Published in final edited form as:

Subst Abus. 2020 ; 41(3): 382–390. doi:10.1080/08897077.2019.1635966.

Posting, Texting, and Related Social Risk Behavior While High

Joseph J. Palamar, PhD, MPH¹, Austin Le, Mse^{1,2}, Patricia Acosta, BA¹

¹Department of Population Health, New York University School of Medicine, New York, NY;

²New York University College of Dentistry, New York, NY

Abstract

Background: Posting on social media can have lasting consequences in one's social life and career. Research has not yet focused on social media or more modern forms of communication as social risk factors for individuals high on drugs. This study aims to examine prevalence and correlates of engaging in social media posting and related behavior while high.

Methods: We examined data from 872 adults (39.8% female) who were surveyed entering electronic dance music (EDM) parties in New York City and reported lifetime illegal drug use. Participants were asked if they were ever high on a drug while 1) posting on social media, 2) calling or texting someone, and 3) being in a photo. Those answering affirmatively were also asked if they later regretted the behavior. We examined demographic and drug-related correlates of these behaviors.

Results: 34.3% posted on social media while high (with 21.4% regretting it), 55.9% had texted or called someone while high (with 30.5% regretting it), and 47.6% had been in a photo while high (with 32.7% regretting it). Females and young adults (ages 18–24) were at high risk for posting on social media while high and at higher risk for engaging in more of these behaviors. Past-month marijuana users in particular were at increased risk for engaging in each of these behaviors.

Conclusion: Engaging in these behaviors while high on drugs appears to be prevalent, and prevention and harm reduction efforts should seek to prevent or reduce likelihood of social harm that can result from such situations.

Keywords

social media; drugs; substance use; social risk factors

Introduction

The use of social media—particularly among younger generations—is now ubiquitous. A recent Pew Research report estimates that over three-quarters (78%) of young adults in the

Address correspondence to: Joseph J. Palamar, Department of Population Health, 180 Madison Avenue, Room 1752, New York, NY 10016, joseph.palamar@nyulangone.org, T: 646-501-3555.

Author Contributions

All authors are responsible for this reported research. J. Palamar conceptualized and designed the study, and conducted the statistical analyses. All authors contributed to the conceptualization of the study, contributed to the drafting of the initial manuscript, interpreted results, and critically reviewed and revised the manuscript. All authors approved the final manuscript as submitted.

None of the authors have any declarations of interest to declare.

United States (US; ages 18–29) use Snapchat, while approximately 71% and 45% use Instagram and Twitter, respectively.¹ More generally, among 18 to 29-year-olds, roughly nine in every ten (88%) use some form of social media.¹ Meanwhile, technologies and hardware that facilitate the use of social media are essentially universal—an estimated 96% of young Americans (ages 18–24) own a smart phone and approximately 99% own any type of mobile phone.² While the ubiquity of these technologies has many benefits, using mobile devices in order to share posts on social media, send text messages, make calls, or take photos or videos, also has the capacity to cause social harm to users.^{3,4} We believe the risk of such harm may increase if users are inebriated. In this paper, we examine the prevalence and correlates of engaging in such behaviors while high in order to inform prevention and harm reduction strategies.

The opportunity to post personalized content on social media platforms enables users to display curated versions of their lives, and has, consequently, become a common means through which users embellish or hyperbolize their social status.^{5,6} Some mainstream media outlets have dubbed this phenomenon “the pressure of perfection”,^{7,8} which, for younger users, often translates to sharing photos and videos of activities from social outings and parties as a status symbol of popularity.⁹ Unsurprisingly, then, researchers have found that the content of many such posts often involve substance use.^{10,11} For instance, many adolescents who report spending any time on social media in a typical day also report seeing photos of peers becoming inebriated, “passing out”, or using drugs,¹¹ and they are also typically exposed to captions, advertisements, and related content promoting drug use.^{6,12,13} Not only can the normalization and glamorization of substance use through social media platforms promote drug use,^{14–17} but it may also inspire further posts displaying similar behaviors and activities.

In general, research investigating the effects of social media use on substance use is its infancy,^{18–21} and some studies have begun to explore platforms such as Twitter for public discussions related to substance use.^{15,22,23} However, to our knowledge, no studies have yet considered socially risky or potentially regrettable social outcomes stemming from using social media—as well as other modern forms of mobile phone communication—while high on drugs. We believe this to be an important topic for research because of the degree to which social harm can negatively impact one’s life, and because substance use may make such scenarios more likely to occur. For example, in addition to sharing images of substance use-related activities on social media, “sexting” (the sharing of nude, sexually explicit, or sexually suggestive photos via text or social media) is also significantly increasing in prevalence among adolescents,²⁴ and it has been found that those who sext are more likely to report recent substance use than those who do not.²⁵ Additionally, a national study of high school students found a dose-response relationship between internet use and binge-drinking.²⁶ Texting while inebriated can also be socially problematic, and software developers are actively producing mobile applications to prevent or mitigate its occurrence.²⁷ Importantly, though, is the fact that the content of posts and electronic messages delivered through social media or other means of digital communication are often quite perpetual—even deleted content may have been previously “screenshotted” or stored, thereby allowing others to save and share content post-hoc. Moreover, the omnipresence of mobile devices with built-in

cameras adds to this risk, as photos or videos can often be used to clearly identify the depicted persons and can be taken (and posted) without one's knowledge.

In terms of undesirable social outcomes, risky social media posts can have adverse implications for one's career,²⁸ with the majority of employers now using social media platforms to screen job candidates and search for evidence of substance use.^{29,30} Similarly, risky posts have the potential to cause embarrassment, stress, and conflict both among users and those in the user's social network. Further still, the mainstream media has covered numerous instances of notable figures encountering reputational, financial, or career-related issues owing to previous risky social media posts or texts,^{31–35} and it is reasonable to assume that similar situations affect the lay population as well.

Given the ubiquitous nature of social media, it is important to investigate whether substance use increases the likelihood of adverse social outcomes arising from potentially risky and regrettable use of social media or other forms of modern communication. In this paper, we focus on a sample of electronic dance music (EDM) party attendees—a high-risk population for drug use.^{36–39} For example, a nationally representative study of adolescents in the US found that compared to non-“rave” party attendees, those who had attended EDM “rave” parties reported higher prevalence and higher frequency of use of 18 different drugs.³⁶ We estimate prevalence and correlates of engaging in risky social media and related behavior while high in this population, in an effort to predict social risk factors and identify alternative goals for harm reduction and prevention programs that aim reduce the potential for social harm stemming from substance use.

Methods

Procedure and Participants

EDM parties in New York City (NYC) were randomly selected to survey attendees entering parties each week using time-space sampling.⁴⁰ Recruitment typically occurred on two nights per week, on Thursday through Sunday. The majority of parties were held at nightclubs, but participants were also surveyed outside of two large daytime EDM festivals. The festivals were not formally selected at random as an aim of the parent study was to compare nightclub and festival attendees, and festivals in NYC occur infrequently. Passersby were eligible to participate if they were 1) between 18–40 years old, and 2) about to enter the selected party. Recruiters approached individuals outside the parties (who were alone or in groups), and, if eligible, were asked if they would be willing to take a survey about drug use. Recruiters ensured that those approached were not visibly inebriated. For example, they ensured that individuals did not exhibit slurred speech or display impaired gait or attention. Surveys were taken on tablets after informed consent was provided. Participants completing the survey were compensated \$10 USD. Recruitment was conducted from June through September of 2018 and the response rate was 73%. 1,006 participants completed the survey, but analyses were limited to the 872 (82.9%) of those reporting lifetime use of any of 91 illegal drugs. This study was approved by the first author's institutional review board.

Measures

Participants were asked about their sex, age, race/ethnicity, education, weekly income, and sexual orientation. They were also asked about their frequency of nightclub, festival and other EDM party attendance. Participants were then asked about lifetime and past-month use of 91 different illegal drugs (including legal prescription drugs which are illegal to misuse) throughout the survey. We selected-out those not reporting use of any illegal drug as at least one illegal drug had to have been used in order to post on social media, call, text, or be in a photo while “high”. Participants were also asked about alcohol use, but we excluded the 46 participants reporting lifetime alcohol use but no illegal drug use because being “high” on a drug does not typically encompass alcohol use. Although we asked about numerous drugs, we focus on the most prevalent drugs in the EDM scene in these analyses as covariates: marijuana, ecstasy (MDMA, Molly), powder cocaine, and ketamine.^{38,39}

After answering about drug use, participants were informed that the following three questions were being asked to inform harm reduction in the party scene. They were then asked: 1) “Have you ever posted on social media (such as Snapchat or Instagram) while high on a drug?”, 2) “Have you ever texted or called someone while high on a drug?”, and 3) “Have you ever been in a photo taken by someone while you were visibly high on a drug?” “High” was not defined for participants and answer options for each question were “no”, “yes”, and “unsure”. Those answering affirmatively to a question were then asked a follow-up question querying whether they later regretted the behavior, and answer options were also “no”, “yes”, and “unsure”. For these analyses, “no” and “unsure” were collapsed into one category (with 7.3–10.2% answering “unsure” for the general items and 8.3–14.6% answering “unsure” for items assessing regret). We also recoded a separate set of variables for sensitivity tests, selecting-out “unsure” responses. We present results of analyses based on “unsure” collapsed with “no” as this prevented loss of power, but we also discuss sensitivity tests below.

Probability Weights

Since time-space sampling was utilized, selection probabilities were computed to provide estimates. These probabilities were composed consisting of frequency of EDM party attendance and number of party attendees (tracked via a clicker) who passed a predetermined line near the party entrance.⁴⁰ Weights for frequency of EDM party attendance were inversely proportional to frequency of attendance. For the component considering number of attendees, weights were inversely proportional to the party-level response rate. The two weight components were combined via multiplication and normalized. This up-weighting of those believed to have a lower probability of selection and down-weighting of those believed to have a higher probability of selection has been used in other studies utilizing venue-based sampling.^{40,41} These probability weights were utilized in all analyses to account for differential selection probability and clustering of participants entering each party.

Analyses

We first described the sample and estimated the prevalence of posting on social media, texting or calling, and/or being in photos while high. We then compared sample

characteristics according to each of the three dichotomous dependent variables. First, bivariable comparisons were conducted using chi-square, then we then fit all covariates simultaneously into separate multivariable generalized linear models using Poisson and log link with each dichotomous variable as a separate outcome. Thus, adjusted prevalence ratios (aPRs) for each covariate were estimated. These models were used instead of logistic regressions because odds ratios can produce over-estimates when outcomes are prevalent. We then examined correlates of total number of behaviors reported (range: 0–3) in a similar manner, but we utilized ordinal regression which allowed us to estimate changes in odds according to each level increase in the dependent variable.

Sensitivity tests were also carried out to test the stability of results using both coding schemes. Specifically, bivariable and multivariable tests were repeated using variables with “unsure” responses treated as missing. All data were analyzed using Stata 13 SE, utilizing Taylor series estimation to obtain accurate standard errors.⁴² Probability weights were utilized for all analyses and randomly selected party was specified as the primary sampling unit.

Results

Table 1 presents sample characteristics. The majority (60.2%) of the sample was male and the majority (59.5%) had a college degree or higher. Most of this lifetime drug-using sample reported using marijuana in the past month (61.8%); nearly a fifth (18.8%) used ecstasy/MDMA/Molly in the past month, and 14.7% and 7.0% used powder cocaine and/or ketamine in the past month, respectively. An estimated third (34.3%) posted on social media while high, over half (55.9%) are estimated to have texted or called someone while high, and almost half (47.6%) are estimated to have knowingly been in a photo while high. While an estimated 41.0% of participants have never engaged in any of these behaviors, a tenth (10.4%) had engaged in one behavior, 18.4% have engaged in two behaviors, and 30.3% have engaged in all three behaviors. With regard to regret, we estimate that over a fifth (21.4%) of those posting on social media while high later regretted it; 30.5% of those who had called or texted while high later regretted it, and a third who had been in photos while high (32.7%) later regretted it.

As shown in Table 2, females were more likely than males (aPR=1.49, $p=.003$) to post on social media while high, and compared to older adults, young adults (ages 18–24) were also more likely (aPR=1.62, $p=.002$) to post on social media while high. Compared to white participants, those identifying as black were less likely to post on social media while high (aPR= 0.39, $p=.026$). Past-month users of marijuana (aPR=2.07, $p=.002$) and/or cocaine (aPR=1.58, $p=.003$) were also at increased risk for reporting this behavior.

With regard to calling or texting others while high (Table 3), compared to white participants, black participants were less than half as likely (aPR=0.45, $p<.001$) to report having engaged in this behavior. Compared to those in the lower income tertile (\$0-\$499 earned per week), those in the highest tertile (\$1,000 earned per week) were more likely (aPR=1.35, $p=.021$) to report having called or texted someone while high, and compared to those identifying as heterosexual, those identifying as “other” sexuality were at increased risk (aPR=1.49,

$p=.002$) for reporting having engaged in this behavior. Past-month marijuana users were also at increased risk ($aPR=1.76$, $p<.001$) for having called or texted someone while high, with two-thirds (65.9%) estimated as having engaged in this behavior.

Table 4 presents results with respect to being in photos while high. Compared to those identifying as white, black participants were at decreased risk ($aPR=0.58$, $p=.009$) for reporting having been in photos while high. Compared to those identifying as heterosexual, those identifying as “other” sexuality were at increased risk ($aPR=1.66$, $p<.001$) for having engaged in this behavior, and past-month marijuana users were at twice the risk ($aPR=1.99$, $p<.001$) of having been in a photo while high.

Correlates of total number of these behaviors reported by participants are reported in Table 5. Compared to males, females were at increased odds ($aOR=1.48$, $p=.031$) for reporting a higher frequency of number of these behaviors. Likewise, compared to older participants, young adults (ages 18–24) were at higher odds ($aOR=1.58$, $p=.027$) for reporting higher frequency of number of these behaviors. Compared to white participants, black participants were at only a quarter of the odds ($aOR=0.25$, $p<.001$) for reporting a higher frequency of number of these behaviors, and compared to heterosexuals, those identifying as “other” sexuality were at over four times the odds ($aOR=4.15$, $p=.038$) of reporting a higher frequency of engaging in such behaviors. Past-month marijuana users were at over three and a half times the odds ($aOR=3.60$, $p<.001$) and cocaine users were at increased odds ($aOR=1.65$, $p=.040$) for reporting higher frequency of these behaviors. Finally, with regard to sensitivity tests, bivariable and multivariable results were similar when selecting-out responses of “unsure”, giving us confidence in our estimates.

Discussion

Research has shown that a considerable portion of user content posted to mainstream social media platforms involves substance use. Although the literature on substance use has traditionally focused on adverse health outcomes, the current ubiquity of social media may give rise to the potential for negative social outcomes as well. However, there is a dearth of studies exploring the risk for adverse social outcomes as a result of using social media, or more modern forms of communication, while high. To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine prevalence and correlates of engaging in risky social media and related behavior while high.

We estimate that a third (34.3%) of EDM party attendees have posted on social media while high; over half (55.9%) have texted or called someone while high, and nearly half (47.6%) have knowingly been in a photo while high. We cannot infer the exact circumstances of these situations, but some behaviors were likely less risky than others. For example, sending a photo of oneself while high to a trustworthy friend on SnapChat is likely less risky than posting a photo of drug use or answering a phone call from one’s supervisor while high. Similarly, utilizing privacy settings and posting on social media only to trustworthy peers may be far less consequential than posting publicly. However, between a fifth and a third of those engaging in these behaviors while high reported later regretting it. Experiencing regret suggests that some situations may have resulted in socially harmful or perhaps simply

embarrassing scenarios. Alcohol use, for example, has been found to commonly be associated with embarrassing behavior,⁴³ and a study of college students found that two-thirds felt that engaging in embarrassing behavior while drinking was perceived as a negative consequence.⁴⁴ However, the same study did find that 2.5% felt embarrassing behavior was a positive outcome, and a recent qualitative study of young adults found that engaging in embarrassing behavior while drinking is sometimes celebrated and such behavior is often considered funny or memorable.⁴⁵ Regardless, the sizeable proportion of respondents reporting regret may warrant further exploration focusing on more specific measures of social harm.

In terms of demographic factors, females and young adults in particular are at higher risk for engaging in risky social media and related behaviors while high, especially with regard to posting on social media. Although young adults are a known high-risk demographic for substance use,⁴⁶ females are typically at lower risk than males.⁴⁷ However, as of 2011, females are more likely to use social media than males.⁴⁸ Therefore, despite making up a smaller proportion of drug users, females should not be overlooked when considering the social consequences of social media and related use while high. In contrast, black EDM attendees were consistently at low risk for engaging in these behaviors while high. While more research is needed to determine why black attendees are at low risk, we do not believe the reason is necessarily related to socioeconomic factors, given that black individuals use social media at the same rate as white and Hispanic individuals,⁴⁸ and the “digital divide” in internet and smart phone use by race/ethnicity reported years ago no longer exists.⁴⁹ We did determine that those with higher income were at higher risk for calling or texting while high, but it is unclear whether this is related to higher prevalence of social media use among those with higher income.⁴⁸

We also found that those identifying as “other sexuality” were at higher risk of engaging in risky social media and related behaviors while high when compared to their heterosexual counterparts. In general, lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) persons are a known high-risk group for substance use,⁵⁰ and are likewise more likely to be active on social media compared to heterosexuals.⁵¹ One potential interpretation is that social media platforms can serve as an infrastructure through which LGB people (and other sexual minorities) in particular can engage more extensively with their own cultures, and numerous individuals have been successful in utilizing online platforms to champion the acceptance of more “alternative” identities (including sexual identities).⁵² Still, more research is needed to explore why those identifying as “other sexuality” are at such high risk for risky social media posting and related behaviors, and to further determine whether this is related to a stance that does not fully align with current normative values.

Although the entire sample in this study consisted of individuals who have used an illegal drug, marijuana users in particular (with 61.8% using in the past month) were found to be at highest risk for engaging in social media behaviors while high, which adds to existing findings showing that marijuana-using adolescents are at high risk for sexting.²⁴ However, we could not determine what drug(s) these individuals were high on during these circumstances, and we could not determine the nature of social media posts, texts, calls, or photos these individuals were in.

Since a significant portion of our sample engaged in regrettable use of social media while high, further investigations of other populations seem warranted in order to better estimate the prevalence of such behaviors among the wider population. If a greater problem indeed exists, then such information could be used to approach harm reduction strategies from different perspectives. For example, many individuals may be unaware of the extent to which they may be more likely to post regrettable content while high, and they may be similarly incognizant of potential for repercussions to occur later in life. Therefore, one potential recommendation for harm reduction or prevention programs is to educate high-risk groups regarding negative social outcomes that can arise as a result of substance use—including alcohol use—in addition to adverse health effects. In particular, the use of social media to disseminate substance use prevention messages seems to hold promise as an effective strategy for harm reduction and prevention.⁵³

Limitations

Our survey did not query which drug(s) participants were high on during these instances and it is unknown whether polydrug use occurred—with or without involvement of alcohol. Consequently, despite marijuana use being a consistent risk factor, we cannot deduce whether or not an individual was in fact high on marijuana during the behavior. We also did not define “high”, so this could have been interpreted differently among participants. For example, an individual can feel inebriated or sedated after using a particular class of drug and may not consider him- or herself “high”. Additionally, we did not consider alcohol as a drug in these analyses, given that being “high” on a drug does not typically encompass alcohol use. However, being inebriated on alcohol can certainly lead to risky and/or regretful behavior. We sensitivity-tested all models including the extra 46 participants who were excluded for reporting alcohol use but not use of other drugs and model results were nearly identical. The extent to which participants were inebriated is also unknown, as are the context and circumstances surrounding those instances, and we are cognizant of the fact that some situations carry greater social risk than others. Similarly, we cannot speak to the specific content of participants’ posts, texts, calls, photos, or videos.

Although a small portion of participants responded “unsure” to questions about these behaviors, we did conduct sensitivity analyses selecting out “unsure” instead of coding it as “no”; models yielded relatively consistent results with regard to direction and also significance in most cases. Importantly, the reader should be reminded that these analyses focused on a sample of EDM party attendees, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Nevertheless, this population is known to be at higher risk for drug use than the general population.

Furthermore, festival attendees often dress up in ‘elaborate’ outfits or costumes while attending these events,⁵⁴ so they may be inherently more inclined to engage in the behaviors investigated in this study (e.g., posting photos wearing their outfits on social media platforms) at such large parties. Posting photos of risqué outfits can be a risk within itself. Future studies are needed to focus on the general population and studies also need to investigate which drugs were used before the behavior(s), what specific risky behavior(s) the

user engaged in (e.g., a post his or her supervisor or parent can see), and what consequence(s) may have led to such regret.

Conclusion

It appears that posting on social media, texting, making calls, and being in photos while inebriated are common—at least in the EDM party scene. We believe engaging in these behaviors while high have been problematic for many of the drug users in this sample as a large portion of users reported regretting these behaviors. Traditional prevention and harm reduction measures have not focused on the social risks of substance use with regard to social media and other forms of modern communication. While prevention programming has largely focused on physical safety (e.g., not driving after drinking), such programs can also stress that that simple use of a smart phone while high can increase risk for a user engaging in regretful behavior. Drug users who insist on using substances need to be educated about the potential risks related to smart phone use while high and utilize tactics to minimize potential social harm. Apps are being developed to prevent people from texting while inebriated, and users may want to delay sharing texts, photos, and or posts until they are not longer experiencing drug effects.

Funding

This project was funded by the National Institutes of Health (K01 DA038800; R01 DA044207; PI: Palamar). The funding organization had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

References

1. Pew Reserach Center. Social Media Use in 2018 Pew Research Center, Internet & Technology. Washington, DC; 2018 Available from: <http://www.pewinternet.org/2018/03/01/social-media-use-in-2018/>
2. Pew Reserach Center. Mobile Fact Sheet Pew Research Center, Internet & Technology. Washington, DC; 2018 Available from: <http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/mobile/>
3. Baccarella CV, Wagner TF, Kietzmann JH, McCarthy IP. Social media? It's serious! Understanding the dark side of social media. *European Management Journal*. 2018; 36(4): 431–8. 10.1016/j.emj.2018.07.002
4. Livingstone S, Görzig A. When adolescents receive sexual messages on the internet: Explaining experiences of risk and harm. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 2014; 33: 8–15. 10.1016/j.chb.2013.12.021
5. Lee CS, Ma L. News sharing in social media: The effect of gratifications and prior experience. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 2012; 28(2): 331–9. 10.1016/j.chb.2011.10.002
6. American Addiction Centers. Guide to Drugs on Social Media American Addiciton Centers. Brentwood, TN; 2018 Available from: <https://americanaddictioncenters.org/drugs-on-social-media/>
7. Scelfo J. Suicide and the Pressure of Perfection. *The New York Times* 2015 [Accessed on October 11, 2018]. Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/02/education/edlife/stress-social-media-and-suicide-on-campus.html>
8. Marsh S. The pressure of perfection: five women tell their stories. *The Guardian*. 2016 [Accessed on October 11, 2018]. Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/oct/14/perfect-girls-five-women-stories-mental-health>
9. Curran T, Hill AP. Perfectionism is increasing over time: A meta-analysis of birth cohort differences from 1989 to 2016. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2017 10.1037/bul0000138

10. Costello CR, Ramo DE. Social Media and Substance Use: What Should We Be Recommending to Teens and Their Parents? *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 2017; 60(6): 629–30. 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2017.03.017 [PubMed: 28532648]
11. Tao D, Arpita R, Zhiyuan C, Qian Z, Shimei P. Analyzing and retrieving illicit drug-related posts from social media. 2016 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM); 2016 15–18 Dec. 2016; 2016 p. 1555–60.
12. Primack BA, Land SR, Fine MJ. Adolescent smoking and volume of exposure to various forms of media. *Public health*. 2008; 122(4): 379–89. 10.1016/j.puhe.2007.07.022 [PubMed: 18206196]
13. Feinstein EC, Richter L, Foster SE. Addressing the Critical Health Problem of Adolescent Substance Use Through Health Care, Research, and Public Policy. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 2012; 50(5): 431–6. 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2011.12.033 [PubMed: 22525104]
14. Cherian R, Westbrook M, Ramo D, Sarkar U. Representations of Codeine Misuse on Instagram: Content Analysis. *JMIR public health and surveillance*. 2018; 4(1): e22 10.2196/publichealth.8144 [PubMed: 29559422]
15. Cavazos-Rehg PA, Krauss M, Fisher SL, Salyer P, Grucza RA, Bierut LJ. Twitter chatter about marijuana. *The Journal of adolescent health : official publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine*. 2015; 56(2): 139–45. 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.10.270 [PubMed: 25620299]
16. Chu KH, Allem JP, Cruz TB, Unger JB. Vaping on Instagram: cloud chasing, hand checks and product placement. *Tobacco control*. 2016; 26(5): 575–8. 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2016-053052 [PubMed: 27660111]
17. Shutler L, Nelson LS, Portelli I, Blachford C, Perrone J. Drug Use in the Twittersphere: A Qualitative Contextual Analysis of Tweets About Prescription Drugs. *Journal of addictive diseases*. 2015; 34(4): 303–10. 10.1080/10550887.2015.1074505 [PubMed: 26364675]
18. The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) at Columbia University. National Survey of American Attitudes on Substance Abuse XVI: Teens and Parents New York, NY; 2011 Available from: <https://www.centeronaddiction.org/addiction-research/reports/national-survey-american-attitudes-substance-abuse-teens-parents-2011>
19. Ilakkuvan V, Johnson A, Villanti AC, Evans WD, Turner M. Patterns of Social Media Use and Their Relationship to Health Risks Among Young Adults. *The Journal of adolescent health : official publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine*. 2018 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2018.06.025
20. Katsuki T, Mackey TK, Cuomo R. Establishing a Link Between Prescription Drug Abuse and Illicit Online Pharmacies: Analysis of Twitter Data. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2015; 17(12). 10.2196/jmir.5144
21. Litt DM, Lewis MA, Spiro ES, et al. #drunktwitter: Examining the relations between alcohol-related Twitter content and alcohol willingness and use among underage young adults. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2018 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.08.021
22. Lamy FR, Daniulaityte R, Sheth A, et al. “Those edibles hit hard”: Exploration of Twitter data on cannabis edibles in the U.S. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2016; 164: 64–70. 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2016.04.029 [PubMed: 27185160]
23. Chan B, Lopez A, Sarkar U. The Canary in the Coal Mine Tweets: Social Media Reveals Public Perceptions of Non-Medical Use of Opioids. *PloS one*. 2015; 10(8): e0135072 10.1371/journal.pone.0135072 [PubMed: 26252774]
24. Frankel AS, Bass SB, Patterson F, Dai T, Brown D. Sexting, Risk Behavior, and Mental Health in Adolescents: An Examination of 2015 Pennsylvania Youth Risk Behavior Survey Data. *The Journal of school health*. 2018; 88(3): 190–9. 10.1111/josh.12596 [PubMed: 29399839]
25. Benotsch EG, Snipes DJ, Martin AM, Bull SS. Sexting, substance use, and sexual risk behavior in young adults. *The Journal of adolescent health : official publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine*. 2013; 52(3): 307–13. 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.06.011 [PubMed: 23299017]
26. Mu KJ, Moore SE, LeWinn KZ. Internet use and adolescent binge drinking: Findings from the Monitoring the Future study. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*. 2015; 2: 61–6. 10.1016/j.abrep.2015.09.001 [PubMed: 26807435]
27. Moore C. Apps to help you avoid drinking and ... texting. *The Washington Post*. 2015 [Accessed on October 11, 2018]. Available from: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/magazine/apps->

to-help-you-avoid-drinking-and--texting/
2015/12/21/4308841c-96d2-11e5-8917-653b65c809eb_story.html?
noredirect=on&utm_term=.b2288b0c36bd

28. Bohnert D, Ross WH. The Influence of Social Networking Web Sites on the Evaluation of Job Candidates. 2010; 13(3): 341–7. 10.1089/cyber.2009.0193
29. The Harris Poll. Hunting for a Job? Be Careful What You Post. 2017 <https://theharrispoll.com/hunting-for-a-job-be-careful-what-you-post/> (accessed Oct. 13, 2018).
30. Stoughton JW, Thompson LF, Meade AW. Big Five Personality Traits Reflected in Job Applicants' Social Media Postings. 2013; 16(11): 800–5. 10.1089/cyber.2012.0163
31. CNN. Comedian Gilbert Gottfried fired as voice of Aflac duck. CNN [Accessed on October 11, 2018]. Available from: <http://edition.cnn.com/2011/BUSINESS/03/14/georgia.aflac.duck/index.html>
32. Calfas J. MLB Pitcher Apologizes After Racist and Homophobic Tweets Surface During All-Star Game. Time. 2018 [Accessed on October 11, 2018]. Available from: <http://time.com/5341983/mlb-pitcher-josh-hader-all-star-game-racist-tweets/>
33. Dave P. Roseanne Barr disputes Zimmerman lawsuit over Twitter post. Los Angeles Times. 2014 [Accessed on October 11, 2018]. Available from: <http://www.latimes.com/nation/nationnow/la-na-nn-roseanne-barr-george-zimmerman-lawsuit-twitter-20140422-story.html>
34. The Week. Sexting scandal: what was the content of business minister Andrew Griffiths' explicit messages? The Week. 2018 [Accessed on October 11, 2018]. Available from: <http://www.theweek.co.uk/95050/sexting-scandal-what-was-the-content-of-business-minister-andrew-griffiths-explicit-messages>
35. Duke A. Alleged Tiger Woods mistress publishes 'sext' messages,. CNN. 2010 [Accessed on October 11, 2018]. Available from: <http://www.cnn.com/2010/US/03/18/tiger.woods.texts/index.html>
36. Palamar JJ, Griffin-Tomas M, Ompad DC. Illicit drug use among rave attendees in a nationally representative sample of US high school seniors. Drug Alcohol Depend. 2015; 152: 24–31. 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2015.05.002 [PubMed: 26005041]
37. Fernandez-Calderon F, Cleland CM, Palamar JJ. Polysubstance use profiles among electronic dance music party attendees in New York City and their relation to use of new psychoactive substances. Addictive behaviors. 2018; 78: 85–93. 10.1016/j.addbeh.2017.11.004 [PubMed: 29128711]
38. Palamar JJ, Acosta P, Ompad DC, Cleland CM. Self-Reported Ecstasy/MDMA/"Molly" Use in a Sample of Nightclub and Dance Festival Attendees in New York City. Substance Use and Misuse. 2017; 52(1): 82–91. 10.1080/10826084.2016.1219373 [PubMed: 27661470]
39. Hughes CE, Moxham-Hall V, Ritter A, Weatherburn D, MacCoun R. The deterrent effects of Australian street-level drug law enforcement on illicit drug offending at outdoor music festivals. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2017; 41: 91–100. 10.1016/j.drugpo.2016.12.018 [PubMed: 28131615]
40. MacKellar DA, Gallagher KM, Finlayson T, Sanchez T, Lansky A, Sullivan PS. Surveillance of HIV Risk and Prevention Behaviors of Men who Have Sex with Men--A National Application of Venue-Based, Time-Space Sampling. Public health reports (Washington, DC : 1974). 2007; 122 Suppl 1: 39–47.
41. Jenness SM, Neaigus A, Murrill CS, Gelpi-Acosta C, Wendel T, Hagan H. Recruitment-adjusted estimates of HIV prevalence and risk among men who have sex with men: effects of weighting venue-based sampling data. Public Health Rep. 2011; 126(5): 635–42. [PubMed: 21886323]
42. Heeringa SG, West BT, Berglund PA. Applied survey data analysis. London: Chapman and Hall: CRC Press; 2010.
43. Wicki M, Mallett KA, Delgrande Jordan M, et al. Adolescents who experienced negative alcohol-related consequences are willing to experience these consequences again in the future. Experimental and clinical psychopharmacology. 2018; 26(2): 132–7. 10.1037/pha0000184 [PubMed: 29389210]

44. Patrick ME, Maggs JL. College students' evaluations of alcohol consequences as positive and negative. *Addictive behaviors*. 2011; 36(12): 1148–53. 10.1016/j.addbeh.2011.07.011 [PubMed: 21855224]
45. Davies EL, Law C, Hennelly SE, Winstock AR. Acceptability of targeting social embarrassment in a digital intervention to reduce student alcohol consumption: A qualitative think aloud study. *Digital health*. 2017; 3: 2055207617733405. 10.1177/2055207617733405
46. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Key substance use and mental health indicators in the United States: Results from the 2017 National Survey on Drug Use and Health Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Rockville, MD; 2018 Available from: <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/>
47. Miech RA, Johnston LD, O'Malley PM, Bachman JG, Schulenberg JE, Patrick ME. Monitoring the Future national survey results on drug use, 1975–2016: Volume I, Secondary school students Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan; 2017 Available from: http://www.monitoringthefuture.org/pubs/monographs/mtf-vol1_2016.pdf
48. Pew Reserach Center. Social Media Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center, Internet & Technology; 2018 <http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/social-media/>
49. Perrin A. Smartphones help blacks, Hispanics bridge some – but not all – digital gaps with whites. 2017 <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/08/31/smartphones-help-blacks-hispanics-bridge-some-but-not-all-digital-gaps-with-whites/> (accessed October 26, 2018).
50. Medley G, Lipari RN, Bose J, Cribb DS, Kroutil LA, McHenry G. Sexual orientation and estimates of adult substance use and mental health: Results from the 2015 National Survey on Drug Use and Health. Rockville, MD; 2016 Available from: <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/NSDUH-SexualOrientation-2015/NSDUH-SexualOrientation-2015/NSDUH-SexualOrientation-2015.htm>
51. Seidenberg AB, Jo CL, Ribisl KM, et al. A National Study of Social Media, Television, Radio, and Internet Usage of Adults by Sexual Orientation and Smoking Status: Implications for Campaign Design. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2017; 14(4). 10.3390/ijerph14040450
52. O'Neill MG. Transgender Youth and YouTube Videos: Self-Representation and Five Identifiable Trans Youth Narratives In: Pullen C, ed. *Queer Youth and Media Cultures*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK; 2014: 34–45.
53. Evans W, Andrade E, Goldmeier S, Smith M, Snider J, Girardo G. The Living the Example Social Media Substance Use Prevention Program: A Pilot Evaluation. *JMIR Mental Health*. 2017; 4(2): e24 10.2196/mental.7839 [PubMed: 28655704]
54. Lund A, Turris SA. Mass-gathering Medicine: Risks and Patient Presentations at a 2-Day Electronic Dance Music Event. *Prehospital and disaster medicine*. 2015; 30(3): 271–8. 10.1017/s1049023x15004598 [PubMed: 25868489]

Table 1.

Sample Characteristics (n=872)

	N	%
Sex		
Male	506	60.2
Female	366	39.8
Age		
18–24	422	48.5
25–40	450	51.4
Race/Ethnicity		
White	430	46.1
Black	65	9.3
Hispanic	173	20.8
Asian	134	16.0
Other/Mixed	70	7.9
Education		
High School or Less	101	16.2
Some College	214	24.2
College Degree or Higher	557	59.5
Weekly Income		
\$0-\$499	312	34.0
\$500-\$999	324	37.5
\$1,000	236	28.5
Sexual Orientation		
Heterosexual	657	81.3
Gay/Lesbian	95	11.4
Bisexual	89	6.2
Other Sexuality	31	1.1
Past-Month Drug Use		
Marijuana	554	61.8
Ecstasy	222	18.8
Powder Cocaine	193	14.7
Ketamine	89	7.0
Social Media, Texting, and Photos While High		
Have Posted on Social Media While High	318	34.3
Have Texted While High	492	55.9
Have Been in a Photo While High	416	47.6

Table 2.

Correlates of Having Posted On Social Media While High

	Did Not Post on Social Media While High, % (65.7%, n=554)	Posted on Social Media While High, % (34.3%, n=318)	aPR (95% CI)
Sex			
Male	72.2	27.8 **	1.00
Female	55.7	44.3	1.49 (1.16, 1.92) **
Age			
25–40	73.1	26.9 *	1.00
18–24	57.8	42.2	1.62 (1.21, 2.17) **
Race/Ethnicity			
White	62.5	37.5	1.00
Black	87.4	12.6	0.39 (0.18, 0.89) *
Hispanic	65.9	34.1	1.00 (0.66, 1.52)
Asian	63.6	36.4	0.95 (0.75, 1.20)
Other/Mixed	61.7	38.3	1.17 (0.66, 2.07)
Education			
High School or Less	67.1	32.9	1.00
Some College	67.3	32.7	0.80 (0.55, 1.16)
College Degree or Higher	64.6	35.4	0.98 (0.58, 1.64)
Weekly Income			
\$0-\$499	60.2	39.8	1.00
\$500-\$999	66.5	33.5	1.00 (0.66, 1.51)
\$1,000	71.1	28.9	1.16 (0.73, 1.83)
Sexual Orientation			
Heterosexual	66.5	33.5	1.00
Gay/Lesbian	69.7	30.3	1.19 (0.59, 2.39)
Bisexual	53.2	46.8	1.14 (0.66, 1.99)
Other Sexuality	29.7	70.3	1.42 (0.76, 2.64)
Past-Month Drug Use			
Marijuana	57.2	42.8 **	2.07 (1.36, 3.15) **
Ecstasy	53.8	46.2	1.21 (0.97, 1.50)
Powder Cocaine	48.8	51.2 **	1.58 (1.19, 2.11) **
Ketamine	59.2	40.8	0.76 (0.45, 1.27)

Note. aPR = adjusted prevalence ratio, CI= confidence interval.

*
p < .05,

**
p < .01

Table 3.

Correlates of Having Texted or Called Someone While High

	Did Not Call or Text While High, % (44.1%, n=380)	Called or Texted While High, % (55.9%, n=492)	aPR (95% CI)
Sex			
Male	47.0	53.0	1.00
Female	39.8	60.2	1.11 (0.94, 1.32)
Age			
25–40	43.0	57.0	1.00
18–24	45.3	54.7	1.03 (0.88, 1.21)
Race/Ethnicity			
White	37.0	63.0	1.00
Black	69.6	30.4	0.45 (0.31, 0.66) ***
Hispanic	47.7	52.3	0.82 (0.61, 1.11)
Asian	48.5	51.5	0.86 (0.68, 1.08)
Other/Mixed	37.1	62.9	1.11 (0.74, 1.68)
Education			
High School or Less	54.3	45.7	1.00
Some College	43.9	56.1	1.01 (0.68, 1.51)
College Degree or Higher	41.4	58.6	1.05 (0.74, 1.47)
Weekly Income			
\$0-\$499	48.7	51.3	1.00
\$500-\$999	41.8	58.2	1.20 (0.96, 1.50)
\$1,000	41.6	58.4	1.35 (1.05, 1.73)*
Sexual Orientation			
Heterosexual	45.6	54.4	1.00
Gay/Lesbian	43.1	56.9	1.06 (0.70, 1.60)
Bisexual	32.7	67.3	1.20 (0.82, 1.75)
Other Sexuality	10.6	89.4	1.49 (1.18, 1.89) **
Past-Month Drug Use			
Marijuana	34.1	65.9 **	1.76 (1.41, 2.20) ***
Ecstasy	42.8	57.2	0.94 (0.83, 1.06)
Powder Cocaine	41.0	59.0	0.96 (0.77, 1.21)
Ketamine	43.7	56.3	0.88 (0.65, 1.21)

Note. aPR = adjusted prevalence ratio, CI= confidence interval.

**
p < .01,

p < .001

Table 4.**Correlates of Having Been in a Photo While High**

	Not in Photo While High, % (52.4%, n=456)	In Photo While High, % (47.6%, n=416)	aPR (95% CI)
Sex			
Male	54.0	46.0	1.00
Female	49.9	50.1	1.01 (0.85, 1.19)
Age			
25–40	54.3	45.7	1.00
18–24	50.3	49.7	1.20 (0.94, 1.53)
Race/Ethnicity			
White	46.2	53.8	1.00
Black	68.3	31.7	0.58 (0.39, 0.86) **
Hispanic	53.1	46.9	0.93 (0.70, 1.22)
Asian	60.3	39.7	0.76 (0.54, 1.06)
Other/Mixed	51.6	48.4	1.02 (0.63, 1.65)
Education			
High School or Less	60.4	39.6	1.00
Some College	54.0	46.0	0.96 (0.58, 1.59)
College Degree or Higher	49.5	50.5	1.11 (0.75, 1.64)
Weekly Income			
\$0-\$499	53.6	46.4	1.00
\$500-\$999	50.1	49.9	1.16 (0.87, 1.56)
\$1,000	53.9	46.1	1.21 (0.87, 1.68)
Sexual Orientation			
Heterosexual	52.8	47.2	1.00
Gay/Lesbian	57.0	43.0	0.93 (0.57, 1.52)
Bisexual	45.5	54.5	1.07 (0.62, 1.84)
Other Sexuality	11.8	88.2	1.66 (1.34, 2.06) ***
Past-Month Drug Use			
Marijuana	41.3	58.7 ***	1.99 (1.41, 2.80) ***
Ecstasy	41.8	58.2	1.20 (0.99, 1.46)
Powder Cocaine	40.4	59.6	1.18 (0.99, 1.39)
Ketamine	51.0	49.0	0.72 (0.50, 1.05)

Note. aPR = adjusted prevalence ratio, CI= confidence interval.

**
p < .01,

p < .001

Table 5.

Correlates of Total Number of Reported Behaviors

	Bivariable Comparison of Number of Behaviors				Multivariable Model	
	0 Behaviors, % (41.0%, n=344)	1 Behavior, % (10.4%, n=104)	2 Behaviors, % (18.4%, n=150)	3 Behaviors, % (30.3%, n=274)	aOR (95% CI)	
Sex						
Male	44.7	9.0	21.3	25.1 *	1.00	
Female	35.5	12.5	14.0	38.0	1.48 (1.04, 2.10) *	
Age						
25–40	40.2	14.6	20.6	24.7 *	1.00	
18–24	41.8	5.9	16.0	36.2	1.58 (1.06, 2.36) *	
Race/Ethnicity						
White	34.9	10.3	20.7	34.2	1.00	
Black	65.9	1.8	23.9	8.4	0.25 (0.13, 0.47) ***	
Hispanic	44.2	9.8	14.4	31.6	0.74 (0.36, 1.52)	
Asian	42.9	14.0	15.6	27.5	0.65 (0.40, 1.06)	
Other/Mixed	35.2	15.2	14.5	35.2	1.37 (0.41, 4.64)	
Education						
High School or Less	54.3	3.4	12.0	30.3	1.00	
Some College	37.9	17.0	17.5	27.6	0.93 (0.40, 2.16)	
College Degree or Higher	38.7	9.6	20.5	31.3	1.14 (0.54, 2.39)	
Weekly Income						
\$0-\$499	44.7	6.5	15.4	33.4	1.00	
\$500-\$999	37.6	12.1	21.2	29.0	1.28 (0.68, 2.38)	
\$1,000	41.0	12.7	18.2	28.1	1.62 (0.90, 2.94)	
Sexual Orientation						
Heterosexual	42.2	9.2	19.9	28.7	1.00	
Gay/Lesbian	40.2	18.9	11.5	29.5	1.19 (0.44, 3.18)	
Bisexual	32.1	12.0	11.1	44.8	1.34 (0.39, 4.59)	
Other Sexuality	10.6	0.4	19.5	69.5	4.15 (1.09, 15.76) *	
Past-Month Drug Use						

	Bivariable Comparison of Number of Behaviors				Multivariable Model aOR (95% CI)
	0 Behaviors, % (41.0%, n=344)	1 Behavior, % (10.4%, n=104)	2 Behaviors, % (18.4%, n=150)	3 Behaviors, % (30.3%, n=274)	
Marijuana	31.1	9.4	20.4	39.0 ^{**}	3.60 (2.10, 6.18) ^{***}
Ecstasy	36.3	5.7	18.2	39.9	1.24 (0.85, 1.82)
Powder Cocaine	33.8	8.0	12.9	45.3	1.65 (1.03, 2.66) [*]
Ketamine	41.0	6.0	18.9	34.1	0.52 (0.21, 1.31)

Note. aOR = adjusted odds ratio generated by ordinal regression, representing change in adjusted odds for every level increase in the dependent variable (number of behaviors reported, compared to 0 behaviors reported). CI= confidence interval.

^{*}

p < .05,

^{**}

p < .01,

^{***}

p < .001