported nearly universal alcohol use (0.99), high probability of tobacco use (0.69), moderate probability of marijuana use (0.32) and negligible probabilities of other drug use (below 0.05). *Class 3 (“Marijuana, ecstasy and other illicit drug use”)*: Participants in this cluster (10.2%) reported nearly universal alcohol use (0.99), high probability of tobacco, marijuana and ecstasy use (above 0.67), moderate probability of cocaine, hallucinogens and amphetamine use (0.32 – 0.37) and low probabilities of other drug

use. *Class 4 (“Extended concurrent drug use”)*: Participants in this cluster (2.3%) reported universal alcohol use (1.00), high probability of tobacco, marijuana, ecstasy, tranquillisers/sleeping pills, cocaine, amphetamine and pain killers/ analgesics use (above 0.63), and moderate probabilities of hallucinogens (0.47). Relative to the Alcohol only class, the following findings were significant covariates that predicted membership in the multiple concurrent drug using classes (see Table 1): being male (Class 2,  $p < .05$ , Class 3,  $p < .001$ , respectively), not completing high school (all classes,  $p < .05$ ), not having a partner (all classes,  $p < .05$ ), low income level (Class 3,  $p < .001$ ), depressive symptoms ( $p < .001$ ), and coming from an English speaking home ( $p < .001$ ). Regionality was unrelated to cluster membership.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

[INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]

## DISCUSSION

The overall objective of this study was to examine drug use clusters, their prevalence and correlates using the latest available (2010) nationally representative survey data. A four cluster solution was the most robust and interpretable and the key risk markers of cluster membership were being male and not competing high school. Coming from a non-English speaking home and having a partner were protective markers. There were close parallels between the 2007 and the 2010 clusters – both the present study and our earlier study identified an *alcohol only* cluster, an *alcohol and tobacco* cluster, and a *marijuana, ecstasy and other licit drug use* cluster. Our earlier study found evidence of a distinct cluster *alcohol and sedatives/tranquillisers*. In the present study this cluster was not replicated. Instead, posterior probabilities for *sedatives/tranquilliser use* were high in the extended concurrent drug use cluster. In our earlier

study, we noted that the sedatives and alcohol cluster was quite small (1.3%) and it is possible that this cluster was statistically unstable.

We were able to make cautious observations about the relative prevalence of drug clusters from 2007 to 2010, given the similarity of the clusters across surveys. There was some variation in the proportions of the sample that fell into each cluster, but variations across the two surveys were within measurement error. For *alcohol only*, the proportion was  $50.9 \pm 1.7\%$  in 2010, and  $52.3 \pm 1.8\%$  in 2007. The cluster *alcohol and tobacco* had a proportion of  $36.6 \pm 1.6\%$  in 2010 and  $34.2 \pm 1.8\%$  in 2007. For *cannabis, ecstasy and illicit drug use*, the proportion was  $10.22 \pm 1.0\%$  in 2010 and  $9.63 \pm 1.1\%$  in 2007. Finally, the proportion of those in the *extended concurrent drug use* was  $2.3 \pm 0.5\%$  in 2010 and  $2.8 \pm 0.5\%$  in 2007. In all, the comparison of the 2007 and 2010 results showed no evidence of change. Cross-year survey replications like the National Drug Strategy Household Survey are an ideal benchmark to evaluate the impact of population level policies and programs targeting concurrent drug use. The clustering of alcohol and tobacco for a large proportion of young adults was robust, and is perhaps of greatest concern, given that tobacco and alcohol are the leading contributors to drug-related public health costs (Collins & Lapsley, 2008; Kelly, 2012). More research is needed on the extent to which alcohol consumption is a contextual antecedent to smoking in young adults (Kelly & Jackson-Carroll, 2007; Kelly et al., 2011). Longitudinal research on the association of concurrent drug use and senior school noncompletion is needed. Screening and brief advice/counselling in settings such as employment services, trade schools and technical colleges may assist in reducing the apparent broadening of substance use profiles that occurs over the transition to young adulthood (Chen et al., 2013).

While replication of earlier found clusters points to the robustness of findings, we have previously noted the limitations of these surveys. Individuals with severe problems may be under-represented in this survey. The design is cross-sectional and so conclusions cannot be made about causality, progression, and sequencing. The study relies on self-report, although the confidential and anonymous nature of participation is likely to have reduced response bias. Findings may vary with the frequency/severity of substance use, which was not assessed. Reports of the use of different substances within the past year (the present measure) may be more likely to capture proximal use compared to lifetime prevalence rates, but the use of individual substances may be temporally or functionally unrelated.

Table 1.

*Odd ratios and 95% confidence intervals with Alcohol only class as the reference group.*

	Alcohol and tobacco		Marijuana, ecstasy and other illicit drug use		Extended concurrent drug use	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Age	0.99	(0.99, 1.03)	0.95	(0.95, 1.02)	0.93	(0.93, 1.08)
Female (Ref: Male)	0.75**	(0.75, 0.95)	0.45***	(0.45, 0.68)	0.45	(0.45, 1.04)
Not Completed high school	1.55***	(1.55, 2.03)	1.08*	(1.08, 1.82)	1.40**	(1.4, 3.45)
Couple status - Partnered (Ref. not partnered)	0.74**	(0.74, 0.96)	0.45***	(0.45, 0.76)	0.30*	(0.30, 0.86)
Income level (Ref: \$41,600 or above)						
\$13000 - \$41599	0.99	(0.99, 1.32)	0.67***	(0.67, 1.13)	0.45	(0.45, 1.41)
\$12999 or below	0.76	(0.76, 1.10)	0.35***	(0.35, 0.74)	0.48	(0.48, 1.98)
Prefer not to say/ Don't know	0.66*	(0.66, 0.96)	0.12***	(0.12, 0.30)	0.16*	(0.16, 0.88)
Remoteness (Ref: Major cities)						
Inner regional	0.83	(0.83, 1.11)	0.60	(0.6, 1.08)	0.40	(0.40, 1.20)
Outer regional/ remote/ very remote	0.88	(0.88, 1.22)	0.53	(0.53, 1.04)	0.40	(0.40, 1.38)
Non-English speaking background	0.39***	(0.39, 0.58)	0.11***	(0.11, 0.34)	0.10*	(0.10, 0.85)
Depressive symptoms	1.03***	(1.03, 1.05)	1.04***	(1.04, 1.08)	1.08***	(1.08, 1.13)

Notes. \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .




Figure 1. Probabilities of using each drug type for the four classes identified in the latent class analysis.

**Statement 1: Role of Funding Sources**

This study was supported through internal funds and via Australian Research Council Project DP130102015 to ABK (first chief investigator). JPC is supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia Career Development Fellowship (APP1031909).

These funding bodies had no role in the design, analysis or interpretation of the data. The data on which this study is based were collected as part of the National Drug Strategy Household Survey by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. The funding sponsors had no role in the study design, collection, analysis, or interpretation of data, writing the manuscript, and the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

**Statement 2: Contributors**

A. B. Kelly wrote the first draft of the manuscript. G.C.K. Chan conducted the analyses. A. White assisted with manuscript preparation and coordination of analyses. J. B. Saunders provided comments on an earlier draft. P. J. Baker provided feedback on statistical design and results. J. P. Connor provided advice on research methodology and feedback on the manuscript.

**Statement 3: Conflict of Interest**

There are no conflicts of interest by any author.

**Acknowledgements**

The authors thank Prof. Wayne Hall for helpful comments on this manuscript.

## References

- ABS. (2009). Socio-economic indices for areas. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- Agrawal, Lynskey, Madden, Bucholz, & Heath. (2007). A latent class analysis of illicit drug abuse/dependence: results from the National Epidemiological Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. *Addiction*, 102(1), 94-104. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2006.01630.x
- AIHW. (2008). 2007 National Drug Strategy Household Survey: Detailed findings. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW).
- AIHW. (2011). *2010 National Drug Strategy Household Survey report*. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Cat. no. PHE 145. Canberra: AIHW.
- Akaike. (1974). A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 19(6), 716-723.
- Carter, Strang, Frissa, Hayes, SELCoH, Hatch, & Hotopf. (2013). Comparisons of polydrug use at national and inner city levels in England: Associations with demographic and socioeconomic factors. *Annals of Epidemiology*, 23, 636-645.
- Chen, Yi, & Moss. (2013). Early adolescent patterns of alcohol, cigarettes, and marijuana polysubstance use and young adult substance use: Outcomes in a nationally representative sample. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2013.12.011>

- Chiauzzi, DasMahapatra, & Black. (2013). Risk behaviors and drug use: A latent class analysis of heavy episodic drinking in first-year college students. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 27(4), 974-985. doi: 10.1037/a0031570
- Chung, Kim, Hipwell, & Stepp. (2013). White and black adolescent females differ in profiles and longitudinal patterns of alcohol, cigarette, and marijuana use. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 27(4), 1110-1121. doi: 10.1037/a0031173
- Collins, & Lapsley. (2008). The costs of tobacco, alcohol and illicit drug abuse to Australian society in 2004/05. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Connor, Gullo, White, & Kelly. (2014). Invited paper: Polysubstance use: diagnostic challenges, patterns of use and health. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry, Manuscript under editorial review*.
- Font-Mayolas, Gras, Cebrián, Salamó, Planes, & Sullman. (2013). Types of polydrug use among Spanish adolescents. *Addictive Behaviors*, 38(3), 1605-1609. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2012.09.007
- Kelly. (2012). Adolescent alcohol-related harm reduction: Realities, innovations, and challenges. In G. A. Marlatt, M. E. Larimer & K. Witkiewitz (Eds.), *Harm Reduction: Pragmatic Strategies for Managing High-Risk Behaviors* ( 2nd ed., pp. 318-338). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kelly, & Jackson-Carroll. (2007). Interactivity and equifinality of risks for adolescent smoking. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse*, 17(1), 51-64.
- Kelly, O'Flaherty, Connor, Homel, Toumbourou, Patton, & Williams. (2011). The influence of parents, siblings and peers on pre- and early-teen smoking: A multilevel model. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 30, 381-387. doi: 10.1111/j.1465-3362.2010.00231.x

- Kessler, Barker, Colpe, Epstein, Gfroerer, Hiripi, . . . Walters. (2003). Screening for serious mental illness in the general population. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 60(2), 184.
- Licata, & Renshaw. (2010). Neurochemistry of drug action. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1187(1), 148-171.
- Lo, Mendell, & Rubin. (2001). Testing the number of components in a normal mixture. *Biometrika*, 88(3), 767.
- Lynskey, Agrawal, Bucholz, Nelson, Madden, Todorov, . . . Heath. (2006). Subtypes of illicit drug users: a latent class analysis of data from an Australian twin sample. *Twin Res Hum Genet*, 9(4), 523-530. doi: 10.1375/183242706778024964 [doi]
- Muthén, & Muthén. (2000). Integrating Person-Centered and Variable-Centered Analyses: Growth Mixture Modeling With Latent Trajectory Classes. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 24(6), 882-891. doi: 10.1111/j.1530-0277.2000.tb02070.x
- Muthén, & Muthén. (2011). *Mplus Version 6.01*. Los Angeles: Muthén and Muthén.
- Nylund, Asparouhov, & Muthén. (2007). Deciding on the number of classes in latent class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 14(4), 535-569.
- Quek, Chan, White, Connor, Baker, Saunders, & Kelly. (2013). Concurrent and simultaneous polydrug use: latent class analysis of an Australian nationally representative sample of young adults. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 1. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2013.00061
- Reyes, Perez, Colon, Dowell, & Cumsille. (2013). Prevalence and patterns of polydrug use in Latin America: Analysis of population-based surveys in six countries. *Review of European Studies*, 5, 10-18.
- Schwarz. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *The annals of statistics*, 6(2), 461-464.

Sclove. (1987). Application of model-selection criteria to some problems in multivariate analysis. *Psychometrika*, 52(3), 333-343.

Smith, Farrell, Bunting, Houston, & Shevlin. (2011). Patterns of polydrug use in Great Britain: Findings from a national household population survey. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 113(2-3), 222-228.

White, Chan, Quek, Connor, Baker, Saunders, & Kelly. (2013). The topography of multiple drug use among adolescent Australians: Findings from the National Drug Strategy Household Survey. *Addictive Behaviors*, 38(4), 2038-2073.

Yang. (2006). Evaluating latent class analysis models in qualitative phenotype identification. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 50(4), 1090-1104. doi: 10.1016/j.csda.2004.11.004

**HIGHLIGHTS**

- We focused on drug use profiles in a large nationally representative survey (2010)
- There were four clusters of concurrent drug use amongst young adults (18-29 years)
- Of those who used any drug, about half concurrently used 2 or more drugs (past year)
- There was little meaningful change in drug clusters from 2007