Research Article

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20161368

Socio-demographic profile of male drug abusers residing in Mumbai city, Maharashtra, India

Prashil P. Jumade¹*, Abhiram M. Kasbe², Purushottam A. Giri³

Received: 22 February 2016 Revised: 24 February 2016 Accepted: 06 April 2016

*Correspondence:

Dr. Prashil P. Jumade,

E-mail: pjumade@gmail.com

Copyright: © the author(s), publisher and licensee Medip Academy. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ABSTRACT

Background: The drug abusers problem is becoming worse in the metropolitan city like Mumbai, India. There come many migrant population from out of state and from inside the state for the search of job or for the sake of employment. These people are at most risk of becoming the drug abusers if they fail to get proper employment or get into the bad company. Drug abuse is becoming the emerging problem in the youth of India.

Methods: A cross-sectional study was conducted during the period of January to December 2013 at de-addiction centre of NGO working for the drug abusers at 3 different sites in Mumbai city. Total 100 subjects were selected according to the convenient method sampling.

Results: In this study, more than 50% were below the age of 40 years and 66% were Muslim followed by 31% were Hindu by religion. More than 50% were educated upto secondary level and were married and maximum subjects were living in nuclear family. About 71% subjects were living with their family. Total 99 out of 100 subjects were having addiction of brown sugar followed by 77 out of 100 subjects were having charas addiction.

Conclusion: Maximum drug abusers were Muslim by religion followed by Hindu and age below 40 years and educated upto secondary level and were born in Mumbai only. Maximum subjects were married and living in nuclear family and were having addiction of brown sugar followed by charas.

Key words: Drug abusers problem, Drug abuse, Brown sugar, Charas

INTRODUCTION

The drug abuse is the complex problem of not only of individual but also of the entire community. According to the World Health Organization (WHO) substance use is persistent or sporadic drug inconsistent with or unrelated to acceptable medical practices. A drug is broadly defined as any chemical agent that affects living protoplasm. Some drugs reinforcement i.e. they produce the effects that user enjoys and which make him/her wish

to take it again or to induce drug seeking behavior.² Drug addiction symptoms or behaviors (in general) includes: Feeling that you have to use the drug regularly; Failing in your attempts to stop using the drug; Spending money on the drug, even though you can't afford it; Doing things to obtain the drug that you normally wouldn't do, such as stealing; Feeling that you need the drug to deal with your problems; and Focusing more and more time and energy on getting and using the drug.³

¹Department of Community Medicine, Government Medical College, Chandrapur, Maharashtra, India

²Department of Community Medicine, T. N. Medical College and B.Y.L. Nair Ch. Hospital, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

³Department of Community Medicine, Indian Institute of Medical Science and Research Medical College, Badnapur, Jalna, Maharashtra, India

Drug abuse is becoming the emerging problem in the youth of India. Drug abuse in India owes much to the growing unemployment, the travails of rural life. Mostly children of the age 13-15 are the first victim of the illegal drug use. In India there are many NGO working for the de-addiction treatment of the drug abusers. But, mere building treatment centers will not be enough, and millions of drug users in the community will have to be motivated, informed, and encouraged to come forward to seek treatment.

METHODS

This cross sectional study was conducted during the period of January to December 2013 at the de-addiction centre of nongovernmental organization (NGO) at three different sites (Jogeshwari, Bandra & Boriwali) in Mumbai city. The study area was the slum area. Total 330 subjects were enrolled in the register of the NGO during the study period. As per the convenient method sampling, 30% of total subjects were taken for the sample size. Thus, rounding-up, 100 was the sample size, i.e. 33 from each of two sites & 34 from one site. The subjects were chosen randomly from the register and interviewed. The relevant data was collected related to sociodemographic profile. Data was entered in MS Excel and analyzed by using percentage and proportion wherever appropriate.

RESULTS

The information was gathered for a total of 100 participants in the study. The socio-demographic characteristics of the study population are shown in Table 1. The study sample consisted of all 100% males. Most (35%) of the subjects were in the age group 20-29 years followed by (27%) in the age group of 30-39 years. Only (18%) patients were aged 40-49 years. Majority of subjects 53% were educated upto seconday, (19%) were illiterate, and only (7%) were educated graduation. Out of total subjects (66%) were Muslims, (32%) were Hindu and only 2% were Christians. Thus, drug abusers were predominantly Muslims followed by Hindu. Majority 59% subjects were married, 36% were unmarried, while 4% subjects had separated from their life partner and 1% subjects were living-in-relationship. According to the modified BG Prasad classification 2013, (34%) subjects belonged to the class II followed by (31%) to class III. Also, 22% subjects belonged to class IV and only 2% were belonged to class V.

Out of all subjects, (42%) belonged to Nuclear family, (37%) subjects belonged to Joint family. While, (5%) subjects belonged to extended joint family and (16%) subjects lived single without a family. Forty-four percent of subjects were earning their bread and butter for themselves & for their family, 25% were earning themselves along with their family member to sustain their family and 31% of subjects depended on their family member for their bread and butter. About 99% of

subjects had used Brown sugar, 77% had used Charas, and 38% of subjects had used ganja, while only 1% had used L.S.D. for their drug abusing practices.

As Table 2 revealed that with 18.2% class I subjects using 4 and more drugs the percentage dropped to 11.8% and 12.9% respectively in the class II & III, further falling to 9.1% and 0.0% in class IV and V.

Table 1: Socio-demographic profile of the study population.

Percentage Percentage Percentage	Socio-demographic	Number	
20-29 35 35.0 30-39 27 27.0 40-49 18 18.0 50 & above 20 20.0 Religion Muslims 66 66.0 Hindu 32 32.0 Christian 02 2.0 Marital status Married 59 59.0 Unmarried 36 36.0 Separate / divorce 04 4.0 Living in relationship 01 1.0 Education Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77<			Percentage
30-39 27 27.0 40-49 18 18.0 50 & above 20 20.0 Religion Muslims 66 66.0 Hindu 32 32.0 Christian 02 2.0 Marital status Married 59 59.0 Unmarried 36 36.0 Separate / divorce 04 4.0 Living in relationship 01 1.0 Education Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Age (in years)		
40-49 18 18.0 50 & above 20 20.0 Religion Muslims 66 66.0 Hindu 32 32.0 Christian 02 2.0 Marital status Married 59 59.0 Unmarried 36 36.0 Separate / divorce 04 4.0 Living in relationship 01 1.0 Education Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class III 34 34.0 34.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	20-29	35	35.0
50 & above 20 20.0 Religion Muslims 66 66.0 Hindu 32 32.0 Christian 02 2.0 Marital status Married 59 59.0 Unmarried 36 36.0 Separate / divorce 04 4.0 Living in relationship 01 1.0 Education Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class III 31 31.0 34.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	30-39	27	27.0
Religion Muslims 66 66.0 Hindu 32 32.0 Christian 02 2.0 Marital status Married Married 59 59.0 Unmarried 36 36.0 Separate / divorce 04 4.0 Living in relationship 01 1.0 Education Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	40-49	18	18.0
Muslims 66 66.0 Hindu 32 32.0 Christian 02 2.0 Marital status Married Married 59 59.0 Unmarried 36 36.0 Separate / divorce 04 4.0 Living in relationship 01 1.0 Education Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	50 & above	20	20.0
Hindu 32 32.0 Christian 02 2.0 Marital status Separate 59 59.0 Unmarried 36 36.0 Separate / divorce 04 4.0 Living in relationship 01 1.0 Education Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class II 34 34.0 34.0 Class IV 22 22.0 2.0 Class V 02 2.0 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Religion		
Christian 02 2.0 Marital status Married 59 59.0 Unmarried 36 36.0 Separate / divorce 04 4.0 Living in relationship 01 1.0 Education Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Muslims	66	66.0
Marital status Married 59 59.0 Unmarried 36 36.0 Separate / divorce 04 4.0 Living in relationship 01 1.0 Education Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Hindu	32	32.0
Married 59 59.0 Unmarried 36 36.0 Separate / divorce 04 4.0 Living in relationship 01 1.0 Education Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Christian	02	2.0
Unmarried 36 36.0 Separate / divorce 04 4.0 Living in relationship 01 1.0 Education Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class III 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Marital status		
Separate / divorce 04 4.0 Living in relationship 01 1.0 Education Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Married	59	59.0
Living in relationship 01 1.0 Education 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Unmarried	36	36.0
Education Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Separate / divorce	04	4.0
Illiterate 19 19.0 Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Living in relationship	01	1.0
Primary 18 18.0 Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Education		
Secondary 53 53.0 Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Illiterate	19	19.0
Higher secondary 03 3.0 Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class III 34 34.0 Class IVII 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Primary	18	18.0
Graduate 07 7.0 Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Secondary	53	53.0
Socioeconomic class * Class I 11 11.0 Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Higher secondary	03	3.0
Class I 11 11.0 Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Graduate	07	7.0
Class II 34 34.0 Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Socioeconomic class *		
Class III 31 31.0 Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use 8 Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Class I	11	11.0
Class IV 22 22.0 Class V 02 2.0 Substance use Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Class II	34	34.0
Class V 02 2.0 Substance use 99 99.0 Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Class III	31	31.0
Substance use Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Class IV	22	22.0
Brown sugar 99 99.0 Charas 77 77.0	Class V	02	2.0
Charas 77 77.0	Substance use		
	Brown sugar	99	99.0
Conio 20 20 0	Charas	77	77.0
Ganja 38.0	Ganja	38	38.0
Sedatives/hypnotic 26 26.0	Sedatives/hypnotic	26	26.0
Opium/afeem 09 9.0		09	9.0
Cocaine 08 8.0	Cocaine	08	8.0

^{*(}As per Modified B.G. Prasad classification 2013)9

This indicate the financial burden the drug abuse put on its users and that easy money means more degree of substance use (p-value=0.952). More than 50% study subjects were poly-substance abusers.

When asked about the reason to start drug, about 27.20% responses were that subjects responded it was for self-

enjoyment, while 24.70% and 21.60% responded to get hooked up and peer force respectively.

Table 2: Association between socioeconomic status and substance use among study population.

Socio-economic class (As per modific Prasad classification 2013)	ed B.J.		No. of substance use			Total
			1+2	3 ^	4 & > ^	
Class I		No.	4	5	2	11
		%	36.4%	45.5%	18.2%	100.0%
Class II		No.	17	13	4	34
		%	50.0%	38.2%	11.8%	100.0%
Class III		No.	15	12	4	31
		%	48.4%	38.7%	12.9%	100.0%
Class IV		No.	11	9	2	22
		%	50.0%	40.9%	9.1%	100.0%
Class V		No.	1	1	0	2
		%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Total		No.	48	40	12	100
		%	48.0%	40.0%	12.0%	100.0%
Chi-Square Tests	Value	d.f.	p-value Association is-			
Pearson Chi-Square \$	1.303	8	0.996	Not si	gnificant	
Pearson Chi-Square ^	0.692	4	0.952	Not si	gnificant	

\$ 8 cells (53.3%) have expected count less than 5; ^ column data pooled & chi-square test reapplied.

DISCUSSION

In the present study, the maximum numbers of subjects were found to be<40 years of age. Mean±SD age of enrolled subjects was 24.74 to 47.86 years. Similarly the study conducted in Rohtak by Vinay kumar et al.⁴ revealed that 15.35% subjects were in the age group of 16-25, 34.16% were in age group of 26-35, and 29.75% were in age group of 36-45. One of the report by Manick and Mehar Singh in Punjab stated that 77.78% of the drug users lies in the age group of 19 to 35 years of age.⁵ Thus, both the studies show that maximum number of study subjects were adults aged less than 40 years and present study reconfirm the same.

Religion wise distribution showed in our study that majority of subjects were Muslims (66%) followed by (31%) Hindus. The reason for this might be that the subjects were enrolled from the area catered by the NGO having more Muslim population. Majority (53%) of study subjects were having secondary education while, (19%) of subjects were illiterate indicating that literacy is not a barrier to drug abuser. Similarly study by Ghulam Muhammad, conducted in EssaNagri and Lyari of Pakistan showed that 63.7% Muslims, and 10.29% Hindu as study subjects. Also majority of the subjects in this study were literate.⁶

According to the Modified BG Prasad Classification 2013, almost 55% subjects belonged to class III, IV and

V. However 11% and 34% subjects belonged to class I and II respectively. Thus, poor to rich substance use was independent of socio-economic class. About 44% subjects were the only earner for their family while, 31% subjects were totally depended on their family for their bread and butter. Most of the subjects in the study were daily wage worker, auto driver, labourers and few subjects were working in the company. In a descriptive study conducted by Srivastava AK et al.7 at de-addiction centre at Kanpur showed that 19.3% were unemployed, 29.3% self-employed, 19.3% in government sector, 28.8% in private sector and 3.1% were students. Among the study subjects, 16% subjects were living alone while, 42%, 37% and 5% subjects were living in Nuclear, Joint and extended joint family respectively. This high proportion of substance users living with family is a favorable situation as targeted interventions can take supports of family members in pursuing the subject to stop addiction. Study in de-addiction centre at Kanpur showed that there are 53.7% study subjects are of nuclear family and 46.2% subjects are of joint family and no subjects belongs to the extended joint family and people living alone. The present study, there was increased in degree of substance used as the socio-economic status increased, but the association between socio-economic status and no. of substance used was not found statistically significant (p-value = 0.952). According to the study by Shastri SS and Kolhatkar KP, showed that no correlation was found between liability for addiction and economical status of the family, as judged by per capita income.⁸

CONCLUSION

In the present study maximum subjects belong to age less than 40 years, maximum was Muslim by religion, maximum belongs to the socio-economic class II followed by class III. Also, maximum subjects had consumed Brown sugar followed by charas. Maximum subjects were educated upto the secondary level and maximum lived with their family. Thus, sociodemographic profile revealed that advancing age, illiteracy, low socio economic status and educational background were frequent observations with drug abusers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors would like to express our deep sense of gratitude to the Mrs. Shobha Kapoor, founder of NGO and Mr. Umesh Tandel, Project Director of NGO for permission to work in NGO and for support and guidance.

Funding: No funding sources Conflict of interest: None declared

Ethical approval: The study was approved by the

Institutional Ethics Committee

REFERENCES

- 1. WHO. Techn. Res. Ser. No.886: 1999;48.
- 2. Goodman & Gilman's. The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics, 12th ed. Chapter 1, Drug Invention and the Pharmaceutical Industry. 2011;3.
- 3. Mayo Clinic Diseases and Condition: Drug Addiction. Available at http://www.mayoclinic.org/

- diseases-conditions/drug-addiction/ basics/ causes/con-20020970.
- 4. Kumar V, Nehra DK, Kumar P, Sunila, Gupta R. Prevalence and Pattern of Substance Abuse: A study from De-addiction Centre; State Institute of Mental Health, Rohtak, Delhi Psychiatry Journal. 2013;16(1):15-23.
- 5. Manick, Singh M. Drug addiction and alcoholism in Punjab: an empirical study of a village. Political Economy Journal of India, 2013. Also available at http://www.thefreelibrary.com/.Drug+addiction+and+alcoholism+in+Punjab%3A+an+empirical+study+of+a...-a0335292788.
- Muhammad G. A sociological study of drug abuse in Pakistani society with special reference to heroin addiction, its causes and consequences by University of Karachi/ Department of Sociology, chapter 4, Analysis and interpretation of data. 77-144. Also available at http://eprints.hec.gov.pk/ 812/ 1/ 523.html.htm.
- 7. Srivastava AK, Gahlot Anju, Keshwarni P. A study of medico-social profile of drug and alcohol dependents treated at de-addiction centre, Kanpur. Indian J Prev Soc Med. 2011;42(3):27-32.
- Shastri SS, Kolhatkar KP. Socio-demographic features of cannabis and heroin abuse in Bombay. J Post Graduate Medicine. 1989;35(4):196-8.
- 9. An Updated Prasad's Socio Economic Status Classification for 2013 by Shankar Reddy Dudala, Arlappa N.Also available at http://www.ijrdh.com/files/1%20Prasad%20SES.pdf.

Cite this article as Jumade PP, Kasbe AM, Giri PA. Socio-demographic profile of male drug abusers residing in Mumbai city, Maharashtra, India. Int J Community Med Public Health 2016:3:1115-8.