

Technological University Dublin ARROW@TU Dublin

Reports

Tobacco Free Research Institute Ireland (TFRI)

2025

# ESPAD Ireland 2024. European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs

Joan Hanafın Tobacco Free Research Institute, Technological University Dublin

Salome Sunday Tobacco Free Research Institute, Technological University Dublin

Helen Fitzmarice Tobacco Free Research Institute, Technological University Dublin

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://arrow.tudublin.ie/tobacreports

Part of the Community Health and Preventive Medicine Commons, Maternal and Child Health Commons, and the Public Health Education and Promotion Commons

#### **Recommended Citation**

Hanafin J, Sunday S, Fitzmaurice H, Clancy, L. (2025). ESPAD Ireland 2024: Results from the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs. Dublin: TobaccoFree Research Institute Ireland for the Department of Health Ireland. ISBN: 978-1-90-045497-1. DOI: 10.21427/bqh8-5p87

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Tobacco Free Research Institute Ireland (TFRI) at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Reports by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact vera.kilshaw@tudublin.ie.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License.

### Authors

Joan Hanafin, Salome Sunday, Helen Fitzmarice, and Luke Clancy

This report is available at ARROW@TU Dublin: https://arrow.tudublin.ie/tobacreports/2





# European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs

# ESPAD Ireland 2024

TobaccoFree Research Institute Ireland TU Dublin for the Department of Health

Joan Hanafin, Salome Sunday, Helen Fitzmaurice, Luke Clancy





# **ESPAD Ireland 2024**

# European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs

### May 2025

Joan Hanafin, Salome Sunday, Helen Fitzmaurice, Luke Clancy

TobaccoFree Research Institute Ireland (TFRI) TU Dublin for the Department of Health

www.tri.ie/espad-ireland



**An Roinn Sláinte** Department of Health





# Citation

Hanafin J, Sunday S, Fitzmaurice H, Clancy, L. (2025). *ESPAD Ireland 2024: Results from the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs.* 

Dublin: TobaccoFree Research Institute Ireland for the Department of Health Ireland.

ISBN: 978-1-90-045497-1

DOI: 10.21427/bqh8-5p87

© Copyright 2025 TobaccoFree Research Institute Ireland (TFRI), TU Dublin Published by the TobaccoFree Research Institute Ireland (TFRI) for the Department of Health Infographics and cover concept by Salome Sunday, layout by Dearbhla Gowen The report is available online at https://doi.org/10.21427/bqh8-5p87



# Contents

9	Prefa	ce	
10	Introd	duction	
12	Meth	odology	
23	CHO	Cigarettes, E-cigarettes, and Alternative Tobacco and Nicotine Products	SUMMARY
47	F	Alcohol	
62	St	Cannabis and Other Illicit Drugs and Substances	SUMMARY
83		Gambling, Gaming, and Social Media	SUMMARY
104	$\square$	Student Well-being, Substance Use Prevention, and Skills Training	SUMMARY
111	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	Trends in Teenager Substance Use 1995-2004	SUMMARY
120	TFRI	ESPAD Publications, 2015-2024	
123	ESPA	D Ireland 2024 Student Questionnaire	

ESPAD Ireland 2024 Supplementary Analysis Report. A Closer Look at Teenager Substance Use and Gambling through Family, Peer, and School Data



### List of Tables

- 24 Table 3.1 Cigarettes: prevalence of lifetime use
- 24 Table 3.2 Cigarettes: prevalence of use in the last 30 days
- 25 Table 3.3 Age of initiation of cigarette use
- 25 Table 3.4 Age of initiation of daily cigarette use
- 26 Table 3.5 Perceived availability of cigarettes
- 26 Table 3.6 Risk perception of trying cigarettes occasionally
- 27 Table 3.7 Risk perception of trying cigarettes regularly
- 27 Table 3.8 Associations between truancy and cigarette use
- 28 Table 3.9 Associations between parental monitoring and teenager cigarette use
- 28 Table 3.10 Associations between parental cigarette use and teenager cigarette use
- 28 Table 3.11 Associations between peer cigarette use and teenager cigarette use
- **30** Table 3.12 E-cigarettes: prevalence of lifetime use
- **30** Table 3.13 E-cigarettes: prevalence of use in the last 30 days, weekly use, and daily use
- **31** Table 3.14 Age of initiation of e-cigarette use
- **31** Table 3.15 Age of initiation of daily e-cigarette use
- 32 Table 3.16 Perceived availability of e-cigarettes
- 32 Table 3.17 Relationship with traditional cigarettes at first e-cigarette use
- 33 Table 3.18 Risk perception of occasional e-cigarette use
- **33** Table 3.19 Risk perception of regular e-cigarette use
- 34 Table 3.20 Content of e-cigarettes
- 34 Table 3.21 Reasons for trying e-cigarettes
- **35** Table 3.22 Types of posts seen on social media about e-cigarettes
- 37 Table 3.23 Associations between truancy and e-cigarette use
- **38** Table 3.24 Associations between parental monitoring and teenager e-cigarette use
- 38 Table 3.25 Associations between parental e-cigarette use and teenager e-cigarette use
- **39** Table 3.26 Associations between peer e-cigarette use and teenager e-cigarette use
- **39** Table 3.27 Water pipes: prevalence of lifetime use and of use in the last 30 days
- **40** Table 3.28 Moist snuff ('snus'): prevalence of lifetime use and of use in the last 30 days
- 40 Table 3.29 Heated tobacco products: prevalence of lifetime use and of use in the last 30 days
- 40 Table 3.30 Nicotine pouches: prevalence of lifetime use and of use in the last 30 days
- 41 Table 3.31 Age of initiation of moist snuff use
- 41 Table 3.32 Age of initiation of nicotine pouch use
- 42 Table 3.33 Lifetime use of cigarettes and/or e-cigarettes



- 42 Table 3.34 Current use of cigarettes and/or e-cigarettes
- 43 Table 3.35 Lifetime use of any nicotine product
- **43** Table 3.36 Current use of any nicotine product
- 48 Table 4.1 Alcohol: prevalence of lifetime use
- 49 Table 4.2 Alcohol: prevalence of use in the last 12 months
- 49 Table 4.3 Alcohol: prevalence of use in the last 30 days
- 50 Table 4.4 Last alcoholic drink consumed
- **50** Table 4.5 Alcohol: prevalence of lifetime intoxication
- 51 Table 4.6 Alcohol: prevalence of intoxication in the last 12 months
- 51 Table 4.7 Alcohol: prevalence of intoxication in the last 30 days
- 52 Table 4.8 Alcohol: prevalence of heavy episodic (binge) drinking in the last 30 days
- 52 Table 4.9 Age of initiation of alcohol use
- 53 Table 4.10 Age of first alcohol intoxication
- 53 Table 4.11 Sources of access to alcohol
- 54 Table 4.12 Risk perception of consuming 1-2 alcoholic drinks nearly every day
- 54 Table 4.13 Risk perception of consuming 4-5 alcoholic drinks nearly every day
- 55 Table 4.14 Risk perception of consuming 5 or more alcoholic drinks nearly every weekend
- 55 Table 4.15 Reasons for alcohol use
- 58 Table 4.16 Associations between truancy and alcohol use
- 58 Table 4.17 Associations between parental monitoring and teenager alcohol use
- 59 Table 4.18 Associations between parental alcohol use and teenager alcohol use
- 59 Table 4.19 Associations between peer alcohol use and teenager alcohol use
- 63 Table 5.1 Cannabis: prevalence of lifetime use
- 64 Table 5.2 Cannabis: prevalence of use in the last 12 months
- 64 Table 5.3 Cannabis: prevalence of use in the last 30 days
- 65 Table 5.4 Age of initiation of cannabis use
- **65** Table 5.5 Perceived availability of cannabis
- 66 Table 5.6 Number of opportunities to try cannabis without using it
- 66 Table 5.7 Use of Cannabis mixed with tobacco
- 66 Table 5.8 Risk perception of trying cannabis once or twice
- 67 Table 5.9 Risk perception of smoking cannabis occasionally
- 67 Table 5.10 Risk perception of smoking cannabis regularly
- **68** Table 5.11 Problem cannabis use in the last 12 months: Cannabis Abuse Screening Test (CAST) indicators
- **69** Table 5.12a Problem cannabis use in the last 12 months (total sample): Cannabis Abuse Screening Test (CAST)



- **69** Table 5.12b Problem cannabis use in the last 12 months among cannabis users: Cannabis Abuse Screening Test (CAST)
- 70 Table 5.13 Associations between truancy and cannabis use
- 70 Table 5.14 Associations between parental monitoring and teenager cannabis use
- 71 Table 5.15 Associations between parental cannabis use and teenager cannabis use
- 71 Table 5.16 Associations between peer cannabis use and teenager cannabis use
- 73 Table 5.17 Other illicit drugs and substances: prevalence of lifetime use
- 74 Table 5.18 Other illicit drugs and substances: prevalence of use in the last 12 months
- 75 Table 5.19 Perceived availability of other illicit drugs and substances
- 76 Table 5.20 Risk perception of other illicit drug and substance use
- 78 Table 5.21 New psychoactive substances: prevalence of lifetime use
- 78 Table 5.22 New psychoactive substances: prevalence of use in the last 12 months
- 79 Table 5.23 Content of new psychoactive substances
- 79 Table 5.24 Performance enhancers: prevalence of lifetime use
- 80 Table 5.25 Performance enhancers: sources of access
- 85 Table 6.1a Prevalence of gambling for money in the last 12 months (Direct Measure)
- 85 Table 6.1b Prevalence of gambling for money in the last 12 months (Composite Measure)
- 86 Table 6.2 Time spent gambling on a typical day in the last 12 months
- **86** Table 6.3 Frequency of gambling for more than 2 hours on a single occasion in the last 12 months
- 87 Table 6.4 Forms of on-site gambling
- 88 Table 6.5 Forms of online gambling
- 89 Table 6.6a Problem Gambling in the total sample (Measure 1)
- **90** Table 6.6b Problem Gambling among those who gambled (Measure 1)
- **91** Table 6.7a Indicators of Problem Gambling (Measure 2) in total sample responses to individual item statements
- **93** Table 6.7b Indicators of Problem Gambling among those who gambled (Measure 2) individual item responses
- **98** Table 6.8 Time spent gaming on a school day in the last 30 days
- 98 Table 6.9 Time spent gaming on a non-school day in the last 30 days
- 99 Table 6.10 Number of days spent gaming in the last 7 days
- 99 Table 6.11 Perception of time spent on gaming
- 100 Table 6.12 Perception of mood when time cannot be spent on gaming
- 100 Table 6.13 Parents' perception of time spent on gaming
- 101 Table 6.14 Perception of time spent on social media
- **101** Table 6.15 Perception of mood when time cannot be spent on social media



- 102 Table 6.16 Parents' perception of time spent on social media
- 104 Table 7.1 Responses to statements about well-being in last two weeks
- 105 Table 7.2 Level of well-being (low, moderate, or high)
- 105 Table 7.3 Participation in alcohol prevention activities
- 105 Table 7.4 Participation in tobacco prevention activities
- 106 Table 7.5 Participation in drugs (other than tobacco and alcohol) prevention activities
- 106 Table 7.6 Participation in gambling, gaming or internet disorder prevention activities
- 107 Table 7.7 Participation in training activities: social skills
- 107 Table 7.8 Participation in training activities: personal skills
- 107 Table 7.9 Participation in training activities: media literacy
- 108 Table 7.10 Delivery of prevention and training activities
- 108 Table 7.11 Location of prevention and training activities
- 112 Table 8.1 Trend in lifetime cigarette use 1995-2024
- 113 Table 8.2 Trend in last 30-day (current) cigarette use 1995-2024
- 114 Table 8.3 Trend in lifetime e-cigarette use 2015-2024
- 114 Table 8.4 Trend in last 30-day (current) e-cigarette use 2015-2024
- 115 Table 8.5 Trend in lifetime alcohol use 2007-2024
- 115 Table 8.6 Trend in last 30-day (current) alcohol use 1995-2024
- 116 Table 8.7 Trend in lifetime cannabis use 1995-2024
- 117 Table 8.8 Trend in last 30-day (current) cannabis use 2007-2024
- 118 Table 8.9 Trend in lifetime inhalant use 1999-2024
- 118 Table 8.10a Trend in last 12-month gambling (Direct Measure) 2015-2024
- 118 Table 8.10b Trend in last 12-month gambling (Composite Measure)\* 2019-2024





# List of Figures

- 111 Figure 8.1 Trend in lifetime cigarette use 1995-2024
- 112 Figure 8.2 Trend in last 30-day (current) cigarette use 1995-2024
- **113** Figure 8.3 Trend in lifetime e-cigarette use 2015-2024
- 114 Figure 8.4 Trend in last 30-day (current) e-cigarette use 2015-2024
- **115** Figure 8.5 Trend in lifetime alcohol use 2007-2024
- 116 Figure 8.6 Trend in last 30-day (current) alcohol use 1995-2024
- 117 Figure 8.7 Trend in lifetime cannabis use 1995-2024
- 117 Figure 8.8 Trend in last 30-day (current) cannabis use 2007-2024
- 119 Figure 8.9 Trend in last 12-month gambling (Composite Measure)\* 2019-2024





# Preface

The ESPAD Ireland 2024 Report represents the eighth data-collection wave of the European Schools Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs (ESPAD) carried out in Ireland, and the first wave since the Covid-19 pandemic. Some of the results were probably influenced by the pandemic. The longterm consequences of the pandemic will need careful monitoring and appropriate interventions.

The data reported here—and submitted to ESPAD Europe—comprises responses from 5,587 students, including 2,002 students born in 2008, who were aged 15-16 at the time of the survey. The fieldwork was conducted in a representative sample of Irish post-primary schools between March and May 2024.

These serial data sets, collected since 1995, enable us to monitor trends in use of alcohol, tobacco, nicotine, other drugs including illicit drug use such as cannabis and cocaine, as well as gambling, gaming, internet use, well-being, and other behaviours. These results allow us to report the present situation in Ireland, to compare Ireland with some 40 European countries, and to examine changes over the past 30 years in a wide number of behaviours. During that time nearly a million European students have answered the ESPAD Student Questionnaire.

The first ESPAD Europe report, with data from 1995, included information from 26 countries including Ireland, while the present eighth report, scheduled for publication in June 2025, contains results from 37 countries. ESPAD is widely regarded as one of the most reliable and frequently accessed sources of information on substance use and gambling among young people in Europe, with participation from both EU and non-EU countries.

The ESPAD project was initiated in 1993 by the Swedish Council for Information on Alcohol and Other Drugs (CAN) as a follow-up of a test of a European school-survey questionnaire funded by the Pompidou Group at the Council of Europe in a pilot study in 1986-1988. ESPAD now partners with the European Union Drugs Agency (EUDA) in Lisbon. This co-operation has deepened in recent years and includes support for data collection, analysis, and reporting as well as the hosting of an ESPAD Project Meeting and is now a shared project.

Students' participation is voluntary and anonymous, and no results are presented for individuals or single classes. Apart from using a common questionnaire and a commonly defined target population and data collection period, fieldwork practices as well as capture, cleaning, delivery and analyses of the data are carried out in standardised ESPAD fashion.

The data collections in individual countries are funded through national sources. In our case, the ESPAD Ireland student survey and report would not have been possible without financing by the Department of Health, through its Open Tender for Research Services for the European Schools Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs (ESPAD) 2024.

ESPAD Ireland relies on and greatly appreciates the gracious generosity of the principals, teachers, and support staff in schools throughout Ireland who facilitate us in the data collection despite numerous competing demands. We thank especially the 5,587 post-primary school students who made it possible for us to achieve a representative sample in this 2024 post-pandemic wave of ESPAD Ireland and without whom there would be no survey.

Luce Clancy

Luke Clancy Director General, Tobacco Free Research Institute Ireland (TFRI), May 2025

ToC

9



# Introduction

# Background

The European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs (ESPAD) is a cross-sectional study of substance use and other forms of risk behaviour among students in Europe aged 15-16 years. Carried out every four years since 1995, there was, exceptionally, a five-year gap between ESPAD 2019 and ESPAD 2024. The main purpose of ESPAD is to collect comparable data on substance use and other forms of risk behaviour in order to monitor trends within, as well as between, countries.

Between 1995 and 2024, eight waves of data collection were conducted across some 49 European countries. Ireland has participated in all eight waves. This report presents selected key results for use of each substance, with additional data analyses presented the linked Supplementary Analysis Report linked to this report. The 2024 ESPAD Ireland data collection took place during spring 2024 in a nationally representative sample of post-primary schools and, in total, 5587 participated, of whom 2002 students were born in 2008.

The ESPAD questionnaire contains a core set of questions that tracks key long-term trends and is also constantly adapted to include new topics responding to changes in substance use and the emergence of new risk behaviours among adolescents throughout Europe. Additions in recent cycles include questions about use of e-cigarettes, nicotine pouches, social media, new synthetic drugs, and new psychoactive substances. Screening instruments for high-risk use of cannabis and gambling have also been added in recent cycles. The ESPAD Ireland 2024 survey contained over 500 variables.

The ESPAD data are intended to deepen understanding of adolescent risk behaviours, to contribute to policy formation on adolescent substance use, and to provide the most up-to-date information for policymakers and practitioners who devise and implement intervention strategies. The TobaccoFree Research Institute Ireland (TFRI), whose main research focus is providing the evidence base for smoking, e-cigarettes, and alternative tobacco and nicotine products, has published numerous articles in the last ten years on tobacco-related topics based on ESPAD data. Likewise, it has published work on alcohol use, drug use, and gambling, and links between use of these substances that may be explained by, for example, the Common Liability Theory based on these data. A list of linked TFRI peer-reviewed publications using ESPAD data is provided at the end of this report.

# Content of the Report

The aim of this report is to provide the main findings from the ESPAD Ireland 2024 survey. This report presents selected key results on use of tobacco, alcohol, and drugs (prevalence estimates; high-risk use; availability; risk perception; age of initiation); prevalence of gambling and problem gambling; self-perceived problem gaming and social media use; and associations with key variables.

# Structure of the Report

The main body of the report presents findings by chapter on tobacco, alcohol, drugs, gambling, gaming, and social media.



### Tobacco, Nicotine, Alcohol, Cannabis, Other Drugs and Substances

ESPAD Ireland 2024 provides information on prevalence estimates of use of substances including cigarettes, e-cigarettes, alternative tobacco and nicotine products, alcohol, cannabis and other illicit drugs, inhalants, and new psychoactive substances (Chapters 3, 4, and 5). Prevalence estimates for substances are presented for lifetime, last-year, last 30-day (current), weekly, and daily use, as per the questionnaire, along with prevalence estimates of intensive and high-risk substance use, where available in the questionnaire. Age of initiation of use of substances, perceived availability of substances, and the perceived risk associated with occasional and regular use of substances are detailed. For each of the substances described, analyses are presented for four additional variables that we have found in previous ESPAD research to be associated with use of the substance<sup>1 2 3 4 5</sup>: school absence through truancy, parental monitoring, parental use of the substance, and peer use of the substance.

#### Gambling, Gaming, and Social Media Use

Prevalence estimates of gambling for money, including online gambling, estimates of the proportion of students who gamble and display problem gambling behaviour, and prevalence estimates of gaming, as well as of self-perceived problem use of gaming and social media are presented in Chapter 6.

#### Well-Being, Prevention, and Training Activities

For the first time in ESPAD Ireland, we report on student well-being using a 5-item scale. Also for the first time, we report on whether students participated in prevention activities related to smoking, alcohol, drugs, or gambling and on whether they had received any interactive training on social skills, personal skills, or media literacy; who delivered the training and where it was delivered. These results are detailed in Chapter 7.

#### Trends in Substance Use 1995-2024

Overall ESPAD Ireland trends, between 1995 and 2024, in use of substances and gambling are detailed in Chapter 8.

#### **Associations with Use of Substances**

Throughout the report, all data are presented by gender, showing responses separately for those who respond male or female, as well as for those who prefer not to say whether they are male or female. In addition to data on use of substances, gambling, gaming, and social media, ESPAD Ireland collects a wide variety of sociodemographic, familial, peer, and behavioural data, with in excess of 500 variables in total. Several hundred additional data analyses are provided in the linked **Supplementary Analysis Report**, showing associations between these variables and use of various substances, and providing analyses indicating where differences between observed and expected outcomes are statistically significant.

- 1 Friends and Family Matter Most: a trend analysis of increasing e-cigarette use among Irish teenagers and sociodemographic, personal, peer and familial associations. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. *BMC Public Health* 21, 1988 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-12113-9
- 2 The associations of parental smoking, quitting and habitus with teenager e-cigarette, smoking, alcohol and other drug use in GUI Cohort '98. Sunday S, Clancy L, Hanafin J. Sci Rep. (2023) Nov 16;13(1):20105, doi: 10.1038/s41598-023-47061-4.
- 3 Sociodemographic, personal, peer, and familial predictors of e-cigarette ever-use in ESPAD Ireland: A forward stepwise logistic regression model. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. *Tobacco Induced Diseases* (2022); 20 (February), doi: https://doi.org/10.18332/tid/144234.
- 4 ESPAD 2019 Ireland: Results from the European Schools Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs in Ireland. Sunday S, Keogan S, Hanafin J, Clancy L. (2020). Dublin: TFRI. 2020. ISBN: 978-0-9557528-4-1, doi: https://doi.org/10.21427/9tfn-s318.
- 5 E-cigarettes and smoking in Irish teens: a logistic regression analysis of current (past 30-day) use of e-cigarettes. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. *J Public Health (Berl.)* (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-021-01610-1



# Methodology

### ESPAD Ireland: the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and other Drugs

ESPAD Ireland is conducted approximately every four years in collaboration with research teams in 35-40 other countries and the ESPAD Europe Coordinating Team. Participating researchers from all countries co-operate in relation to survey content, methodology, and timing, and an international protocol is developed. Strict adherence to the protocol is required for inclusion in the ESPAD international database and this has been achieved with the ESPAD Ireland 2024 survey.

# Sample and Sampling Procedures

The ESPAD target population is defined as students who reach the age of 16 years in the calendar year of the survey and who are present in the classroom on the day of the survey, so that 15-16-yearolds across the participating countries can be compared. Students who are enrolled in regular, vocational, general, or academic studies are included; in Ireland, this comprises students in all postprimary (second-level) schools, secondary, vocational, and community/comprehensive. Those who are enrolled in either special schools or special classes for students with learning disorders or severe disabilities are excluded. A homogeneous and standardised sampling design is used across the 35-40 ESPAD countries to select the target population.

In 2024, the target population comprised all students born in 2008. The target student group in Ireland is found across several year-groups in post-primary schools (JC3, TY, and LC1/3rd, 4th, and 5th year). In order to provide a representative national sample of students in the target year, a sample of schools was chosen based on defined stratification criteria:

- school size (small, medium, large);
- school type (secondary, vocational, community/comprehensive);
- gender (boys, girls, mixed);
- religious affiliation (Catholic, Church of Ireland, inter-denominational);
- fee-paying/non fee-paying;
- school-level disadvantage status (DEIS vs Non-DEIS);
- geographical region.

The list of all post-primary (secondary/second-level) schools in Ireland available from the Department of Education Ireland website, which contains data on the stratification criteria used, was used, https://www.gov.ie/en/department-of-education/collections/data-on-individual-schools/. For the purposes of generating a nationally representative stratified random sample and also of managing data collection for ESPAD Ireland 2024, we collaborated with technical expert, Martin Wallace of Dovetail Technologies Ltd Ireland. Initial analysis indicated that 25-28 schools would provide the required sample size. Computer-generated algorithms were used to generate 10 separate stratified random samples of 28 schools so that each sample met all stratification criteria, with schools in numbers proportionate to their numbers in the population based on the stratification criteria we had defined and that are listed above. Additionally, two substitute lists of 28 schools were generated for each random sample of schools in case of refusal of a school on the first list (n=56). Each of these computer-generated samples was inspected and the sample with the optimum



geographical representation was chosen (Sample 5). As two matched substitute schools for each school was identified, in the case of school refusal or dropout, a substitute pre-matched school from the sampling process was used to ensure comparability and representativeness. This occurred in the case of 3 schools in total.

To achieve representativeness as regards the target sample, sampling included all three year-groups (JC3, TY, LC1). The List of Post-Primary Schools provides detailed information on how many students are in each of these year-groups, but there are no available data on the number of students per year-group who were born in 2008. Following consultation with school personnel, all students in each of the three year-groups were included in the sampling frame for administrative reasons.

# **Obtained Sample**

Our sampling procedure generated a total sample of 5,587 students in 269 classes (in the three year-groups) in 28 schools. Of these, 2,002 students were born in 2008 and their responses were extracted into a separate database. This database was cleaned centrally by the ESPAD Coordinating Team and by the Irish team at TFRI, conforming to the criteria that were applied across all 37 ESPAD countries, described below in the section *Data Cleaning*. This resulted in a final analytic sample of 1,880 students in Ireland born in 2008, comparable with students in other ESPAD countries, and used for the analyses presented in this report.

# Survey Instrument: Questionnaire Amendment and Web Administration

The ESPAD survey instrument consists of core, optional, and country-specific questions. The crosssectional survey questionnaire is largely homogenous for ESPAD participating countries, allowing comparisons to be made across some 40 participating countries. Furthermore, the questionnaire is largely consistent from one cycle to the next, allowing comparisons to be made over time, both within and across countries. All countries must use core questions which constitute the majority of questions on the questionnaire. Each country decides which of the optional questions they include or exclude. ESPAD also allows for the introduction of some new questions at each cycle that take account of changes in substance use over time. Moreover, ESPAD allows for the inclusion of a small number of country-specific questions, should that be desired. In 2015, using this mechanism, ESPAD Ireland included questions on e-cigarettes for the first time, being the only ESPAD country to do so. These questions were subsequently included as core questions for all ESPAD countries and further developed in 2019 and 2024.

For ESPAD countries such as Ireland, participating in the central online data collection process in 2024, all work on questionnaire amendment and development was carried out on the online LimeSurvey platform provided and overseen by the ESPAD Coordination Team. One of the PIs acted as the English-speaking IT operator proficient in working within the LimeSurvey environment to amend and develop the ESPAD Ireland questionnaire, having received the necessary training carried out by the ESPAD Coordination Team, and was responsible for customising the country-specific questionnaire, including hiding optional questions that we did not wish to include in the student questionnaire, and adding country-specific questions. We used these country-specific questions to collect data on, for example, the emerging use in Ireland of newer drugs such as fentanyl and nitazenes, and the exposure of teenagers to messaging about e-cigarettes on social media platforms.



# Liaison with Schools

Survey administration commenced in late 2023 when initial contact was made with schools via an invitation letter sent by email, followed up by telephone call and email. A letter of support from Minister Naughton TD was included with the invitation, along with introductory details about ESPAD 2024. Once initial contact was established, or agreement to participate received, a follow-up email was sent containing information leaflets for parents and students, and passive consent forms. More intensive follow-up of the first contact was required for most schools before agreement to participate was confirmed, and ongoing contacts were required to identify designated teachers and agree the participating classes. In the case of some schools, contact to secure agreement was needed until close to the end of the survey administration period.

## Training and Support for Designated Teachers and Schools

In advance of data collection, written and oral training and support were provided for designated teachers and schools. We developed a PowerPoint training and troubleshooting presentation and ancillary material which was sent to school principals, designated teachers, and additional class teachers responsible for administering the survey, both in advance of the survey and when distributing the survey platform access codes (tokens), and usually again on the day of survey administration if there was any time lapse between distribution of codes and administration of survey. Before the day of the survey, we spoke to the designated teachers about how the survey would be administered, addressing any possible concerns that they had or potential issues that they envisaged and stressing the importance of student privacy during survey administration. When we were distributing the access codes (tokens) to the schools by email, we also provided a further written guide to administering the survey.

# Data Collection and Survey Administration

Data collection was carried out between 20 March 2024 and 20 May 2024. For countries administering the survey on the central online platform, the ESPAD Coordination Team required operators responsible for managing the distribution of 'tokens' (codes/passwords to access the online platform) to participating schools in a traceable manner. This was carried out by the PIs and involved the identification of class groups within each participating school; the assignment of consistent codes to identify grades/class years and types; the liaising with the ESPAD Coordination Team to receive tokens; the distribution of tokens to relevant school personnel; and the resolution of any issues that designated teachers/survey leaders encountered in accessing the platform during the administration phase, or in advance. The PIs also liaised with the ESPAD Coordination Team during live survey administration regarding technical issues as needed.

# Management of Survey Administration

To manage the overall survey administration, we used a bespoke structured web-based management system called TFRI ESPAD Ireland School Outreach (TFRI-EISOP). This utilised "PowerApps" from the Microsoft Power Platform, a collection of low-code development tools that allows users to build databases, automate workflows, and analyse data. TFRI-EISOP was devised, developed, and improved iteratively in conjunction with our project Technology consultant Martin Wallace, Director, Dovetail Technologies Ltd. From the sampling procedure to the final sign-off to schools, this facilitated keeping a data base, recording all sampled schools, and identifying suitable substitute schools when required.



Within TFRI-EISOP was a record of all relevant contact details, emails sent, telephone calls made, responses received, and plans for recontact including distribution of reminders. It also included all details of survey scheduling with dates, times, and class details, including estimates of student numbers, as well as training requested and supplied via the PowerPoint Training presentation and back-up telephone and Zoom calls. The estimation and distribution of codes was also managed within TFRI-EISOP. Updated in real time, a main benefit of TFRI-EISOP was the automated workflow that assigned schools within specific "queues", indicating where they were on the Timeline for survey administration, and the automated movement of schools from one queue to the next appropriate one. These multiple queues included all stages from First Contact Made to Survey Complete to Thank You Message Sent to School. For the PIs, it meant that it was immediately evident at all times within the App at what point schools were at in the survey process, and also what actions were needed in order to gain assent to participation in ESPAD Ireland and all subsequent steps. The TFRI-EISOP, using "PowerApps", was a useful tool in achieving the high level of school consent in this wave of the survey.

Using TFRI-EISOP and these data, the PIs next provided a detailed schedule of planned survey administrations that allowed the ESPAD Coordination Team to ensure that the centralised system, using Limesurvey, could handle multiple concurrent accesses by schools. We held regular online meetings with, and remained in regular email contact with, the ESPAD Coordination Team, making timely requests for codes and notifying the Team of any planned or unexpected changes with regards to schools, dates, times, assigned class designations, and tokens. Lists of tokens were provided to schools in good time and there was no instance of any school not having the required access codes and full access information on the nominated day of their survey.

On the day of the survey, data were collected by self-complete questionnaires via the online portal, using Limesurvey. Students completed the questionnaires anonymously on devices including desktop computers, laptops, tablets, and personal telephones in their classrooms, school halls, and specialist computer laboratories. They were supervised by school principals, deputy principals, and designated teachers who also completed classroom reports for ESPAD indicating the numbers of students present, absent, and refusing. Schools scheduled between 40 and 60 minutes for questionnaire completion. There were no internet/broadband problems in any school. On the day of survey administration, the PIs were in contact before and after the survey administration, and during the survey if needed, as occurred on many occasions. When the survey was complete, we thanked the schools by email and asked for any observations or identification of problems. Apart from some comments about length of the survey (especially for students with learning needs), schools seemed satisfied with the process.

# Student Privacy During Survey Administration

The importance of student privacy was stressed when liaising with designated teachers who were themselves very attuned to student privacy issues. The importance of privacy was also underlined in information sheets/instructions/training materials to survey administrators. Additionally, as numbers in classrooms were generally much smaller than the classrooms were capable of accommodating, there were no issues with overcrowding which could lead to breaches of privacy. As regards device selection, a relatively small number of schools completed the survey in computer classrooms/ labs with desktops/PCs, while most used handheld devices including iPads and laptops/tablets, and especially mobile telephones. This allowed for easier privacy implementation than in computer labs with large desktop computer monitors.



The PIs monitored the Limesurvey platform in real time during survey administration. Spot interrogation of randomly chosen variables was carried out and completion rates per class, per school, and intra-school were examined and compared. Attention to responses and completion rates were comparable across the country.

# Ethics

A scientific ethical review for the 2024 ESPAD Ireland study was carried out by the PIs at TFRI, which is located at TU Dublin. Approval was granted by TU Dublin's Research Ethics & Integrity Committee (REIC), (No. REC-23-27). As in previous ESPAD cycles, passive student and parental consent was used. Students were informed at the time of the distribution of information sheets that participation was voluntary and again at the time of survey administration. The first page of the survey questionnaire, which the survey administrator (designated teacher) on the day was asked to read out to the students, again informed students that they did not have to participate if they did not wish to do so. Passive parental consent required parents to sign and return a form if they refused to allow their child to participate in the survey.

# Measures

### **Cigarette Use**

Students were asked whether they had ever smoked cigarettes (excluding e-cigarettes and alternative tobacco and nicotine products), with response categories including whether they had smoked in the last 30 days, in the last 12 months but not in the last 30 days, more than 12 months ago, or never. Additionally, data were collected on the frequency of smoking and the number of cigarettes smoked in the last 30 days, with response options such as 'Not at all', 'Less than 1 cigarette a week', 'Less than 1 cigarette a day', '1-5 cigarettes a day', '6-10 cigarettes a day', '11-20 cigarettes a day', and 'More than 20 cigarettes a day'. Lifetime prevalence was based on responses indicating whether students had smoked in the last 30 days, in the last 12 months but not in the last 30 days, or more than 12 months ago, while last 30-day prevalence was determined based on those who reported smoking in the last 30 days. The method used to assess last 30-day (current) smoking in this report differs from that used in 2019, where current smoking was based on the question: 'How often have you smoked cigarettes (excluding e-cigarettes) during the LAST 30 DAYS?', with response options ranging from 'Not at all' to 'More than 20 cigarettes per day'. Therefore, a direct comparison between the 2024 results and the 2019 results may not be accurate.

### **Electronic Cigarette Use**

Students were asked whether they had used e-cigarettes, with response categories including whether they had used e-cigarettes in the last 30 days, in the last 12 months but not in the last 30 days, more than 12 months ago, or never. Frequency of e-cigarette use in the last 30 days was also collected with response options of 'Not at all', 'Less than once per week', 'At least once a week', and 'Almost every day or every day'. Lifetime prevalence was based on responses indicating whether students had used e-cigarettes in the last 30 days, in the last 12 months but not in the last 30 days, or more than 12 months ago, while last 30-day prevalence was based on those who reported using e-cigarettes in the last 30 days. The method used to assess last 30-day (current) e-cigarette use in this report differs slightly from that used in 2019, where current e-cigarette use was based on the question: 'How often have you smoked e-cigarettes during the LAST 30 DAYS?', with response options ranging from 'Not at all' to 'Almost every day'. Therefore, a direct comparison between the 2024 results and the 2019 results may not be accurate. Additionally, students were asked about the contents of the e-cigarettes they used, both during the last 30 days and at the time of their first





### **Alternative Tobacco and Nicotine Product Use**

Students were asked about their use of alternative tobacco and nicotine products, including water pipe (shisha), moist snuff ('snus'), heated tobacco products, and nicotine pouches. They were required to indicate whether they had used these products in the last 30 days, in the last 12 months but not in the last 30 days, more than 12 months ago, or never. For each product, responses indicating use in the last 30 days, in the last 12 months but not in the last 30 days, and more than 12 months ago were used to assess lifetime prevalence, while last 30-day prevalence was based on those who reported using these products in the last 30 days.

### **Alcohol Use**

Students were asked about their alcohol use and intoxication in their lifetime, during the last 12 months, and in the last 30 days. Response categories for the number of drinking occasions included '0', '1-2', '3-5', '6-9', '10-19', '20-39', and '40 or more'. Prevalence for alcohol use were calculated for lifetime, last 12 months, and last 30 days, along with the prevalence of intoxication during these periods. Students were also asked how many times they have consumed different types of alcoholic beverages, including beer, cider, premixed drinks (such as spritz or alcopops), wine, and spirits. The response options for each beverage type were '0', '1-2', '3-5', '6-9', '10-19', '20-39', and '40 or more' occasions. Heavy episodic drinking was defined as consuming at least five alcoholic drinks on a single occasion at least once in the last 30 days. Students were also asked how they usually get alcohol, when they last drank alcohol, and how intoxicated they felt on that occasion, using a scale from 1 (not at all) to 10 (heavily intoxicated, not remembering what happened), with an additional option for those who never drink alcohol. Additionally, students were asked about their reasons for drinking alcohol in the last 12 months, with response options ranging from 'Never' to 'Always' for various reasons such as to get high, to improve mood, and fitting in with peers.

### **Cannabis Use**

Students were asked about their cannabis use in their lifetime, the last 12 months, and the last 30 days, with response categories ranging from '0' to '40 or more' occasions. Prevalence rates were calculated for lifetime, last 12 months, and last 30-day use. Students were also asked if they have ever had the possibility to try cannabis without trying it and the type of cannabis used in the last 12 months. Those who used cannabis in the last 12 months were asked about the frequency of cannabis experiences including: (1) smoking before midday; (2) smoking alone; (3) experiencing memory problems after use; (4) being advised by friends or family to reduce use; (5) unsuccessful attempts to quit or reduce use; and (6) having problems due to cannabis use (e.g., arguments, accidents, or poor school performance). Response options ranged from 'Never' to 'Very often'. These six items were also used to calculate a Cannabis Abuse Screening Test (CAST) score, which indicates for possible cannabis-related problems<sup>6</sup>. Each question was scored as either 0 or 1, with a score of 1 assigned if participants responded 'From time to time' or more frequently for the first two questions, and 'Rarely' or more frequently for the remaining four questions, giving a total CAST score between 0 and 6. A total score of 2 or more was used to indicate high-risk cannabis use.

ToC

**ESPAD** 

<sup>6</sup> Assessing the structure of the CAST (Cannabis Abuse Screening Test) in 13 European countries using multigroup analyses. Legleye, S., Eslami, A. and Bougeard, S. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*. (2017) 26 (1), p. e1552, doi: 10.1002/mpr.1552.



### **Other Illicit Drug and Substance Use**

Students were asked about their use of other illicit drugs and substances in their lifetime and in the last 12 months, using response categories of '0', '1-2', and '3 or more' occasions for substances such as ecstasy, amphetamine, methamphetamine, synthetic cannabinoids, synthetic cathinones, synthetic opioids, cocaine, crack, heroin, inhalants, LSD or some other hallucinogens, magic mushrooms, drugs by injection with a needle, alcohol together with pills, anabolic steroids, fentanyl, GHB and new psychoactive substances, and performance enhancers. Lifetime prevalence was based on use on at least one occasion. Students were asked how many times they had used new psychoactive substances (NPS) in their lifetime and in the last 12 months, with response options ranging from '0' to '3 or more times' and 'Don't know/not sure'. Those who reported use in the last 12 months were also asked about the form in which the substances were taken. Options included herbal smoking mixtures, powders, crystals or tablets, liquids with drug-like effects, and other forms.

### Gambling

Students were asked about their gambling behaviour in the last 12 months, including the frequency of their gambling and the types of games played on-site and online (playing on slot machines, playing cards or dice for money, playing the lottery, betting on sports or animal races), with response options ranging from 'I have not gambled' to '2-3 times or more a week'. Gambling prevalence was calculated in two separate ways, based on students' self-reports of gambling for money in the last 12 months. The first measure of gambling prevalence (Gambling Direct Measure) calculated students' responses to the question 'How often (if ever) did you gamble for money in the LAST 12 MONTHS?'. This is the measure that was used in previous ESPAD Ireland and ESPAD Europe reports. The second measure of gambling prevalence (Gambling Composite Measure) was calculated as the rate of those who had gambled for money on at least one of the four games of chance (playing on slot machines, playing cards or dice for money, playing the lottery, betting on sports or animal races) in the last 12 months. Thus, students were classified as having engaged in gambling if they reported gambling for money in the last 12 months (Gambling Direct Measure) or indicated participation in any of the identified on-site or online gambling activities: slot machines; card games; lotteries; sports betting (Gambling Composite Measure). The Gambling (Composite Measure) was reported for the first time in the ESPAD Europe 2019 report and we also previously reported it in 2023<sup>7</sup>. We report both measures for comparison purposes with previous reports; however, the Gambling Composite Measure approach is believed to produce a more reliable estimate of gambling prevalence than the Gambling Direct Measure approach<sup>8</sup>.

Two separate measures indicating Problem Gambling were used.

The Lie/Bet Questionnaire<sup>9</sup>, a two-question screening tool, was used to assess the proportion of gamblers with problem gambling behaviour. The two questions used in the tool are 'Have you ever lied to family and friends about how much money you have spent on gambling?' and 'Have you ever felt that you needed to gamble for more and more money?'. Responses were categorised as 'Yes' = 1 and 'No' = 0, and individuals who answered 'Yes' to either question were considered to have problem gambling behaviour. We report percentages both for the total sample and among those who gamble for money.

<sup>7</sup> Children and gambling – evidence to inform regulation and responses in Ireland. H McAvoy, CME Reynolds, S Sunday, J Hanafin, L Clancy (2023). Dublin: Institute of Public Health and TFRI. https://doi.org/10.14655/11971-1084912

<sup>8</sup> Prevalence of youth gambling and potential influence of substance use and other risk factors throughout 33 European countries: first results from the 2015 ESPAD study. Molinaro, S., Benedetti, E., Scalese, M., Bastiani, L., Fortunato, L., Cerrai, S., Canale, N., et al., *Addiction* (2018) 113 (10), pp. 1862-1873, doi: 10.1111/ add.14275.

<sup>9</sup> The Lie/Bet Questionnaire for screening pathological gamblers. Johnson, E. E., Hamer, R., Nora, R. M., Tan, B., Eisenstein, N. and Engelhart, C. *Psychological Reports* (1997) 80 (1), pp. 83-88, doi: 10.2466/pr0.1997.80.1.83.



In the second Problem Gambling measure, we report on students' responses to twelve item statements that indicate problem gambling. Students who gambled in the last 12 months were asked about gambling behaviours such as frequency of efforts to win back losses ('Never', Some of the time', 'Most of the time', 'Every time'), and their agreement ('Yes'/'No' options) with 11 statements including lying about winnings, financial or social problems caused by their gambling, and difficulties controlling their gambling. We also report the overall percentages who respond "Yes' to any of the indicators, both for the total sample and among those who gamble for money.

### Gaming and Social Media/Internet Use

Students were asked to report their gaming and social media habits. Gaming habits were assessed by asking students how many days they had played games on electronic devices (e.g., computers, tablets, consoles, smartphones) in the last 30 days and the average number of hours spent gaming in the last 7 days, also distinguishing between school and non-school days. The response categories included 'None', 'Half an hour or less', 'About 1 hour', 'About 2-3 hours', 'About 4-5 hours', and '6 hours or more'. Students were asked to rate their agreement with statements about their gaming habits and time spent on social media. These included statements regarding their time spent gaming/on social media, the impact on their mood, and parental concerns, using a five-point scale from 'Strongly agree' to 'Strongly disagree'. In addition, students were asked about the potential negative consequences of gaming over the past 12 months, such as gaming despite stress or conflict with others, neglecting responsibilities, or experiencing negative impacts on school performance, personal appearance, and relationships.

Students were also asked about their internet-use behaviours, including difficulties with stopping or limiting internet use, the impact of internet use on sleep, relationship with others, and daily responsibilities, as well as feelings from internet use such as restlessness or using the internet to cope with negative feelings. These items were rated on a five-point scale from 'Never' to 'Very often'. Finally, students reported how often they saw different types of e-cigarette-related content on social media platforms such as Instagram, TikTok, Snapchat, and Facebook. These included posts with hashtags, promotional content, e-cigarette challenges, and posts highlighting both positive and negative portrayals of e-cigarettes, using a six-point scale ranging from 'Never' to 'More than 20 times a day'.

### **General Well-Being**

Students were asked to rate how they had been feeling over the past two weeks by responding to five statements including: feeling cheerful and in good spirits, feeling calm and relaxed, feeling active and vigorous, waking up feeling fresh and rested, and feeling that their daily life is filled with things that interest them. Response options ranged from 'All the time' to 'At no time'. Responses were recoded, with those who selected 'At no time' considered to have not experienced the feeling, and all other responses grouped as having experienced it. A well-being score was then calculated by summing responses across the five items, producing a total score ranging from 0 to 5. Students were classified into three categories based on their total score: Low level of well-being (scores  $\leq 2$ ), Moderate well-being (scores 3-4), and High level of well-being (score = 5).

### **Perceived Availability of Substances**

Perceived availability was used as a proxy measure of how easy or difficult students believe it is to obtain substances such as cigarettes, alcohol, and illicit drugs. Students were asked to assess the difficulty of obtaining these substances if they wanted to, with response options ranging from 'Impossible' to 'Very easy', and 'Don't know'.



### **Risk Perception of Substance Use**

Students were asked to evaluate the perceived risk of harm associated with various substance-use behaviours, including smoking cigarettes, using e-cigarettes, consuming alcohol, and using illicit drugs such as cannabis, ecstasy, amphetamines, synthetic cannabinoids, and opioids, with response options: 'No risk', 'Slight risk', 'Moderate risk', 'Great risk', and 'Don't know'.

### Age of Initiation of Substance Use

Students were asked how old they were when they used a particular substance for the first time (cigarettes, e-cigarettes, alcohol, cannabis, nicotine pouches, moist snuff), started to use it on a daily basis (cigarettes, e-cigarettes), and experienced excessive use (alcohol intoxication). The response categories ranged from 'Never', '9 years old or less' to '16 years or older'.

### **Factors Considered in the Analysis**

Factors associated with the use of substances were examined based on demographic, socioeconomic, behavioural, familial, and peer characteristics. These included gender, parental education, perceived family wealth, parental rule-setting, and parental monitoring, such as awareness of their child's whereabouts and activities. Parental and peer influences, including smoking, e-cigarette use, alcohol use, and gambling habits, were also analysed. Additionally, students' satisfaction with relationships with parents and friends, school absenteeism, and academic performance were considered as potential factors. Perceived parental reactions to their children's behaviours such as drinking or gambling were analysed for their associations with students' substance use. Some of these findings are reported in the main body of the text, and are also presented in the linked Supplementary Analysis Report.

# Data Cleaning

The data were cleaned in two main steps. In the first step, missing responses were only recoded as 'No', and only when there was no indication of use. This was done for the different substances including cigarettes, e-cigarettes, alcohol, and drugs. If someone reported using a substance in the last 30 days, their lifetime use was automatically marked as 'Yes' to ensure consistency. For multiple-choice questions, responses with all options left blank were recoded as missing.

The second step removed invalid responses in three ways. First, any responses missing gender information were removed. Then, responses with more than half of the main questions omitted were removed. Finally, responses that showed repetitive extreme response patterns were removed. For example, if someone claimed to use alcohol 40 times or more or illicit drug use 3+ times across several questions, their response was considered unreliable and removed from the dataset. Cases showing extreme responses in more than half of these response categories were deleted. The data cleaning method used in this report differs slightly from that used in 2019, so a direct comparison between the 2024 results and the 2019 results may not be accurate.

# Data Analysis

Statistical analysis was done in two stages. First, cross-tabulations and chi-square tests were conducted to determine prevalence rates of substance use behaviours by gender. Then, the associations between substance use and demographic, socioeconomic, and behavioural characteristics collected in the survey were examined. Each substance use behaviour was analysed at three time points – lifetime, last 12 months (where available), and last 30-day use – to assess both lifetime and current use.





In this report, the questions on lifetime and last 30-day use differed across substances. For instance, smoking and e-cigarette use were assessed using a single question with response options that included both lifetime and current use (e.g., 'Yes, in the last 30 days', 'Yes, more than 12 months ago', 'Never'). This allowed for a combined analysis of lifetime and current use patterns. In contrast, cannabis and alcohol use were measured using separate questions for lifetime use and frequency of use during different time periods (last 12 months and last 30 days), with responses categorised by number of occasions (ranging from 0 to 40 or more times). Due to these differences, smoking and e-cigarette results are presented combining lifetime and current use, while alcohol and cannabis analyses are presented separately for lifetime and current use where possible (e.g., crosstabs with other substance) but combined in one table with separate *p*-values for all other crosstabs. Statistical significance was set at p<0.05. *P*-values with two decimal places were kept as is, while those with three were rounded to two. All analyses were performed using SPSS version 26. For all rows except the Total row, percentages in parentheses are column percentages within gender. For Total rows, percentages represent row percentages out of the total sample.





Cigarettes, **E-Cigarettes**, and Alternative **Tobacco and Nicotine Products** 









Percentage of students who ever smoked



Of students who ever smoked



**91.0%** Ever Used E-cigarettes





**29.3%** participated in **Tobacco Prevention** activities



# Introduction

ESPAD 2024 asked students about many aspects of use of cigarettes, e-cigarettes, and alternative tobacco and nicotine products including prevalence, age of initiation, availability, and risk associated with use. For the first time in ESPAD, use of nicotine pouches was measured. The main findings are outlined in this chapter, and additional data analyses of associations with use of these products that are not reported here are presented in the linked **Supplementary Analysis Report**. All questions pertaining to cigarettes, e-cigarettes, and alternative tobacco and nicotine products are as shown in the ESPAD Ireland 2024 Student Questionnaire in Appendix A.

# Cigarettes

### **Prevalence of Cigarette Use**

Almost one in four (23.7%) students reported having ever smoked cigarettes (lifetime smoking). Prevalence was higher for female students (24.7%) than for male students (21.7%) and highest of all for students who preferred not to say if they were male or female (51.4%). Last 30-day smoking (current smoking) was reported at 11.7%, again higher for female students (12.9%) than for male students (9.9%). About 2% of students reported being daily smokers. These are the lowest reported figures for prevalence of ever, current, and daily smoking among 15- and 16-year-olds in the thirty years that ESPAD surveys have been carried out in Ireland.

Occasions Smoked	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
None	1432 (76.3)	709 (78.3)	706 (75.3)	17 (48.6)
Ever smoked	446 (23.7)	196 (21.7)	232 (24.7)	18 (51.4)
Last 30 days	219 (11.7)	90 (9.9)	121 (12.9)	8 (22.9)
Last 12 months	130 (6.9)	59 (6.5)	63 (6.7)	8 (22.9)
More than 12 months	97 (5.2)	47 (5.2)	48 (5.1)	2 (5.7)
Total	1878 (100.0)	905 (48.2)	938 (50.0)	35 (1.8)

#### Table 3.1 Cigarettes: prevalence of lifetime use

p<0.001

#### Table 3.2 Cigarettes: prevalence of use in the last 30 days

Smoking Frequency	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Not at all	1709 (91.0)	832 (92.0)	851 (90.6)	26 (74.3)
Less than 1 cigarette per week	94 (5.0)	51 (5.6)	41 (4.4)	2 (5.7)
Less than 1 cigarette per day	36 (1.9)	10 (1.1)	25 (2.7)	1 (2.9)
Daily smoker	39 (2.1)	11 (1.2)	22 (2.3)	6 (17.2)
1-5 cigarettes per day	20 (1.1)	5 (0.6)	12 (1.3)	3 (8.6)
6-10 cigarettes per day	7 (0.4)	3 (0.3)	4 (0.4)	0 (0.0)
11-20 cigarettes per day	4 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	3 (0.3)	0 (0.0)
More than 20 cigarettes per day	8 (0.4)	2 (0.2)	3 (0.3)	3 (8.6)
Total	1878 (100)	904 (48.1)	939 (50.0)	35 (1.9)

p<0.001

Summary



### Age of Initiation of Cigarette Use

Age 14 years was the age most commonly reported for smoking initiation (7.2%). Almost 2% of students reported that they started smoking at age 11 or younger. A further 3.3% of students reported starting to smoke at age 12 years, being 4.4% of female students and 2.2% of male students.

Age First Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1430 (76.1)	705 (77.9)	706 (75.2)	19 (54.3)
9 years old or less	12 (0.6)	7 (0.8)	2 (0.2)	3 (8.6)
10 years old	6 (0.3)	4 (0.4)	2 (0.2)	0 (0.0)
11 years old	18 (1.0)	4 (0.4)	13 (1.4)	1 (2.9)
12 years old	62 (3.3)	20 (2.2)	41 (4.4)	1 (2.9)
13 years old	92 (4.9)	43 (4.8)	47 (5.0)	2 (5.7)
14 years old	135 (7.2)	61 (6.7)	70 (7.5)	4 (11.4)
15 years old	108 (5.7)	54 (6.0)	49 (5.2)	5 (14.3)
16 years old or older	16 (0.9)	7 (0.8)	9 (1.0)	0 (0.0)
Total	1879 (100)	905 (48.2)	939 (50.0)	35 (1.9)

#### Table 3.3 Age of initiation of cigarette use

p<0.001

Age 14 years was also the age most commonly reported for initiation of daily smoking (3.3%). Female students were almost twice as likely as male students to commence daily smoking at that age (4.4% vs 2.3%). About 1.5% of students reported initiation of daily smoking at age 12 years or younger.

Age Began Daily Smoking	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1700 (90.9)	842 (93.2)	833 (89.3)	25 (73.5)
9 years old or less	6 (0.3)	3 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	3 (8.8)
11 years old	6 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.5)	1 (2.9)
12 years old	16 (0.9)	5 (0.6)	10 (1.1)	1 (2.9)
13 years old	28 (1.5)	7 (0.8)	20 (2.1)	1 (2.9)
14 years old	62 (3.3)	21 (2.3)	41 (4.4)	0 (0.0)
15 years old	44 (2.4)	21 (2.3)	21 (2.3)	2 (5.9)
16 years old or older	8 (0.4)	4 (0.4)	3 (0.3)	1 (2.9)
Total	1870 (100.0)	903 (48.3)	933 (49.9)	34 (1.8)

#### Table 3.4 Age of initiation of daily cigarette use

p<0.001



CK



### **Perceived Availability of Cigarettes**

Despite existing restrictions aimed at preventing access to cigarettes by children, almost six in ten (59.2%) 15-16-year-olds reported that it would be easy (39.1%) or very easy (20.1%) for them to access cigarettes. 6.5% reported that it would be impossible to access cigarettes, while one in four (24.8%) reported that it would be very difficult (9.4%) or fairly difficult (15.4%). There were few gender differences as regards reported difficulty of access to cigarettes.

Difficulty to Get Cigarettes	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Impossible	121 (6.5)	62 (6.9)	57 (6.1)	2 (5.7)
Very difficult	177 (9.4)	84 (9.3)	92 (9.8)	1 (2.9)
Fairly difficult	288 (15.4)	126 (13.9)	158 (16.9)	4 (11.4)
Fairly easy	734 (39.1)	340 (37.6)	382 (40.8)	12 (34.3)
Very easy	377 (20.1)	204 (22.6)	163 (17.4)	10 (28.6)
Don't know	178 (9.5)	88 (9.7)	84 (9.0)	6 (17.1)
Total	1875 (100.0)	904 (48.2)	936 (49.9)	35 (1.9)

#### Table 3.5 Perceived availability of cigarettes

p=0.09

### **Risk Perception of Cigarette Use**

Students were asked about how much they thought people risked harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoked occasionally and if they smoked regularly. Regular smoking was reported as being associated with much greater risk than was occasional smoking. About two-thirds (66.8%) of students reported that regular smoking carried great risk compared with about one in four (26.5%) students who reported that occasional smoking carried great risk. More than a third of students (35.1%) reported that occasional smoking carried no risk or slight risk and more than one in ten (11.1%) reported that regular smoking carried no risk or slight risk. More male students than female students reported that occasional and regular smoking carried no risk. Those who answered the non-binary gender option were significantly more likely to report no risk from occasional and regular smoking and less likely to report great risk from regular smoking.

#### Table 3.6 Risk perception of trying cigarettes occasionally

Risk Perception of Trying Cigarettes Occasionally	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
No	161 (8.7)	90 (10.1)	62 (6.7)	9 (26.5)
Slight risk	488 (26.4)	207 (23.3)	272 (29.5)	9 (26.5)
Moderate risk	628 (34.0)	296 (33.3)	324 (35.1)	8 (23.5)
Great risk	489 (26.5)	251 (28.2)	231 (25.0)	7 (20.6)
Don't know	81 (4.4)	46 (5.2)	34 (3.7)	1 (2.9)
Total	1847 (100)	890 (48.2)	923 (50.0)	34 (1.8)

p<0.001

Summary

ToC



Risk Perception of Regular Cigarette Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
No risk	92 (5.0)	49 (5.5)	35 (3.8)	8 (23.5)
Slight risk	111 (6.1)	59 (6.7)	52 (5.7)	0 (0.0)
Moderate risk	332 (18.1)	148 (16.7)	177 (19.3)	7 (20.6)
Great risk	1225 (66.8)	585 (66.2)	622 (67.9)	18 (52.9)
Don't know	74 (4.0)	43 (4.9)	30 (3.3)	1 (2.9)
Total	1834 (100.0)	884 (48.2)	916 (49.9)	34 (1.9)

#### Table 3.7 Risk perception of trying cigarettes regularly

p<0.001

# Associations with Teenager Cigarette Use

#### Truancy

Students who reported missing school through truancy were significantly more likely to be both ever and current smokers. Intensity of truancy is associated with likelihood of smoking, with students who reported missing more days from school through truancy reporting higher ever and current smoking when compared with those who miss fewer days. Fewer than one in five (18.2%) students who reported never truanting had ever smoked, while 43.2% who missed 1 day through truancy had ever smoked, and 62.1% of those who missed 7 days or more had ever smoked. Fewer than one in twelve (8.3%) of those who reported never truanting were current smokers, while 23% of those who missed 1 day were current smokers, and 44.8% of those who missed 7 days or more were current smokers.

Smoking Status	Missing school – Truancy, p<0.001								
	Total	Never	1 day	2 days	3-4 days	5-6 days	7 days or more		
Never	1229	1049	84	40	36	9	11		
	(75.9)	(81.8)	(56.8)	(56.3)	(53.7)	(42.9)	(37.9)		
Ever	390	234	64	31	31	12	18		
	(24.1)	(18.2)	(43.2)	(43.7)	(46.3)	(57.1)	(62.1)		
Current (last 30 days)	194	106	34	15	18	8	13		
	(12.0)	(8.3)	(23.0)	(21.1)	(26.9)	(38.1)	(44.8)		
Total	1619	1283	148	71	67	21	29		
	(100.0)	(79.2)	(9.1)	(4.4)	(4.1)	(1.3)	(1.8)		

#### Table 3.8 Associations between truancy and cigarette use

### **Parental Monitoring**

The question 'Does your mother or your father know where you spend Saturday nights?' has been asked in all cycles of ESPAD and is a measure that repeatedly has been significantly associated with teenager substance use. Table 3.9 shows that parental knowledge of their children's whereabouts on Saturday nights (parental monitoring) is significantly associated with both ever and current smoking, with higher parental awareness being associated with less smoking and lower parental awareness being associated with more smoking. Those who reported that their mother or father always knows where they spend Saturday nights were the most likely to be never smokers.



Summary



Compared with those who reported that their parent 'knows always' where they spend Saturday nights, those who reported that their parent 'knows sometimes' were three to four times more likely to be both ever smokers (51.3% vs 17.3%) and current smokers (33% vs 7.9%).

Smoking Status		Parental Monitoring, p<0.001							
	Total	Know always	Know quite often	Know sometimes	Usually don't know				
Never	1353 (76.4)	1027 (82.7)	240 (65.9)	56 (48.7)	30 (60.0)				
Ever	418 (23.6)	215 (17.3)	124 (34.1)	59 (51.3)	20 (40.0)				
Current smoking (last 30 days)	203 (11.5)	98 (7.9)	55 (15.1)	38 (33.0)	12 (24.0)				
Total	1771	1242 (70.1)	364 (20.6)	115 (6.5)	50 (2.8)				

#### Table 3.9 Associations between parental monitoring and teenager cigarette use

### **Parental Cigarette Use**

Parental smoking is significantly associated with teenager smoking. Students who reported that neither of their parents smoked were less likely to be ever-smokers. Fewer than one in ten (9.2%) students reported being ever-smokers when neither parent smoked compared with one in five (21%) when only their father smoked, one in four (24.5%) when only their mother smoked, and one in three (33.8%) when both parents smoked. Similarly, 4% reported being current smokers when neither parent smoked, 9.3% when their father only smoked, 12.6% when their mother only smoked, and 17.8% reported being current smokers when both their parent smoked.

#### Table 3.10 Associations between parental cigarette use and teenager cigarette use

Smoking Status	Parental Smoking, p<0.001						
	Total	None	Only father	Only mother	Both	Don't know	
Never	1294 (76.7)	364 (90.8)	237 (79.0)	120 (75.5)	434 (66.2)	139 (81.8)	
Ever	392 (23.3)	37 (9.2)	63 (21.0)	39 (24.5)	222 (33.8)	31 (18.2)	
Current (last 30 days)	191 (11.3)	16 (4.0)	28 (9.3)	20 (12.6)	117 (17.8)	10 (5.9)	
Total	1686 (100.0)	401 (23.8)	300 (17.8)	159 (9.4)	656 (38.9)	170 (10.1)	

### Peer Cigarette Use

Associations between teenager smoking and that of their peers are well established. Those who reported that none of their peers smoke were least likely to report being either ever or current smokers. One in 20 (5%) students reported being a current smoker and having no peers who smoke, while almost half (47.7%) reported being a current smoker when most of their peers smoke.

#### Table 3.11 Associations between peer cigarette use and teenager cigarette use

Smoking	Peer Smoking, p<0.001							
Status	Total	None	A few	Some	Most	All		
Never	1320 (76.7)	829 (86.4)	350 (69.4)	98 (62.8)	33 (38.4)	10 (66.7)		
Ever	400 (23.3)	130 (13.6)	154 (30.6)	58 (37.2)	53 (61.6)	5 (33.3)		
Current (last 30 days)	196 (11.3)	48 (5.0)	70 (13.9)	31 (19.9)	41 (47.7)	5 (33.3)		
Total	1720 (100.0)	959 (55.8)	504 (29.3)	156 (9.1)	86 (5.0)	15 (0.9)		



Summary

**E-CIGARETTES** 







Percentage of students who ever used e-cigarettes



15.7% Used e-cigarettes in the last 30 days



Age of first use 7\_6%

first used e-cigarettes at age 14-15

Female students start earlier than male students (14.7 years vs 15 years)



found e-cigarettes fairly or very easy to obtain (n)

1.5%

perceived a moderate risk from using e-cigarettes occasionally



42.7%

perceived a great risk from using e-cigarettes regularly







Lower Parental Monitoring

# **Factors Associated with Increased Use of E-Cigarettes**





Parental Smoking/ E-cigarette Use



Lower Educational

### **E-Cigarettes Use and Other Substances** Of students who ever used e-cigarettes





# **E-Cigarettes**

### Prevalence of E-Cigarette Use

Almost one in three students reported having ever used e-cigarettes (lifetime e-cigarette use); prevalence was higher for female students (34.3%) than for male students (29.4%) and highest of all for students who preferred not to say whether they were male or female (40%). Last 30-day e-cigarette use (current e-cigarette use) was reported at 15.7%, again higher for female students (17.4%) than for male students (13.8%). 6.9% of students reported using e-cigarettes daily or almost daily. Prevalence of ever and current e-cigarette use are lower in ESPAD Ireland 2024 than reported in ESPAD Ireland 2019. A trend analysis of 2015 and 2019 ESPAD data showed that the rate of increase in e-cigarette use for girls in that period was greater than that for boys, and that girls were more likely to overtake boys in prevalence in e-cigarette use, which has now occurred in this 2024 ESPAD cycle. Prevalence of ever and current e-cigarette use is higher than ever and current smoking in ESPAD Ireland 2024.

E-cigarette Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1275 (68.0)	639 (70.6)	615 (65.7)	21 (60.0)
Ever	601 (32.0)	266 (29.4)	321 (34.3)	14 (40.0)
Current (last 30 days)	295 (15.7)	125 (13.8)	163 (17.4)	7 (20.0)
Last 12 months	175 (9.3)	78 (8.6)	94 (10.0)	3 (8.6)
More than 12 months	131 (7.0)	63 (7.0)	64 (6.8)	4 (11.4)
Total	1876 (100.0)	905 (48.2)	936 (49.9)	35 (1.9)

#### Table 3.12 E-cigarettes: prevalence of lifetime use

p=0.22

#### Table 3.13 E-cigarettes: prevalence of use in the last 30 days, weekly use, and daily use

E-cigarette Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Not at all	1556 (83.0)	769 (85.2)	762 (81.4)	25 (71.4)
Less than once per week	126 (6.7)	55 (6.1)	69 (7.4)	2 (5.7)
At least once a week	62 (3.3)	29 (3.2)	31 (3.3)	2 (5.7)
Almost every day or every day	130 (6.9)	50 (5.5)	74 (7.9)	6 (17.1)
Total	1874 (100.0)	903 (48.2)	936 (49.9)	35 (1.9)

p=0.06

### Age of Initiation of E-Cigarette Use

Age 14 years was the age most commonly reported for initiation of e-cigarette use (11.4%). Almost 2% of students reported that they started using e-cigarettes at age 11 years or younger (1.8%). A further 3.9% of students reported starting to use e-cigarettes at age 12 years, being 4.6% of female students and 3.2% of male students. Almost one in ten (9.2%) students first used e-cigarettes at age 13 years, being 11.3% of female students and 7.1% of male students.

Summary ToC



Age of First E-cigarette Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1255 (66.9)	629 (69.6)	608 (65.0)	18 (51.4)
9 years old or less	8 (0.4)	4 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	4 (11.4)
10 years old	5 (0.3)	3 (0.3)	2 (0.2)	0 (0.0)
11 years old	20 (1.1)	6 (0.7)	14 (1.5)	0 (0.0)
12 years old	73 (3.9)	29 (3.2)	43 (4.6)	1 (2.9)
13 years old	173 (9.2)	64 (7.1)	106 (11.3)	3 (8.6)
14 years old	213 (11.4)	103 (11.4)	106 (11.3)	4 (11.4)
15 years old	117 (6.2)	57 (6.3)	55 (5.9)	5 (14.3)
16 years old or older	11 (0.6)	9 (1.0)	2 (0.2)	0 (0.0)
Total	1875 (100.0)	904 (48.2)	936 (49.9)	35 (1.9)

#### Table 3.14 Age of initiation of e-cigarette use

p<0.001

Age 14 years was also the most commonly reported initiation age of daily e-cigarette use (4.8%) and female students were much more likely than male students to commence daily e-cigarette use at that age (6.1% vs 3.5%). 1.3% of students reported initiation of daily e-cigarette use at age 12 years or younger.

Age Began Daily E-cigarette Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1596 (86.0)	795 (89.5)	777 (83.2)	24 (70.6)
9 years old or less	5 (0.3)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	3 (8.8)
11 years old	4 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	0 (0.0)
12 years old	15 (0.8)	2 (0.2)	12 (1.3)	1 (2.9)
13 years old	52 (2.8)	18 (2.0)	33 (3.5)	1 (2.9)
14 years old	90 (4.8)	31 (3.5)	57 (6.1)	2 (5.9)
15 years old	79 (4.3)	34 (3.8)	42 (4.5)	3 (8.8)
16 years old or older	15 (0.8)	5 (0.6)	10 (1.1)	0 (0.0)
Total	1856 (100.0)	888 (47.8)	934 (50.3)	34 (1.8)

#### Table 3.15 Age of initiation of daily e-cigarette use

p<0.001

### **Perceived Availability of E-Cigarettes**

Two-thirds of students (66.1%) reported that it would be fairly easy (35.7%) or very easy (30.4%) to access e-cigarettes. This was somewhat higher than the almost six in ten (59.2%) students who said that it would be fairly or very easy to access cigarettes. 30.4% of students thought that it would be very easy to access e-cigarettes compared with 20% who thought it would be very easy to access cigarettes. This may be indicative of long-standing restrictions aimed at preventing access to cigarettes by children compared with the more recent introduction in 2024 of restrictions





in access to e-cigarettes by children. About a fifth of students thought that accessing e-cigarettes would be difficult: 7.2% reported that it would be impossible to access e-cigarettes, 7.1% that it would be very difficult, and 11.4% that it would be fairly difficult.

Difficulty of Getting E-cigarettes	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Impossible	134 (7.2)	63 (7.0)	69 (7.4)	2 (5.7)
Very difficult	133 (7.1)	60 (6.6)	72 (7.7)	1 (2.9)
Fairly difficult	213 (11.4)	98 (10.9)	114 (12.2)	1 (2.9)
Fairly easy	669 (35.7)	314 (34.8)	340 (36.3)	15 (42.9)
Very easy	570 (30.4)	292 (32.3)	267 (28.5)	11 (31.4)
Don't know	155 (8.3)	76 (8.4)	74 (7.9)	5 (14.3)
Total	1874 (100.0)	903 (48.2)	936 (49.9)	35 (1.9)

#### Table 3.16 Perceived availability of e-cigarettes

p=0.48

### **Relationship with Traditional Cigarettes at First E-Cigarette Use**

The majority of students who used e-cigarettes (76.2%) reported that they had never used traditional cigarettes when they first used e-cigarettes. About a fifth (20.7%) occasionally used traditional cigarettes and only 3.1% said that they regularly used traditional cigarettes when they first used e-cigarettes. Female students were more likely than male students to have regularly used traditional cigarettes when they first used e-cigarettes (3.7% vs 2.1%).

#### Table 3.17 Relationship with traditional cigarettes at first e-cigarette use

Relationship with Traditional Cigarettes	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never used traditional cigarettes	416 (76.2)	185 (78.1)	223 (75.1)	8 (66.7)
Occasionally used traditional cigarettes	113 (20.7)	47 (19.8)	63 (21.2)	3 (25.0)
Regularly using traditional cigarettes	17 (3.1)	5 (2.1)	11 (3.7)	1 (8.3)
Total	546 (100)	237 (43.4)	297 (54.4)	12 (2.2)

p<0.01

### **Risk Perception of E-Cigarette Use**

Students were asked about how much they thought people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they used e-cigarettes occasionally or regularly. Regular e-cigarette use was reported as being associated with much greater risk than was occasional e-cigarette use (42.7% vs 6.9%), considerably less than the two-thirds (66.8%) of students who reported that regular smoking carried great risk and the one in four (26.5%) students who reported that occasional smoking carried great risk. A large majority (76.8%) perceived no risk (38.4%) or slight risk (38.2%) in occasional e-cigarette use, more than twice as many as the 35.1% who reported that occasional smoking carried no risk or slight risk.







Regular e-cigarette use was perceived as carrying greater risk. Fewer than one in five (16.7%) perceived no risk or slight risk from regular e-cigarette use. Three-quarters of students perceived moderate risk (36.1%) or great risk (42.7%) from regular e-cigarette use. As with smoking, fewer male students than female students associated regular e-cigarette use with moderate or great risk.

Risk Perception of Occasional E-cigarette Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
No risk	705 (38.4)	334 (37.7)	356 (38.8)	15 (44.1)
Slight risk	703 (38.2)	333 (37.5)	356 (38.8)	14 (41.2)
Moderate risk	212 (11.5)	98 (11.0)	114 (12.4)	0 (0.0)
Great risk	126 (6.9)	70 (7.9)	53 (5.8)	3 (8.8)
Don't know	92 (5.0)	52 (5.9)	38 (4.1)	2 (5.9)
Total	1838 (100.0)	887 (48.3)	917 (49.9)	34 (1.8)

#### Table 3.18 Risk perception of occasional e-cigarette use

p=0.18

#### Table 3.19 Risk perception of regular e-cigarette use

Risk Perception of Regular E-cigarette Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
No risk	93 (5.1)	51 (5.8)	36 (3.9)	6 (17.6)
Slight risk	213 (11.6)	113 (12.8)	97 (10.6)	3 (8.8)
Moderate risk	664 (36.1)	298 (33.6)	353 (38.5)	13 (38.2)
Great risk	785 (42.7)	377 (42.6)	398 (43.4)	10 (29.4)
Don't know	82 (4.5)	47 (5.3)	33 (3.6)	2 (5.9)
Total	1837 (100.0)	886 (48.2)	917 (49.9)	34 (1.9)

p<0.01

### **Reported Content of E-Cigarettes**

Possible responses to the question 'If you have used e-cigarettes during the LAST 30 DAYS, what did they contain?' included nicotine, flavouring, CBD, and THC. CBD, short for cannabidiol, is a non-psychoactive compound found in the cannabis plant. THC (tetrahydrocannabinol) is the primary psychoactive compound found in cannabis, and the main compound that causes the altered mental state or "high" experienced after cannabis consumption. Of those who responded to the question on using e-cigarettes in the last 30 days, 82.4% said that they contained nicotine, 68.5% that they contained flavouring, 16.3% that they contained THC, and 5.1% that they contained CBD (Table 3.20). Females were significantly more likely than males to report using e-cigarettes with flavours (73% vs 61.6%), and males more likely than females to have used e-cigarettes containing CBD (6.4% vs 2.5%) or THC (20.8% vs 11.7%).






E-cigarette Content	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Nicotine					
No	52 (17.6)	24 (19.2)	26 (16.0)	2 (28.6)	
Yes	243 (82.4)	101 (80.8)	137 (84.0)	5 (71.4)	<0.001
Flavouring					
No	93 (31.5)	48 (38.4)	44 (27.0)	1 (14.3)	
Yes	202 (68.5)	77 (61.6)	119 (73.0)	6 (85.7)	<0.001
CBD					
No	280 (94.9)	117 (93.6)	159 (97.5)	4 (57.1)	
Yes	15 (5.1)	8 (6.4)	4 (2.5)	3 (42.9)	<0.001
тнс					
No	247 (83.7)	99 (79.2)	144 (88.3)	4 (57.1)	
Yes	48 (16.3)	26 (20.8)	19 (11.7)	3 (42.9)	<0.001
Don't know					
No	270 (91.5)	111 (88.8)	153 (93.9)	6 (85.7)	
Yes	25 (8.5)	14 (11.2)	10 (6.1)	1 (14.3)	0.26

### **Table 3.20 Content of e-cigarettes**

\* As this is a check-all-that-apply question, the denominator used is the number of students who responded 'Yes' to Question C10 'used e-cigarettes in the last 30 days' (n=295).

# **Reasons for Trying E-Cigarettes**

Table 3.21 confirms that e-cigarettes are not being used by teenagers to stop smoking, with only 0.6% of students reporting that their reason for using e-cigarettes in the previous 30 days was to stop smoking. As in previous cycles of ESPAD Ireland, 'Out of curiosity' and 'Friends/other people offered' were the most frequently named reasons for teenager e-cigarette use.

Table 5.21 Reasons for trying e-cigarettes	Table 3.2	l Reasons	for trying	e-cigarettes
--	-----------	-----------	------------	--------------

Reasons for Trying E-cigarettes	Total	Male	Female	Rather not answer	<i>p</i> -value
To stop smoking cigarettes					
No	1865 (99.4)	900 (99.7)	932 (99.3)	33 (97.1)	
Yes	11 (0.6)	3 (0.3)	7 (0.7)	1 (2.9)	0.10
Out of Curiosity					
No	1526 (81.3)	730 (80.8)	772 (82.2)	24 (70.6)	
Yes	350 (18.7)	173 (19.2)	167 (17.8)	10 (29.4)	0.20
Friends/other people offered					
No	1566 (83.5)	780 (86.4)	757 (80.6)	29 (85.3)	
Yes	310 (16.5)	123 (13.6)	182 (19.4)	5 (14.7)	<0.01
None of the above					
No	1802 (96.1)	876 (97.0)	894 (95.2)	32 (94.1)	
Yes	74 (3.9)	27 (3.0)	45 (4.8)	2 (5.9)	0.12





# Types of Posts Seen on Social Media about E-Cigarettes

For the first time in ESPAD, students were asked, on an average day, how often they see various types of posts on social media about e-cigarettes (vapes). Table 3.22 shows that between a fifth and almost a half of students reported seeing both positive and negative posts about e-cigarettes on social media. More than four out of ten students had seen posts with hashtags about e-cigarettes (46.4%), posts showing negative images of people using e-cigarettes (44.1%), and posts about possible harm from e-cigarettes (42.7%). More than half of the students did not see any of the suggested posts, namely those with hashtags about e-cigarettes (53.6%); with information about how to buy or get e-cigarettes (74.4%); showing positive (67%) or negative (55.9%) images of people using e-cigarettes; with e-cigarettes "challenges" (81.4%); about possible harm from e-cigarettes (57.3%); or promoting e-cigarettes as an alternative to smoking (70.5%). The next largest proportion in each case saw them less than five times a day, with only about one in ten, or fewer, seeing them more frequently. Gender differences were significant in all cases. Compared with males and females, those who preferred not to state their gender were much more likely to have seen each of these types of posts more than 20 times a day.

On an average day, how often do you see posts on any Social Media platform about e-cigarettes (vapes)?	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Posts with hashtags about e-cigarettes (e.g. #vapes)					
Never	895 (53.6)	457 (57.2)	426 (50.4)	12 (44.4)	
Less than 5 times a day	590 (35.3)	259 (32.4)	320 (37.9)	11 (40.7)	
5-10 times a day	109 (6.5)	47 (5.9)	61 (7.2)	1(3.7)	
10-20 times a day	40 (2.4)	21 (2.6)	19 (2.2)	0 (0.0)	
More than 20 times a day	37 (2.2)	15 (1.9)	19 (2.2)	3 (11.1)	
Total	1671 (100.0)	799 (47.9)	845 (50.6)	27 (1.6)	<0.01
Posts with information about how to buy or get e-cigarettes					
Never	1233 (74.4)	614 (77.4)	606 (72.4)	13 (48.1)	
Less than 5 times a day	344 (20.8)	142 (17.9)	193 (23.1)	9 (33.3)	
5-10 times a day	42 (2.5)	18 (2.3)	23 (2.7)	1(3.7)	
10-20 times a day	22 (1.3)	12 (1.5)	9 (1.1)	1(3.7)	
More than 20 times a day	16 (1.0)	7 (0.9)	6 (0.7)	3 (11.1)	
Total	1657 (100.0)	793 (47.9)	837 (50.5)	27 (1.6)	<0.001

### Table 3.22 Types of posts seen on social media about e-cigarettes

Summary

ToC



On an average day, how often do you see	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N	<i>p</i> -value
posts on any Social Media platform about e-cigarettes (vapes)?				(%)	
Posts showing positive images of people using e-cigarettes					
Never	1110 (67.0)	582 (73.6)	517 (61.6)	11 (42.3)	
Less than 5 times a day	395 (23.9)	152 (19.2)	237 (28.2)	6 (23.1)	
5-10 times a day	102 (6.2)	36 (4.6)	61 (7.3)	5 (19.2)	
10-20 times a day	27 (1.6)	13 (1.6)	14 (1.7)	0 (0.0)	
More than 20 times a day	22 (1.3)	8 (1.0)	10 (1.2)	4 (15.4)	
Total	1656 (100.0)	791 (47.8)	839 (50.7)	26 (1.6)	<0.001
Posts showing negative images of people using e-cigarettes					
Never	923 (55.9)	465 (58.8)	444 (53.2)	14 (53.8)	
Less than 5 times a day	575 (34.8)	250 (31.6)	317 (38.0)	8 (30.8)	
5-10 times a day	106 (6.4)	48 (6.1)	57 (6.8)	1(3.8)	
10-20 times a day	28 (1.7)	19 (2.4)	8 (1.0)	1(3.8)	
More than 20 times a day	20 (1.2)	9 (1.1)	9 (1.1)	2 (7.7)	
Total	1652 (100.0)	791 (47.9)	835 (50.5)	26 (1.6)	<0.01
Posts with e-cigarettes "challenges" (e.g. competitions)					
Never	1344 (81.4)	651 (82.4)	677 (81.1)	16 (61.5)	
Less than 5 times a day	237 (14.4)	105 (13.3)	126 (15.1)	6 (23.1)	
5-10 times a day	41 (2.5)	20 (2.5)	20 (2.4)	1(3.8)	
10-20 times a day	15 (0.9)	6 (0.8)	9 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	
More than 20 times a day	14 (0.8)	8 (1.0)	3 (0.4)	3 (11.5)	
Total	1651 (100.0)	790 (47.8)	835 (50.6)	26 (1.6)	<0.001
Posts about possible harm from e-cigarettes					
Never	945 (57.3)	473 (59.9)	457 (54.7)	15 (57.7)	
Less than 5 times a day	550 (33.3)	246 (31.2)	297 (35.6)	7 (26.9)	
5-10 times a day	116 (7.0)	48 (6.1)	66 (7.9)	2 (7.7)	
10-20 times a day	24 (1.5)	15 (1.9)	9 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	
More than 20 times a day	15 (0.9)	7 (0.9)	6 (0.7)	2 (7.7)	
Total	1650 (100.0)	789 (47.8)	835 (50.6)	26 (1.6)	<0.01

Summary

ТоС

CH) Fr



On an average day, how often do you see posts on any Social Media platform about e-cigarettes (vapes)?	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Posts promoting e-cigarettes as an alternative to smoking					
Never	1162 (70.5)	580 (73.5)	568 (68.1)	14 (53.8)	
Less than 5 times a day	378 (22.9)	163 (20.7)	211 (25.3)	4 (15.4)	
5-10 times a day	73 (4.4)	27 (3.4)	41 (4.9)	5 (19.2)	
10-20 times a day	18 (1.1)	10 (1.3)	8 (1.0)	0 (0.0)	
More than 20 times a day	18 (1.1)	9 (1.1)	6 (0.7)	3 (11.5)	
Total	1649 (100.0)	789 (47.8)	834 (50.6)	26 (1.6)	<0.001

# Associations with Teenager E-Cigarette Use

# Truancy

Students who reported missing school through truancy were less likely to be never e-cigarette users and more likely to be both ever and current e-cigarette users. Intensity of truancy is associated with likelihood of e-cigarette use, with students who reported missing more days from school through truancy reporting higher ever and current e-cigarette use. About one in four (26.9%) students who reported never truanting had ever used e-cigarettes, while 51.4% who missed 1 day through truancy had ever used e-cigarettes, and 62.1% of those who missed 7 days or more had ever used e-cigarette users, while 30.4% of those who missed 1 day were current e-cigarette users, and 51.7% of those who missed 7 days or more were current e-cigarette users.

E-cigarette		Mi	ssing schoo	l - Truancy,	p<0.001		
Use	Total	Never	1 day	2 days	3-4 days	5-6 days	7 days or more
Never	1096 (67.7)	937 (73.1)	72 (48.6)	35 (49.3)	33 (49.3)	8 (38.1)	11 (37.9)
Ever	522 (32.3)	345 (26.9)	76 (51.4)	36 (50.7)	34 (50.7)	13 (61.9)	18 (62.1)
Current (last 30 days)	260 (16.1)	145 (11.3)	45 (30.4)	25 (35.2)	22 (32.8)	8 (38.1)	15 (51.7)
Total	1618 (100.0)	1282 (79.2)	148 (9.1)	71 (4.4)	67 (4.1)	21 (1.3)	29 (1.8)

### Table 3.23 Associations between truancy and e-cigarette use

### **Parental Monitoring**

In response to the question 'Does your mother or your father know where you spend Saturday nights?', Table 3.24 shows that parental knowledge of their children's whereabouts on Saturday nights (parental monitoring) is significantly associated with both ever and current e-cigarette use, with higher parental awareness being associated with less e-cigarette use and lower parental awareness being associated with more e-cigarette use for those whose parents 'know quite often' or 'know sometimes' compared with those whose parents 'know always'. Those who reported that



Summary



their mother or father always knows where they spend Saturday nights were the most likely to be never e-cigarette users. Compared with those who reported that one of their parents 'knows always' where they spend Saturday nights, those who reported that their parent 'knows sometimes' were more than twice as likely to be ever e-cigarette users (24.5% vs 57.9%) and four times more likely to be current e-cigarette users (10.9% vs 45.6%).

E-cigarette Use	Parental Monitoring, p<0.01							
	Total	Know always	Know quite often	Know sometimes	Usually don't know			
Never	1199 (67.9)	938 (75.5)	188 (51.8)	48 (42.1)	25 (50.0)			
Ever	570 (32.1)	304 (24.5)	175 (48.2)	66 (57.9)	25 (50.0)			
Current (last 30 days)	277 (15.7)	135 (10.9)	76 (20.9)	52 (45.6)	14 (28.0)			
Total	1769 (100.0)	1242 (70.2)	363 (20.5)	114 (6.4)	50 (2.8)			

### Table 3.24 Associations between parental monitoring and teenager e-cigarette use

### **Parental E-cigarette Use**

Parental e-cigarette use was significantly associated with teenager e-cigarette use. Students who reported that neither of their parents use e-cigarettes were least likely to be ever or current e-cigarette users. About one in four (23.9%) students reported being ever e-cigarette users when neither parent used e-cigarettes compared with 44.5% when only their father used e-cigarettes, 49.5% when only their mother used e-cigarettes, 55.4% when both parents used e-cigarettes. Similarly, 10% reported being current e-cigarette users when neither parent used e-cigarettes, 25.4% when their father only used e-cigarettes, 29.4% when their mother only used e-cigarettes, and 33.1% reported being current e-cigarette users when both their parents used e-cigarettes.

Table	3.25	Associations	between	parental	e-cigarette	use and	teenager	e-cigarette	use

E-cigarette Use	Parental E-cigarette Use, p<0.001							
	Total	None	Only father	Only mother	Both	Don't know		
Never	1136 (67.7)	811 (76.1)	96 (55.5)	55 (50.5)	70 (44.6)	104 (60.1)		
Ever	542 (32.3)	255 (23.9)	77 (44.5)	54 (49.5)	87 (55.4)	69 (39.9)		
Current (last 30 days)	265 (15.8)	107 (10.0)	44 (25.4)	32 (29.4)	52 (33.1)	30 (17.3)		
Total	1678 (100.0)	1066 (63.5)	173 (10.3)	109 (6.5)	157 (9.4)	173 (10.3)		

### Peer E-cigarette Use

There are strong associations between teenager e-cigarette use and that of their peers. Students who reported that none of their peers use e-cigarettes were least likely to report being either ever or current e-cigarette users. Only one in 50 (2.2%) students reported being a current e-cigarette user and having no peers who use e-cigarettes, while six in ten (60.5%) reported being a current e-cigarette user when all of their peers use e-cigarettes.



Summary



E-cigarette Use		P	eer E-cigaret	te Use, p<0.0	01	
	Total	None	A few	Some	Most	All
Never	1158 (67.9)	449 (90.9)	414 (71.8)	163 (57.6)	117 (36.9)	15 (39.5)
Ever	551 (32.1)	45 (9.1)	163 (28.2)	120 (42.4)	200 (63.1)	23 (60.5)
Current (last 30 days)	269 (15.7)	11 (2.2)	46 (8.0)	49 (17.3)	140 (44.2)	23 (60.5)
Total	1709 (100.0)	494 (28.9)	577 (33.8)	283 (16.6)	317 (18.5)	38 (2.2)

### Table 3.26 Associations between peer e-cigarette use and teenager e-cigarette use

# Alternative Tobacco and Nicotine Products

# **Prevalence of Alternative Tobacco and Nicotine Product Use**

Questions about ever and current use of four alternative or emerging tobacco/nicotine products were included in ESPAD 2024: Use of Water Pipes, Moist Snuff ('Snus'), Heated Tobacco Products and, for the first time, Nicotine Pouches. Ever-use was highest for moist snuff at 10%, followed by nicotine pouches (7.6%), heated tobacco products (6.5%), and water pipe (3%). Nicotine use in the form of moist snuff and nicotine pouches was significantly higher among male students than among female students (13.6% vs 6.1% for moist snuff and 9.1% vs 5.5% for nicotine pouches).

Current use had a similar pattern to ever use, being also highest for moist snuff (4.4%), followed by nicotine pouches (3.7%), heated tobacco products (2.6%), and water pipe. Prevalence of current use of moist snuff was 6.8% for male students and 1.7% for female students. For nicotine pouches, current use was 5.3% for male students and 1.7% for female students. Among the smaller number who preferred not to state if they were male or female, prevalence was higher for all substances measured.

Water Pipe	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1816 (97.0)	873 (96.8)	915 (97.7)	28 (82.4)
Ever	57 (3.0)	29 (3.2)	22 (2.3)	6 (17.6)
Yes, in the last 30 days	19 (1.0)	11 (1.2)	4 (0.4)	4 (11.8)
Yes, in the last 12 months but not in the last 30 days	24 (1.3)	15 (1.7)	9 (1.0)	0 (0.0)
Yes, more than 12 months ago	14 (0.7)	3 (0.3)	9 (1.0)	2 (5.9)
Total	1873 (100.0)	902 (48.2)	937 (50.0)	34 (1.8)

### Table 3.27 Water pipes: prevalence of lifetime use and of use in the last 30 days

p<0.001



Summary ToC



Moist Snuff ('Snus')	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1655 (90.0)	764 (86.4)	865 (93.9)	26 (76.5)
Ever	184 (10.0)	120 (13.6)	56 (6.1)	8 (23.5)
Yes, in the last 30 days	81 (4.4)	60 (6.8)	16 (1.7)	5 (14.7)
Yes, in the last 12 months but not in the last 30 days	78 (4.2)	45 (5.1)	31 (3.4)	2 (5.9)
Yes, more than 12 months ago	25 (1.4)	15 (1.7)	9 (1.0)	1 (2.9)
Total	1839 (100.0)	884 (48.1)	921 (50.1)	34 (1.8)

### Table 3.28 Moist snuff ('snus'): prevalence of lifetime use and of use in the last 30 days

p<0.001

# Table 3.29 Heated tobacco products: prevalence of lifetime use and of use in the last 30 days

Heated Tobacco Products	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1722 (93.5)	831 (94.1)	863 (93.4)	28 (82.4)
Ever	119 (6.5)	52 (5.9)	61 (6.6)	6 (17.6)
Yes, in the last 30 days	47 (2.6)	16 (1.8)	26 (2.8)	5 (14.7)
Yes, in the last 12 months but not in the last 30 days	43 (2.3)	22 (2.5)	21 (2.3)	0 (0.0)
Yes, more than 12 months ago	29 (1.6)	14 (1.6)	14 (1.5)	1 (2.9)
Total	1841 (100.0)	883 (48.0)	924 (50.2)	34 (1.8)

*p<*0.001

### Table 3.30 Nicotine pouches: prevalence of lifetime use and of use in the last 30 days

Nicotine Pouches	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1700 (92.4)	802 (90.9)	872 (94.5)	26 (76.5)
Ever	139 (7.6)	80 (9.1)	51 (5.5)	8 (23.5)
Yes, in the last 30 days	68 (3.7)	47 (5.3)	16 (1.7)	5 (14.7)
Yes, in the last 12 months but not in the last 30 days	56 (3.0)	29 (3.3)	25 (2.7)	2 (5.9)
Yes, more than 12 months ago	15 (0.8)	4 (0.5)	10 (1.1)	1 (2.9)
Total	1839 (100.0)	882 (48.0)	923 (50.2)	34 (1.8)

p<0.001

Summary ToC

CH)

F



# Age of Initiation of Moist Snuff Use and Nicotine Pouch Use

Age 15 years was the most frequently reported age for initiation of Moist Snuff and Nicotine Pouch Use. 7.5% of students reported that they had first used Moist Snuff at age 15 years. One in eight (11.8%) male students compared with one in twenty-five (4%) female students started using Moist Snuff at age 15 years. 4.5% first used Nicotine Pouches at that age, being 7.5% of male students and 2% of female students.

Age of First Moist Snuff ('Snus') Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1066 (89.3)	442 (84.0)	608 (94.0)	16 (76.2)
9 years old or less	4 (0.3)	2 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	2 (9.5)
10 years old	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.2)	0 (0.0)
11 years old	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.2)	0 (0.0)
12 years old	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1(4.8)
13 years old	3 (0.3)	2 (0.4)	1 (0.2)	0 (0.0)
14 years old	21 (1.8)	13 (2.5)	7 (1.1)	1(4.8)
15 years old	89 (7.5)	62 (11.8)	26 (4.0)	1 (4.8)
16 years old or older	8 (0.7)	5 (1.0)	3 (0.5)	0 (0.0)
Total	1194 (100.0)	526 (44.1)	647 (54.2)	21 (1.8)

### Table 3.31 Age of initiation of moist snuff use

p<0.001

### Table 3.32 Age of initiation of nicotine pouch use

Age of First Nicotine Pouch Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1087 (91.7)	464 (88.7)	607 (94.7)	16 (76.2)
9 years old or less	4 (0.3)	2 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	2 (9.5)
12 years old	5 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	4 (0.6)	1 (4.8)
13 years old	7 (0.6)	2 (0.4)	5 (0.8)	0 (0.0)
14 years old	22 (1.9)	12 (2.3)	9 (1.4)	1 (4.8)
15 years old	53 (4.5)	39 (7.5)	13 (2.0)	1(4.8)
16 years old or older	7 (0.6)	4 (0.8)	3 (0.5)	0 (0.0)
Total	1185 (100.0)	523 (44.1)	641 (54.1)	21 (1.8)

p<0.001





# Use of Nicotine Products

Nicotine poly-product use is an increasing issue of concern as more products are being introduced. Additionally, current smoking rates have led to a potential creeping complacency amid perceptions that this problem has been solved. In this section of ESPAD Ireland 2024, we report on the percentages of students who used at least one nicotine product, continuing the potential for addiction.

# Use of Cigarettes and/or E-Cigarettes

We first describe use of the two most commonly used products, cigarettes and e-cigarettes. More than a third of students had ever used cigarettes and/or e-cigarettes (34.3%), with more female students than male students reporting use of at least one of these two products (36.3% vs 31.5%).

Ever Used Cigarettes (Smoked) and/or E-cigarettes	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say
N (%)				
No	1233 (65.7)	620 (68.5)	596 (63.7)	17 (48.6)
Yes	643 (34.3)	285 (31.5)	340 (36.3)	18 (51.4)
Total	1876 (100.0)	905 (48.2)	936 (49.9)	35 (1.9)

### Table 3.33 Lifetime use of cigarettes and/or e-cigarettes

p=0.01

Current use (in the last 30 days) of cigarettes and/or e-cigarettes was reported by 17.6% of students, almost one in five female students and almost one in seven male students (19.2% vs 15.5%).

### Table 3.34 Current use of cigarettes and/or e-cigarettes

Current Use of Cigarettes (Smoking) and/or E-cigarettes	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say
N (%)				
No	1546 (82.4)	765 (84.5)	756 (80.8)	25 (71.4)
Yes	330 (17.6)	140 (15.5)	180 (19.2)	10 (28.6)
Total	1876 (100.0)	905 (48.2)	936 (49.9)	35 (1.9)

p=0.02

# Use of Any Nicotine Product

More than a third of students (36.4%) reported that they had ever used at least one nicotine product (cigarettes, e-cigarettes, water pipe, moist snuff ('snus'), heated tobacco products, or nicotine pouches). 37.3% of female students and 34.6% of male students reported that they had ever used a nicotine product. Of those who preferred not to state if they were male or female, 60% (n=21) had used at least one of the nicotine products named in the survey.

Summary



Ever Used Any Nicotine Products	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say
N (%)				
No	1174 (63.6)	580 (65.4)	580 (62.7)	14 (40.0)
Yes	673 (36.4)	307 (34.6)	345 (37.3)	21 (60.0)
Total	1847 (100.0)	887 (48.0)	925 (50.1)	35 (1.9)

### Table 3.35 Lifetime use of any nicotine product

p=0.01

Almost one in five students (19.6%) reported being a current user of at least one nicotine product, with more female students than male students using at least one nicotine product (20.2% vs 18.4%).

### Table 3.36 Current use of any nicotine product

Current Use of Any Nicotine Product	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say
N (%)				
No	1485 (80.4)	724 (81.6)	738 (79.8)	23 (65.7)
Yes	362 (19.6)	163 (18.4)	187 (20.2)	12 (34.3)
Total	1847 (100.0)	887 (48.0)	925 (50.1)	35 (1.9)

p=0.05

# Summary: Cigarettes, E-Cigarettes, and Alternative Tobacco and Nicotine Products

### Cigarettes

Almost one in four (23.7%) students reported having ever smoked, and prevalence was higher for female students (24.7%) than for male students (21.7%). About one in ten students was a current smoker (11.7%), again higher for female students (12.9%) than for male students (9.9%). About 2% of students reported being daily smokers. These are the lowest reported figures for prevalence of ever, current and daily smoking among 15- and 16-year-olds in the thirty years that ESPAD surveys have been carried out in Ireland.

Age 14 years was the age most commonly reported for smoking initiation (7.2%). Almost 2% of students reported that they started smoking at age 11 or younger.

A majority (59.2%) reported that it would be easy or very easy for them to access cigarettes. One in four reported that it would be very difficult or fairly difficult, and few (6.5%) reported that it would be impossible to access cigarettes.

Regular smoking was reported as being associated with much greater risk than was occasional smoking. About two-thirds (66.8%) of students reported that regular smoking carried great risk compared with about one in four (26.5%) students who reported that occasional smoking carried great risk. However, more than one in ten (11.1%) reported that regular smoking carried no risk or slight risk.



Summary



As regards factors associated with smoking, those who reported school absence through truancy were significantly more likely to be both ever and current smokers and intensity of truancy was also associated with likelihood of smoking. Parental knowledge of their children's whereabouts on Saturday nights (parental monitoring) was significantly associated with both ever and current smoking, with lower parental awareness of their children's whereabouts on Saturday nights (parental monitoring) significantly associated with more teenager smoking. Having parents and peers who smoke was also significantly associated with more teenager smoking.

### **E-Cigarettes**

Almost a third of students had ever used e-cigarettes (lifetime e-cigarette use) and prevalence was higher for female students (34.3%) than for male students. Current (last 30-day) e-cigarette use was 15.7%, also higher for female students (17.4%) than for male students (13.8%). 6.9% of students reported using e-cigarettes daily or almost daily. Prevalence of ever and current e-cigarette use was lower than reported in ESPAD Ireland 2019. A trend analysis of 2015 and 2019 ESPAD data showed that the rate of increase in e-cigarette use for girls in that period was greater than that for boys, and that girls were more likely to overtake boys in prevalence in e-cigarette use, which has now occurred in this 2024 ESPAD cycle. Prevalence of ever and current e-cigarette use was higher than ever and current smoking in ESPAD Ireland 2024.

As with smoking, age 14 years was the age most commonly reported for initiation of e-cigarette use (11.4%) and for daily e-cigarette use (4.8%). 1.8% of students reported that they started using e-cigarettes at age 11 years or younger.

Two-thirds (66.1%) of students reported that it would be fairly easy (35.7%) or very easy (30.4%) to access e-cigarettes. This was somewhat higher than the almost six in ten (59.2%) students who said that it would be fairly or very easy to access cigarettes. Almost a third (30.4%) of students thought that it would be very easy to access e-cigarettes compared with 20% who thought it would be very easy to access cigarettes of long-standing restrictions aimed at preventing access to cigarettes by children compared with the more recent introduction in 2024 of restrictions in access to e-cigarettes by children. About a fifth (18.5%) of students thought that accessing e-cigarettes would be difficult, and 7.2% that it would be impossible.

The majority of students who used e-cigarettes (69.8%) reported that they had never used traditional cigarettes when they first used e-cigarettes. About a fifth (19%) occasionally used traditional cigarettes and only 2.9% said that they regularly used traditional cigarettes when they first used e-cigarettes.

Regular e-cigarette use was associated with much greater risk than was occasional e-cigarette use (42.7% vs 6.9%). Risk associated with e-cigarette use was considerably less than that associated with smoking. Two-thirds (66.8%) of students reported that regular smoking carried great risk and one in four (26.5%) students reported that occasional smoking carried great risk. As with smoking, fewer male students than female students associated regular e-cigarette use with moderate or great risk.

ESPAD 2024 data confirm that e-cigarettes are not being used by teenagers to stop smoking, with only 0.6% of students reporting that their reason for using e-cigarettes in the previous 30 days was to stop smoking. As in previous cycles of ESPAD Ireland, 'Out of curiosity' and 'Friends/other people offered' were the most frequently named reasons for teenager e-cigarette use.

For the first time in ESPAD, students were asked, on an average day, how often they see various types of posts on social media about e-cigarettes and between a fifth and almost a half of students reported seeing both positive and negative posts about e-cigarettes on social media. More than four out of ten students had seen posts with hashtags about e-cigarettes (46.4%), posts showing negative images of people using e-cigarettes (44.1%), and posts about possible harm from e-cigarettes (42.7%). More than half of the students did not see any of the posts listed.







Compared with male and female students, those who preferred not to state their gender were much more likely to have seen each of these types of posts more than 20 times a day.

As regards factors associated with e-cigarette use, students who reported missing school through truancy were more likely to be both ever and current e-cigarette users. As with smoking, intensity of truancy was associated with likelihood of e-cigarette use, with students who reported missing more days from school through truancy reporting higher ever and current e-cigarette use.

As with smoking, less parental monitoring was significantly associated with higher ever and current e-cigarette use. Parental e-cigarette use was positively correlated with teenager e-cigarette use and the strongest associations were found when both parents use e-cigarettes. Strong associations were also reported between teenager e-cigarette use and that of their peers.

### **Alternative Tobacco and Nicotine Products**

Four alternative or emerging tobacco/nicotine products were included in ESPAD 2024: Use of Water Pipes, Moist Snuff ('Snus'), Heated Tobacco Products and, for the first time, Nicotine Pouches. Ever-use was highest for moist snuff at 10%, followed by nicotine pouches (7.6%), heated tobacco products (6.5%), and water pipe (3%). Nicotine use in the form of moist snuff and nicotine pouches was significantly higher among male students than among female students (13.6% vs 6.1% for moist snuff and 9.1% vs 5.5% for nicotine pouches). Current use had a similar pattern, being also highest for moist snuff (4.4%), followed by nicotine pouches (3.7%), heated tobacco products (2.6%), and water pipe (1%). Prevalence of current use of moist snuff was 6.8% for male students and 1.7% for female students. For nicotine pouches, current use was 5.3% for male students and 1.7% for female students.

Age 15 years was the most frequently reported age for initiation of moist snuff and nicotine pouch use, which is later than for cigarettes or e-cigarettes (age 14 years). 7.5% of students reported that they had first used moist snuff at age 15 years and 4.5% first used nicotine pouches at that age.

### **Use of Any Nicotine Product**

As regards use of nicotine products overall, more than a third of students had ever used either cigarettes or e-cigarettes or both (34.3%), and 17.6% were current users of either cigarettes or e-cigarettes or both. More than a third of students (36.4%) had ever used at least one nicotine product of cigarettes, e-cigarettes, water pipe, moist snuff ('snus'), heated tobacco products, or nicotine pouches, and almost one in five (19.6%) were current users of at least one of these nicotine products. Female students were more likely than male students to use cigarettes/e-cigarettes and to be users of at least one nicotine product.



Summary ToC



# Alcohol







Smoked



Percentage of students who ever used alcohol



ESPAD Ireland 2024



# Introduction

ESPAD 2024 measured items related to alcohol use, including lifetime, last-year, and last 30-day use and intoxication; heavy episodic (binge) drinking; age of initiation and intoxication; sources of alcohol; use of particular drinks; perceived access and risks; and reasons for consuming alcohol. Socioeconomic status, school attendance, academic attainment, parenting style, relationships and supports, and peer/parental substance use were examined to assess their associations with student drinking and alcohol use. The main findings are outlined in this chapter, and additional data analyses not reported here are presented in **Supplementary Analysis Report** linked to this report. All questions pertaining to alcohol are as shown in the ESPAD Ireland 2024 Student Questionnaire in Appendix A.

# **Prevalence of Alcohol Use**

Students were asked on how many occasions in their lifetime they had consumed alcohol. Table 4.1 shows that one-third of students (33.5%) reported never drinking alcohol, while two-thirds (66.5%) had consumed it. In the total student population, 16.8% had consumed alcohol 1-2 times, and 14.9% had used it at least 20 times. No significant gender differences were observed in lifetime alcohol use.

Number of Occasions	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	627 (33.5)	306 (33.9)	309 (33.0)	12 (34.3)
Ever	1247 (66.5)	597 (66.1)	627 (67.0)	23 (65.7)
1-2 times	315 (16.8)	154 (17.1)	156 (16.7)	5 (14.3)
3-5 times	271 (14.5)	135 (15.0)	132 (14.1)	4 (11.4)
6-9 times	178 (9.5)	79 (8.7)	99 (10.6)	0 (0.0)
10-19 times	204 (10.9)	91 (10.1)	107 (11.4)	6 (17.1)
20-39 times	146 (7.8)	72 (8.0)	72 (7.7)	2 (5.7)
40 or more times	133 (7.1)	66 (7.3)	61 (6.5)	6 (17.1)
Total	1874 (100.0)	903 (48.2)	936 (49.9)	35 (1.9)

### Table 4.1 Alcohol: prevalence of lifetime use

p=0.33

Students were also asked if they had consumed alcohol in the last 12 months. Table 4.2 shows that 59.9% of students consumed alcohol during this period, with 8.3% using it 20 or more times. About one-fifth of students (20.6%) had consumed 1-2 drinks in the last year. No significant gender differences were found in the intensity of alcohol use.



Summary



Number of Occasions	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	748 (40.1)	357 (39.8)	375 (40.2)	16 (45.7)
Ever	1118 (59.9)	541 (60.2)	558 (59.8)	19 (54.3)
1-2 times	385 (20.6)	193 (21.5)	187 (20.0)	5 (14.3)
3-5 times	237 (12.7)	114 (12.7)	119 (12.8)	4 (11.4)
6-9 times	161 (8.6)	72 (8.0)	88 (9.4)	1 (2.9)
10-19 times	180 (9.6)	89 (9.9)	86 (9.2)	5 (14.3)
20-39 times	103 (5.5)	48 (5.3)	53 (5.7)	2 (5.7)
40 or more times	52 (2.8)	25 (2.8)	25 (2.7)	2 (5.7)
Total	1866 (100.0)	898 (48.1)	933 (50.0)	35 (1.9)

### Table 4.2 Alcohol: prevalence of use in the last 12 months

p=0.91

As regards current drinking, 35.1% of students had consumed alcohol in the last 30 days, while 64.9% had not. In the total population, 20.6% had used it 1-2 times, and 1.2% had used it at least 20 times. No significant gender differences were found in alcohol-use frequency during this period.

Number of Occasions	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1212 (64.9)	598 (66.5)	591 (63.3)	23 (65.7)
Ever	655 (35.1)	301 (33.5)	342 (36.7)	12 (34.3)
1-2 times	384 (20.6)	173 (19.2)	206 (22.1)	5 (14.3)
3-5 times	147 (7.9)	69 (7.7)	75 (8.0)	3 (8.6)
6-9 times	67 (3.6)	28 (3.1)	36 (3.9)	3 (8.6)
10-19 times	34 (1.8)	18 (2.0)	16 (1.7)	0 (0.0)
20-39 times	12 (0.6)	7 (0.8)	4 (0.4)	1 (2.9)
40 or more times	11 (0.6)	6 (0.7)	5 (0.5)	0 (0.0)
Total	1867 (100.0)	899 (48.2)	933 (50.0)	35 (1.9)

### Table 4.3 Alcohol: prevalence of use in the last 30 days

p=0.51

Students were also asked when they had their last alcoholic drink, with response options (for those who had drunk alcohol) ranging from '1-7 days ago' to 'more than 1 year ago'. In the total student population, including those who never drink alcohol (36.3%), the largest proportion (23.7%) had their last drink between a month and a year ago, while 13.7% had it in the last week. No significant gender differences were found.





Last Drink	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
I never drink alcohol	679 (36.3)	335 (37.1)	332 (35.5)	12 (35.3)
1-7 days ago	256 (13.7)	132 (14.6)	120 (12.8)	4 (11.8)
8-14 days ago	163 (8.7)	69 (7.6)	92 (9.8)	2 (5.9)
15-30 days ago	228 (12.2)	92 (10.2)	130 (13.9)	6 (17.6)
1 month - 1 year ago	443 (23.7)	227 (25.1)	207 (22.1)	9 (26.5)
More than 1 year ago	104 (5.6)	48 (5.3)	55 (5.9)	1 (2.9)
Total	1873 (100.0)	903 (48.2)	936 (50.0)	34 (1.8)

### Table 4.4 Last alcoholic drink consumed

p=0.23

# Prevalence of Alcohol Intoxication

Students were asked on how many occasions (if any) in their lifetime they had been intoxicated from drinking alcohol (for example staggered when walking, not being able to speak properly, throwing up or not remembering what happened). Table 4.5 shows that 72.3% of students had never been drunk, while 27.7% had. In the total student population, 13% had been drunk once or twice compared to 2.4% who had been drunk at least 20 times. No significant gender differences were observed in lifetime alcohol intoxication, although more students who preferred not to state their gender reported having been intoxicated than did males or females.

### Table 4.5 Alcohol: prevalence of lifetime intoxication

Number of Occasions	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1355 (72.3)	671 (74.4)	664 (70.9)	20 (57.1)
Ever	518 (27.7)	231 (25.6)	272 (29.1)	15 (42.9)
1-2 times	244 (13.0)	106 (11.8)	134 (14.3)	4 (11.4)
3-5 times	108 (5.8)	48 (5.3)	56 (6.0)	4 (11.4)
6-9 times	75 (4.0)	31 (3.4)	42 (4.5)	2 (5.7)
10-19 times	47 (2.5)	24 (2.7)	21 (2.2)	2 (5.7)
20-39 times	18 (1.0)	10 (1.1)	7 (0.7)	1 (2.9)
40 or more times	26 (1.4)	12 (1.3)	12 (1.3)	2 (5.7)
Total	1873 (100.0)	902 (48.2)	936 (50.0)	35 (1.9)

p=0.16

Students were also asked if they had been intoxicated from consuming alcohol in the last 12 months. Table 4.6 shows that 24.4% of students reported being drunk during this period. 13% had been drunk once or twice, while 1.5% had been drunk 20 or more times. Significant gender differences were observed, with students who preferred not to state their gender (42.9%) more likely than either males (23.5%) or females (24.5%) to have been intoxicated in the last year.





Number of Occasions	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1407 (75.6)	686 (76.5)	701 (75.5)	20 (57.1)
Ever	453 (24.4)	211 (23.5)	227 (24.5)	15 (42.9)
1-2 times	242 (13.0)	115 (12.8)	119 (12.8)	8 (22.9)
3-5 times	96 (5.2)	38 (4.2)	55 (5.9)	3 (8.6)
6-9 times	53 (2.8)	28 (3.1)	25 (2.7)	0 (0.0)
10-19 times	35 (1.9)	16 (1.8)	18 (1.9)	1 (2.9)
20-39 times	16 (0.9)	8 (0.9)	5 (0.5)	3 (8.6)
40 or more times	11 (0.6)	6 (0.7)	5 (0.5)	0 (0.0)
Total	1860 (100.0)	897 (48.2)	928 (49.9)	35 (1.9)

#### Table 4.6 Alcohol: prevalence of intoxication in the last 12 months

p<0.001

Finally, students were asked if they had been intoxicated from drinking alcohol in the last 30 days. 12.4% of students had, while the majority, 87.6%, had not. In the total population, 9.7% had been drunk once or twice, while only 0.3% had been drunk at least 20 times. Statistically significant gender differences were observed. Compared with males and females, those who preferred not to state their gender were more likely to have been intoxicated, and to be in this state more frequently.

Number of Occasions	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1636 (87.6)	792 (87.9)	815 (87.5)	29 (82.9)
Ever	231 (12.4)	109 (12.1)	116 (12.5)	6 (17.1)
1-2 times	182 (9.7)	83 (9.2)	97 (10.4)	2 (5.7)
3-5 times	27 (1.4)	15 (1.7)	11 (1.2)	1 (2.9)
6-9 times	11 (0.6)	5 (0.6)	5 (0.5)	1 (2.9)
10-19 times	6 (0.3)	2 (0.2)	3 (0.3)	1 (2.9)
20-39 times	2 (0.1)	2 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
40 or more times	3 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.9)
Total	1867 (100.0)	901 (48.3)	931 (49.9)	35 (1.9)

### Table 4.7 Alcohol: prevalence of intoxication in the last 30 days

p<0.01

### Prevalence of Heavy Episodic (Binge) Drinking

Students were asked how many times over the last 30 days they had consumed five or more drinks on one occasion (heavy episodic drinking or binge drinking). Table 4.8 shows that while 76.8% had not consumed five or more drinks on one occasion in the last 30 days, 13.5% had done so once or twice and a further one in ten (9.7%) had done so at least three times. No statistically significant gender differences were observed regarding the number of binge-drinking occasions.







Alcohol 5+ drinks	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
None	1442 (76.8)	699 (77.3)	717 (76.4)	26 (74.3)
1-2 times	253 (13.5)	116 (12.8)	136 (14.5)	1 (2.9)
3-5 times	113 (6.0)	53 (5.9)	55 (5.9)	5 (14.3)
6-9 times	39 (2.1)	21 (2.3)	17 (1.8)	1 (2.9)
10 or more times	30 (1.6)	15 (1.7)	13 (1.4)	2 (5.7)
Total	1877 (100.0)	904 (48.2)	938 (50.0)	35 (1.9)

### Table 4.8 Alcohol: prevalence of heavy episodic (binge) drinking in the last 30 days

p=0.12

# Age of Initiation of Alcohol Use

Students were asked at what age they first drank alcohol (at least one glass). Age 15 years was the most frequently reported starting age (20.8%). Gender differences were not statistically significant.

Age Alcohol First Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	740 (39.6)	361 (40.2)	366 (39.2)	13 (37.1)
9 years or less	63 (3.4)	29 (3.2)	29 (3.1)	5 (14.3)
10 years old	39 (2.1)	17 (1.9)	21 (2.2)	1 (2.9)
11 years old	32 (1.7)	18 (2.0)	14 (1.5)	0 (0.0)
12 years old	85 (4.6)	31 (3.4)	51 (5.5)	3 (8.6)
13 years old	174 (9.3)	84 (9.3)	87 (9.3)	3 (8.6)
14 years old	295 (15.8)	136 (15.1)	157 (16.8)	2 (5.7)
15 years old	388 (20.8)	196 (21.8)	185 (19.8)	7 (20.0)
16 years or older	52 (2.8)	27 (3.0)	24 (2.6)	1 (2.9)
Total	1868 (100.0)	899 (48.1)	934 (50.0)	35 (1.9)

### Table 4.9 Age of initiation of alcohol use

p=0.09

# Age of First Alcohol Intoxication

Students were also asked at what age they first got drunk. Two-thirds of students (66.4%) had never been drunk, while the largest proportion of those who had had done so at age 15 years (15.3%). There were significant gender differences in reported age of first alcohol intoxication. Males (3.4%) were twice as likely as females (1.7%) to be at least 16 years of age before getting intoxicated.



<u>A</u>

# Summary





Age of First Alcohol Intoxication	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1228 (66.4)	599 (67.8)	604 (64.9)	25 (71.4)
9 years or less	9 (0.5)	4 (0.5)	4 (0.4)	1 (2.9)
10 years old	5 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.5)	0 (0.0)
11 years old	8 (0.4)	5 (0.6)	3 (0.3)	0 (0.0)
12 years old	31 (1.7)	11 (1.2)	20 (2.2)	0 (0.0)
13 years old	70 (3.8)	35 (4.0)	32 (3.4)	3 (8.6)
14 years old	169 (9.1)	73 (8.3)	96 (10.3)	0 (0.0)
15 years old	283 (15.3)	127 (14.4)	150 (16.1)	6 (17.1)
16 years or older	46 (2.5)	30 (3.4)	16 (1.7)	0 (0.0)
Total	1849 (100.0)	884 (47.8)	930 (50.3)	35 (1.9)

### Table 4.10 Age of first alcohol intoxication

p=0.03

### **Sources of Access to Alcohol**

Students were asked where they usually get alcohol. Table 4.11 shows that, of the choices given, the most common source was from parents (23.2%), followed by from other youth (11.6%) and from a store/off-license (8.3%). Sources other than those stated were, however, more common (32%). There were significant gender differences in students' sourcing of alcohol. Males (11.4%) were twice as likely as females (5.2%) to buy alcohol from a store/off-license, while females (26.5%) were more likely than males (19.9%) to be given alcohol by their parents.

### Table 4.11 Sources of access to alcohol

Source of Access to Alcohol	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Buy in store/off-license	126 (8.3)	81 (11.4)	41 (5.2)	4 (13.3)
Purchase smuggled goods/ homemade alcohol	4 (0.3)	2 (0.3)	2 (0.3)	0 (0.0)
Get or buy from other youth	177 (11.6)	88 (12.4)	84 (10.7)	5 (16.7)
My parents give/buy me alcohol	354 (23.2)	141 (19.9)	208 (26.5)	5 (16.7)
Siblings buy for me/give to me	102 (6.7)	50 (7.0)	51 (6.5)	1(3.3)
l take alcohol at home without permission	80 (5.2)	29 (4.1)	50 (6.4)	1 (3.3)
Other adults buy/give to me	94 (6.2)	44 (6.2)	47 (6.0)	3 (10.0)
Buy at pubs/bars, <i>etc.</i>	101 (6.6)	62 (8.7)	37 (4.7)	2 (6.7)
Other way	488 (32.0)	213 (30.0)	266 (33.8)	9 (30.0)
Total	1526 (100.0)	710 (46.5)	786 (51.5)	30 (2.0)

p<0.001

ToC

CH)



# **Risk Perception of Alcohol Use**

Students were asked how much they thought people risked harming themselves if they consumed one or two drinks nearly every day (Table 4.12), four to five drinks nearly every day (Table 4.13), and five or more drinks nearly every weekend (Table 4.14). 8.1% perceived no risk in consuming 1-2 drinks nearly every day, whereas 27.5% perceived great risk. Similarly, 8% perceived no risk in consuming 5 or more drinks nearly every weekend compared with 33.7% who perceived great risk. Fewer students (4.7%) perceived no risk in consuming 4-5 drinks nearly every day, while more than twice as many (69.7%) perceived great risk. Perceptions varied significantly by gender: Males, and those who preferred not to state their gender, were more likely than females to perceive no risk, whereas females were more likely to perceive a moderate or great risk.

Risk Perception of Alcohol Use, 1-2 drinks nearly every day	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
No risk	148 (8.1)	90 (10.2)	50 (5.4)	8 (23.5)
Slight risk	352 (19.2)	178 (20.1)	166 (18.1)	8 (23.5)
Moderate risk	753 (41.0)	349 (39.4)	395 (43.0)	9 (26.5)
Great risk	506 (27.5)	223 (25.2)	275 (30.0)	8 (23.5)
Don't know	78 (4.2)	45 (5.1)	32 (3.5)	1 (2.9)
Total	1837 (100)	885 (48.2)	918 (50.0)	34 (1.9)

### Table 4.12 Risk perception of consuming 1-2 alcoholic drinks nearly every day

p<0.001

### Table 4.13 Risk perception of consuming 4-5 alcoholic drinks nearly every day

Risk Perception of Alcohol Use, 4-5 drinks nearly every day	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
No risk	86 (4.7)	50 (5.7)	33 (3.6)	3 (8.8)
Slight risk	79 (4.3)	43 (4.9)	32 (3.5)	4 (11.8)
Moderate risk	320 (17.5)	151 (17.1)	160 (17.4)	9 (26.5)
Great risk	1277 (69.7)	596 (67.6)	664 (72.4)	17 (50.0)
Don't know	71 (3.9)	42 (4.8)	28 (3.1)	1 (2.9)
Total	1833 (100)	882 (48.1)	917 (50.0)	34 (1.9)

p<0.01

ToC



Risk Perception of Alcohol Use, 5 or more drinks nearly every weekend	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
No risk	147 (8.0)	83 (9.4)	58 (6.3)	6 (17.6)
Slight risk	272 (14.9)	130 (14.8)	138 (15.1)	4 (11.8)
Moderate risk	708 (38.7)	318 (36.1)	378 (41.3)	12 (35.3)
Great risk	617 (33.7)	299 (34.0)	308 (33.6)	10 (29.4)
Don't know	86 (4.7)	50 (5.7)	34 (3.7)	2 (5.9)
Total	1830 (100)	880 (48.1)	916 (50.1)	34 (1.9)

# Table 4.14 Risk perception of consuming 5 or more alcoholic drinks nearly everyweekend

p=0.03

# **Reasons for Alcohol Use**

Students were more likely to report that they use alcohol 'mostly' or 'always' for the purpose of enjoyment ('because it's fun' (21.7%)) and to enhance social activity ('makes social gatherings more fun' (20.9%); 'improves parties and celebrations' (20.3%); 'helps [them] to enjoy a party' (16.8%)). Conversely, they were less likely to report using alcohol 'mostly' or 'always' for reasons related to social acceptance/inclusion ('to be liked' (1.9%); so that they 'won't feel left out' (3.4%); 'to fit in' (4.3%) and mental health ('it helps [them] when [they] feel depressed or nervous' (4.1%); 'to cheer up when ... in a bad mood' (4.4%)).

### Table 4.15 Reasons for alcohol use

Category	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
To enjoy a party					
Never	1095 (58.8)	524 (58.7)	551 (59.0)	20 (57.1)	0.94
Seldom	188 (10.1)	95 (10.7)	90 (9.6)	3 (8.6)	
Sometimes	265 (14.2)	129 (14.5)	130 (13.9)	6 (17.1)	
Mostly	226 (12.1)	105 (11.8)	118 (12.6)	3 (8.6)	
Always	87 (4.7)	39 (4.4)	45 (4.8)	3 (8.6)	
Helps when feeling					
depressed or nervous	1614 (86.9)	811 (91.2)	778 (83.2)	25 (73.5)	<0.001
Never	90 (4.8)	31 (3.5)	56 (6.0)	3 (8.8)	
Seldom	79 (4.3)	25 (2.8)	49 (5.2)	5 (14.7)	
Sometimes	46 (2.5)	11 (1.2)	35 (3.7)	0 (0.0)	
Mostly	29 (1.6)	11 (1.2)	17 (1.8)	1(2.9)	
Always	. ,				



Summar

ТоС



Category	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
To cheer up when					
Novor	1570 (84.5)	787 (88.5)	761 (81.5)	22 (64.7)	<0.001
Seldom	83 (4.5)	35 (3.9)	45 (4.8)	3 (8.8)	
Somotimos	123 (6.6)	38 (4.3)	81 (8.7)	4 (11.8)	
Mostly	54 (2.9)	20 (2.2)	32 (3.4)	2 (5.9)	
	27 (1.5)	9 (1.0)	15 (1.6)	3 (8.8)	
Like the feeling					
Never	1297 (69.8)	634 (71.4)	644 (68.9)	19 (54.3)	0.15
Seldom	125 (6.7)	61 (6.9)	61 (6.5)	3 (8.6)	
Sometimes	200 (10.8)	90 (10.1)	103 (11.0)	7 (20.0)	
Mostly	162 (8.7)	73 (8.2)	87 (9.3)	2 (5.7)	
Always	74 (4.0)	30 (3.4)	40 (4.3)	4 (11.4)	
To get high					
Never	1648 (88.7)	791 (89.0)	829 (88.8)	28 (80.0)	0.06
Seldom	54 (2.9)	29 (3.3)	21 (2.2)	4 (11.4)	
Sometimes	76 (4.1)	32 (3.6)	42 (4.5)	2 (5.7)	
Mostly	51 (2.7)	20 (2.2)	30 (3.2)	1 (2.9)	
Always	29 (1.6)	17 (1.9)	12 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	
Makes social					
gatherings more fun	1092 (58.8)	536 (60.4)	535 (57.2)	21 (60.0)	0.49
Never	144 (7.8)	68 (7.7)	72 (7.7)	4 (11.4)	
Seldom	235 (12.6)	98 (11.0)	134 (14.3)	3 (8.6)	
Sometimes	256 (13.8)	124 (14.0)	129 (13.8)	3 (8.6)	
Mostly	131 (7.1)	62 (7.0)	65 (7.0)	4 (11.4)	
Always					
To fit in					52.0
Never	1535 (82.7)	744 (83.7)	763 (81.8)	28 (80.0)	0.67
Seidom	134 (7.2)	60 (6.7)	/1 (7.6)	3 (8.6)	
Mostly	$H_{2}(0.0)$	47 (3.3)	04 (0.9)	1(0.9)	
Always	17 (0.9)	8(0,9)	27 (2.9)	2(3.7)	
Improves parties and	17 (0.9)	0(0.3)	0 (0.3)	1 (2.3)	
celebrations	1112 (59.8)	543 (611)	549 (587)	20 (571)	0.67
Never	150 (81)	60 (68)	85 (91)	5 (14.3)	0.07
Seldom	219 (11.8)	101 (11.4)	113 (12.1)	5 (14.3)	
Sometimes	262 (14.1)	130 (14.6)	130 (13.9)	2 (5.7)	
Mostly	115 (6.2)	54 (61)	58 (6.2)	3 (8.6)	
Always		0. (0.1)	00 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	



Summary



Category	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
To forget problems					
Never	1602 (86.2)	804 (90.4)	774 (82.9)	24 (68.6)	<0.001
Seldom	63 (3.4)	26 (2.9)	34 (3.6)	3 (8.6)	
Sometimes	99 (5.3)	30 (3.4)	67 (7.2)	2 (5.7)	
Mostly	58 (3.1)	21 (2.4)	34 (3.6)	3 (8.6)	
Always	36 (1.9)	8 (0.9)	25 (2.7)	3 (8.6)	
Because it's fun					
Never	1080 (58.1)	534 (60.0)	526 (56.3)	20 (57.1)	0.23
Seldom	157 (8.4)	75 (8.4)	81 (8.7)	1 (2.9)	
Sometimes	219 (11.8)	98 (11.0)	115 (12.3)	6 (17.1)	
Mostly	244 (13.1)	117 (13.1)	125 (13.4)	2 (5.7)	
Always	159 (8.6)	66 (7.4)	87 (9.3)	6 (17.1)	
To be liked					
Never	1651 (88.8)	793 (89.1)	828 (88.7)	30 (85.7)	0.93
Seldom	108 (5.8)	50 (5.6)	55 (5.9)	3 (8.6)	
Sometimes	65 (3.5)	32 (3.6)	33 (3.5)	0 (0.0)	
Mostly	20 (1.1)	8 (0.9)	12 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	
Always	15 (0.8)	7 (0.8)	6 (0.6)	2 (5.7)	
So won't feel left out					
Never	1537 (82.6)	748 (84.0)	758 (81.1)	31 (88.6)	0.36
Seldom	152 (8.2)	75 (8.4)	75 (8.0)	2 (5.7)	
Sometimes	107 (5.8)	40 (4.5)	66 (7.1)	1 (2.9)	
Mostly	49 (2.6)	19 (2.1)	29 (3.1)	1 (2.9)	
Always	15 (0.8)	8 (0.9)	7 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	

# Associations with Teenager Alcohol Use

# Truancy

Skipping school in the last 30 days was significantly associated with lifetime and current alcohol use. Students who skipped 5-6 days were most likely to have consumed alcohol in their lifetime (90.5%) and in the last 30 days (71.4%). Students who did not skip school were the least likely to have consumed alcohol in their lifetime (63.2%) or to be current drinkers (30.2%). Table 4.16 shows the relationship between alcohol use and school absence due to truancy.



Summary

ТоС



Alcohol Use			School	Absence -	Truancy		
	Total	Never	1 day	2 days	3-4 days	5-6 days	7 days or more
Never	534	472	29	9	18	2	4
	(33.0)	(36.8)	(19.6)	(12.7)	(26.9)	(9.5)	(14.3)
Lifetime, p<0.001	1083	810	119	62	49	19	24
	(67.0)	(63.2)	(80.4)	(87.3)	(73.1)	(90.5)	(85.7)
Last 30 days, <i>p</i> <0.001	574	386	79	42	34	15	18
	(35.6)	(30.2)	(53.4)	(59.2)	(50.7)	(71.4)	(64.3)

### Table 4.16 Associations between truancy and alcohol use

# **Parental Monitoring**

A strong relationship was found between parental monitoring of students' whereabouts on Saturday nights and students' alcohol use, with parental awareness acting as a protective factor against both lifetime and last 30-day use. Table 4.17 shows that 70% of students whose parents usually don't know their whereabouts on Saturday nights had consumed alcohol, compared to 60.5% whose parents always know. Similarly, students whose parents usually don't know where they are were twice as likely to be current drinkers (56%) than those whose parents always know (27.9%).

Alcohol Use	Parental Monitoring of Saturday Night Whereabouts						
	Total	Know always	Know quite often	Know sometimes	Usually don't know		
Never	591 (33.4)	490 (39.5)	64 (17.6)	22 (19.3)	15 (30.0)		
Lifetime, p<0.001	1176 (66.6)	749 (60.5)	300 (82.4)	92 (80.7)	35 (70.0)		
Last 30 days, <i>p</i> <0.001	613 (34.8)	346 (27.9)	173 (47.9)	66 (58.9)	28 (56.0)		

#### Table 4.17 Associations between parental monitoring and teenager alcohol use

### **Parental Alcohol Use**

Parental alcohol use was strongly linked to students' alcohol use. Table 4.18 shows that students who reported that one or both of their parents had used alcohol were more likely to report lifetime use and also last 30-day use.



# Summary

ТоС



Alcohol Use	Parental Alcohol Use							
	Total	None	Only father	Only mother	Both	Don't know		
Never	561 (33.4)	115 (69.7)	42 (38.9)	17 (31.5)	364 (27.8)	23 (54.8)		
Lifetime, p<0.001	1117 (66.6)	50 (30.3)	66 (61.1)	37 (68.5)	945 (72.2)	19 (45.2)		
Last 30 days, p<0.001	579 (34.6)	22 (13.3)	28 (26.4)	26 (49.1)	495 (37.9)	8 (19.0)		

### Table 4.18 Associations between parental alcohol use and teenager alcohol use

### **Peer Alcohol Use**

Peer alcohol use was strongly linked to students' lifetime and current alcohol use. Table 4.19 shows that students who reported all of their friends use alcohol were more likely to have tried it (93.7%) compared to those who reported none of their friends use it (35.9%). A more pronounced pattern was observed for current drinkers, with 83.9% of students whose friends all use alcohol being current users, compared to 11.5% of those whose friends don't use it.

Alcohol Use	Peer Alcohol Use						
	Total	None	A few	Some	Most	All	
Never	569 (33.4)	245 (64.1)	163 (34.5)	89 (29.9)	65 (14.7)	7 (6.3)	
Lifetime, p<0.001	1137 (66.6)	137 (35.9)	309 (65.5)	209 (70.1)	377 (85.3)	105 (93.7)	
Last 30 days, p<0.001	594 (34.9)	44 (11.5)	111 (23.6)	95 (31.9)	250 (56.9)	94 (83.9)	

### Table 4.19 Associations between peer alcohol use and teenager alcohol use



Summary ToC



# Summary: Alcohol

Overall, two-thirds of students had tried alcohol, with slightly more females (67%) than males (66.1%) having done so. About six in ten (59.9%) students had used alcohol in the last 12 months, and more than a third (35.1%) had done so in the last 30 days. Almost a quarter (23.7%) had their last drink between a month and a year ago, while 13.7% had it in the last week. The typical age of first use was 15 years.

More than one in four (27.7%) students reported having been intoxicated in their lifetime, while almost one in four (24.4%) had been drunk in the last 12 months, and one in eight (12.4%) in the last 30 days. The most common age of first intoxication was 15 years. Almost a quarter of students (23.2%) had engaged in heavy episodic (binge) drinking in the last 30 days. No statistically significant gender differences were observed regarding the number of binge-drinking occasions.

Students commonly sourced alcohol from parents (23.2%), from other youth (11.6%) and from a store/off-license (8.3%), but more commonly from other unnamed sources (32%). Males were twice as likely as females to buy alcohol from a store/off-license, while females were more likely than males to be given alcohol by their parents.

Regarding perceived risk of alcohol use, 8.1% of students perceived no risk in consuming 1-2 drinks nearly every day, whereas 27.5% perceived great risk; 4.7% perceived no risk in consuming 4-5 drinks nearly every day, while 69.7% perceived great risk; and 8% perceived no risk in consuming 5 or more drinks nearly every weekend compared with 33.7% who perceived great risk. Males, and those who preferred not to state their gender, were more likely than females to perceive no risk, whereas females were more likely to perceive a moderate or great risk.

As regards their reasons for alcohol use, students were more likely to report that they use alcohol for the purpose of enjoyment and to enhance social activity. Conversely, they were less likely to report using alcohol for reasons related to social acceptance/inclusion and mental health.

Truancy was associated with increased alcohol use. Over 90 percent of students who had skipped class on 5-6 days in the last 30 days had used alcohol in their lifetime, and 71.4% were current drinkers. 63.2% who had not skipped class at all had tried alcohol in their lifetime, and 30.2% were current drinkers.

Less frequent parental monitoring was associated with increased alcohol use. Students who reported that their parents usually don't know where they are on Saturday nights were twice as likely to be current drinkers (56%) as students whose parents always know (27.9%).

Peer alcohol use was strongly associated with increased students' alcohol use. Students whose friends all used alcohol were far more likely to have ever tried it (93.7%) and to have used it in the last 30 days (83.9%) compared to those whose friends did not use alcohol (35.9% and 11.5%, respectively). Parental alcohol use was strongly linked to students' alcohol use. Students who reported that one or both of their parents had used alcohol were more likely to report lifetime and last 30-day use.





# Cannabis and Other **Illicit Drugs** and Substances



90.0% Ever Used

**E-cigarettes** 

Ever Used

Alcohol

Ever

Smoked

Prevention activities

ESPAD Ireland 2024



# Cannabis

In ESPAD 2024, students were surveyed on various aspects of cannabis use, including lifetime, last-year, and last 30-day use; age of first use; access to cannabis; opportunity to try cannabis; use with tobacco; perceived risks; cannabis-related experiences; and types of cannabis used. We also examined socioeconomic status, school attendance, academic attainment, parenting style, relationships and supports, and peer/parental substance use to assess their associations with student cannabis use. Findings are detailed below in this chapter, and additional data analyses not reported here are presented in the linked Supplementary Analysis Report. All questions pertaining to cannabis and other drugs are as shown in the ESPAD Ireland 2024 Student Questionnaire in Appendix A.

# **Prevalence of Cannabis Use**

Students were asked on how many occasions in their lifetime they had used cannabis. Table 5.1 shows that 88.2% of students reported never using cannabis, while almost one in eight students (11.8%) had used it. In the total student population, 3.5% had used it 1-2 times, and 3.2% had used it at least 20 times. No significant gender differences were observed in lifetime cannabis use.

Lifetime Cannabis Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1652 (88.2)	794 (87.9)	832 (88.7)	26 (78.8)
Ever	222 (11.8)	109 (12.1)	106 (11.3)	7 (21.2)
1-2 times	66 (3.5)	29 (3.2)	36 (3.8)	1 (3.0)
3-5 times	51 (2.7)	26 (2.9)	24 (2.6)	1(3.0)
6-9 times	21 (1.1)	10 (1.1)	9 (1.0)	2 (6.1)
10-19 times	24 (1.3)	14 (1.6)	9 (1.0)	1(3.0)
20-39 times	16 (0.9)	5 (0.6)	11 (1.2)	0 (0.0)
40 or more times	44 (2.3)	25 (2.8)	17 (1.8)	2 (6.1)
Total	1874 (100.0)	903 (48.2)	938 (50.1)	33 (1.8)

### Table 5.1 Cannabis: prevalence of lifetime use

p=0.16

Table 5.2 shows that 10.2% of students used cannabis in the last 12 months, with 2.2% using it 20 or more times. No significant gender differences were found in cannabis-use intensity, although twice as many males (2.1%) as females (1%) reported using cannabis at least 40 times.







Last 12-Months Cannabis Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1683 (89.8)	802 (88.8)	855 (91.2)	26 (76.5)
Ever	191 (10.2)	101 (11.2)	82 (8.8)	8 (23.5)
1-2 times	71 (3.8)	34 (3.8)	33 (3.5)	4 (11.8)
3-5 times	41 (2.2)	25 (2.8)	16 (1.7)	0 (0.0)
6-9 times	17 (0.9)	8 (0.9)	8 (0.9)	1 (2.9)
10-19 times	19 (1.0)	9 (1.0)	9 (1.0)	1 (2.9)
20-39 times	14 (0.7)	6 (0.7)	7 (0.7)	1 (2.9)
40 or more times	29 (1.5)	19 (2.1)	9 (1.0)	1 (2.9)
Total	1874 (100.0)	903 (48.2)	937 (50.0)	34 (1.8)

### Table 5.2 Cannabis: prevalence of use in the last 12 months

p=0.08

Overall, 4.9% of students used cannabis in the last 30 days, while 95.1% did not. In the total population, 2.1% used it 1-2 times, and 1% used it at least 20 times. No significant gender differences were found in cannabis use frequency during this period.

Last Month Cannabis Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1777 (95.1)	848 (94.2)	899 (96.0)	30 (90.9)
Ever	92 (4.9)	52 (5.8)	37 (4.0)	3 (9.1)
1-2 times	39 (2.1)	23 (2.6)	14 (1.5)	2 (6.1)
3-5 times	13 (0.7)	6 (0.7)	7 (0.7)	0 (0.0)
6-9 times	8 (0.4)	5 (0.6)	3 (0.3)	0 (0.0)
10-19 times	14 (0.7)	8 (0.9)	5 (0.5)	1 (3.0)
20-39 times	5 (0.3)	2 (0.2)	3 (0.3)	0 (0.0)
40 or more times	13 (0.7)	8 (0.9)	5 (0.5)	0 (0.0)
Total	1869 (100.0)	900 (48.2)	936 (50.1)	33 (1.8)

#### Table 5.3 Cannabis: prevalence of use in the last 30 days

p=0.56

### Age of Initiation of Cannabis Use

Students were asked at what age they first tried cannabis. Age 14 years was the most frequently reported starting age (4.4%). Females were more likely to start using it at 14 years of age (5.2%), males at 15 (4.8%).





Age of First Cannabis Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
Never	1649 (87.9)	792 (87.7)	832 (88.6)	25 (73.5)
9 years old or less	6 (0.3)	4 (0.4)	1 (0.1)	1 (2.9)
10 years old	3 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	1 (2.9)
11 years old	4 (0.2)	3 (0.3)	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)
12 years old	10 (0.5)	6 (0.7)	4 (0.4)	0 (0.0)
13 years old	34 (1.8)	14 (1.6)	18 (1.9)	2 (5.9)
14 years old	82 (4.4)	31 (3.4)	49 (5.2)	2 (5.9)
15 years old	74 (3.9)	43 (4.8)	29 (3.1)	2 (5.9)
16 years or older	14 (0.7)	9 (1.0)	4 (0.4)	1 (2.9)
Total	1876 (100.0)	903 (48.1)	939 (50.1)	34 (1.8)

### Table 5.4 Age of initiation of cannabis use

p<0.001

# **Perceived Availability of Cannabis**

Nearly one-third of students (28.5%) reported that obtaining cannabis would be 'fairly easy' or 'very easy', while 19.3% believed it would be 'impossible'. Perceived accessibility did not differ significantly by gender, although a slightly higher proportion of males (11.5%) than females (8.6%) considered it 'very easy' to obtain.

### Table 5.5 Perceived availability of cannabis

Difficulty to Get Cannabis	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
Impossible	361 (19.3)	165 (18.3)	192 (20.4)	4 (11.8)
Very difficult	307 (16.4)	156 (17.3)	145 (15.4)	6 (17.6)
Fairly difficult	311 (16.6)	144 (16.0)	163 (17.4)	4 (11.8)
Fairly easy	346 (18.5)	158 (17.5)	178 (19.0)	10 (29.4)
Very easy	188 (10.0)	104 (11.5)	81 (8.6)	3 (8.8)
Don't know	361 (19.3)	174 (19.3)	180 (19.2)	7 (20.6)
Total	1874 (100.0)	901 (48.1)	939 (50.1)	34 (1.8)

p=0.37

# **Opportunities to Try Cannabis Without Using it**

When asked if they had ever had the opportunity to try cannabis without using it, 26.2% responded yes, while 73.8% said no. More males (29.1%) than females (23.2%) had experienced such an opportunity.



Summary ToC



Possibility to Try Cannabis	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
Never	1382 (73.8)	640 (71.0)	719 (76.7)	23 (67.6)
Once or twice	317 (16.9)	173 (19.2)	138 (14.7)	6 (17.6)
3 times or more	174 (9.3)	89 (9.9)	80 (8.5)	5 (14.7)
Total	1873 (100.0)	902 (48.2)	937 (50.0)	34 (1.8)

### Table 5.6 Number of opportunities to try cannabis without using it

p=0.05

### **Use of Cannabis Mixed with Tobacco**

Of those who used cannabis in the last 12 months (10.2%), 3.3% had often mixed it with tobacco. Compared with males and those who preferred not to state their gender, females were less likely to report often mixing cannabis with tobacco.

### Table 5.7 Use of Cannabis mixed with tobacco

Cannabis Mixed with Tobacco Last 12 Months	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
Never	1724 (92.1)	828 (92.0)	869 (92.7)	27 (79.4)
Rarely	85 (4.5)	41 (4.6)	42 (4.5)	2 (5.9)
Often	62 (3.3)	31 (3.4)	26 (2.8)	5 (14.7)
Total	1871 (100.0)	900 (48.1)	937 (50.1)	34 (1.8)

p=0.01

# **Risk Perception of Cannabis Use**

Students were asked about the perceived risks of cannabis use, including trying it once or twice, occasional use, and regular use. As shown in Table 5.8, 22.5% saw no risk in trying cannabis once or twice, 33.7% perceived slight risk, 19.5% moderate risk, and 16.1% great risk. More males (24.7%) than females (19.6%) perceived no risk, while more females (38.1%) than males (33.7%) perceived a moderate or great risk.

### Table 5.8 Risk perception of trying cannabis once or twice

Risk Perception of Trying Cannabis Once or Twice	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
No risk	414 (22.5)	219 (24.7)	180 (19.6)	15 (44.1)
Slight risk	619 (33.7)	288 (32.5)	321 (35.0)	10 (29.4)
Moderate risk	359 (19.5)	159 (18.0)	199 (21.7)	1 (2.9)
Great risk	295 (16.1)	139 (15.7)	151 (16.4)	5 (14.7)
Don't know	150 (8.2)	80 (9.0)	67 (7.3)	3 (8.8)
Total	1837 (100.0)	885 (48.2)	918 (50.0)	34 (1.9)

p<0.01

ToC



Students were asked how much they thought people risked harming themselves if they smoked cannabis occasionally (Table 5.9). 27.7% perceived great risk, 33.5% moderate risk, 22.3% slight risk, and 8.4% no risk. Perceptions varied significantly by gender: more males (34.7%) than females (25.9%) perceived little or no risk, while more females (67%) than males (56%) saw moderate or great risk.

Risk Perception of Occasional Cannabis Smoking	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
No risk	154 (8.4)	85 (9.6)	62 (6.8)	7 (20.6)
Slight risk	408 (22.3)	221 (25.1)	175 (19.1)	12 (35.3)
Moderate risk	613 (33.5)	260 (29.5)	348 (38.0)	5 (14.7)
Great risk	507 (27.7)	234 (26.5)	266 (29.0)	7 (20.6)
Don't know	150 (8.2)	82 (9.3)	65 (7.1)	3 (8.8)
Total	1832 (100.0)	882 (48.1)	916 (50.0)	34 (1.9)

### Table 5.9 Risk perception of smoking cannabis occasionally

p<0.001

Asked how much they thought people risked harming themselves if they smoked cannabis regularly (Table 5.10), only 5.2% of students believed regular cannabis use posed no risk, 7.9% saw it as a slight risk, 24.5% viewed it as moderately risky, and 54.5% believed it posed a great risk. Significant gender differences were observed, with more males (6.7%) than females (3.4%) perceiving no risk, while more females (60.2%) than males (49.5%) perceived a great risk.

### Table 5.10 Risk perception of smoking cannabis regularly

Risk Perception of Regular Cannabis Smoking	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
No risk	95 (5.2)	59 (6.7)	31 (3.4)	5 (14.7)
Slight risk	145 (7.9)	71 (8.0)	67 (7.3)	7 (20.6)
Moderate risk	449 (24.5)	233 (26.4)	207 (22.6)	9 (26.5)
Great risk	999 (54.5)	437 (49.5)	552 (60.2)	10 (29.4)
Don't know	145 (7.9)	82 (9.3)	60 (6.5)	3 (8.8)
Total	1833 (100.0)	882 (48.1)	917 (50.0)	34 (1.9)

p<0.001

# **Problem Cannabis Use**

Students were asked about indicators of Problem Cannabis Use in the last 12 months, using the Cannabis Abuse Screening Test (CAST). The CAST score measures the possible presence and extent of cannabis-related problems. Originally designed for teenagers, this test was adopted in 2007 in the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and other Drugs (ESPAD) and its psychometric properties have been assessed in representative samples of teenagers in several European countries<sup>10</sup>.



10 Assessing the structure of the CAST (Cannabis Abuse Screening Test) in 13 European countries using multigroup analyses. Legleye S, Eslami A, Bougeard S. International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research. (2017) Mar;26(1):e1552, doi: 10.1002/mpr.1552.



Table 5.11 shows that 4.9% had smoked cannabis before midday and 4.5% had smoked it alone. Students reported experiencing problems due to cannabis use, namely memory problems (5%) and other problems such as arguments, fights, accidents, and poor school results (2.8%). 2.9% of students had been encouraged by family and friends to reduce or stop their use of cannabis, and 2.7% had tried to adjust their habit without success. Compared with males and females, those who preferred not to state their gender were more likely to report indicators of Problem Cannabis Use.

Table 5.11 Problem	cannabis u	se in the la	st 12 months	: Cannabis	Abuse S	Screening <sup>·</sup>	Test
(CAST) indicators							

Cannabis-Related Experiences Last 12 Months	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Have you smoked cannabis before midday?					
Never	1782 (95.1)	858 (95.2)	897 (95.5)	27 (79.4)	
Yes	92 (4.9)	43 (4.8)	42 (4.5)	7 (20.6)	<0.001
Have you smoked cannabis alone?					
Never	1790 (95.5)	860 (95.4)	902 (96.1)	28 (82.4)	
Yes	84 (4.5)	41 (4.6)	37 (3.9)	6 (17.6)	0.01
Have you had memory problems after smoking cannabis?					
Never	1781 (95.0)	861 (95.6)	891 (94.9)	29 (85.3)	
Yes	93 (5.0)	40 (4.4)	48 (5.1)	5 (14.7)	<0.001
Have friends/family told you that you ought to reduce/stop cannabis use?					
Never	1819 (97.1)	872 (96.8)	915 (97.4)	32 (94.1)	
Yes	55 (2.9)	29 (3.2)	24 (2.6)	2 (5.9)	0.53
Have you tried to reduce/stop cannabis without success?					
Never	1824 (97.3)	874 (97.0)	919 (97.9)	31 (91.2)	
Yes	50 (2.7)	27 (3.0)	20 (2.1)	3 (8.8)	0.44
Have you had problems due to cannabis use (arguments, fights, accidents, poor school results etc.)?					
Never	1822 (97.2)	878 (97.4)	914 (97.3)	30 (88.2)	
Yes	52 (2.8)	23 (2.6)	25 (2.7)	4 (11.8)	<0.01



GH)





As described in the methodology section, the Cannabis Abuse Screening Test (CAST) score, which measures the possible presence and extent of cannabis-related problems, was calculated only for participants who gave a valid response to the introductory question of the CAST module, which asks about cannabis use in the last 12 months. CAST scores are reported in Table 5.12a and Table 5.12b, for the total sample and for cannabis users respectively.

Among the total sample (both users and non-users of cannabis in the last 12 months), 4.1% of students were classified as high-risk cannabis users using this measure and 95.9% were classified as being at low or no risk. Male students were more likely than female students to be classified as high-risk cannabis users (4.2% vs 3.5%).

# Table 5.12a Problem cannabis use in the last 12 months (total sample): Cannabis Abuse Screening Test (CAST)

Problem cannabis use (CAST Score) in total sample	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
Low Risk (score<2)	1796 (95.9)	863 (95.8)	905 (96.5)	28 (82.4)
High Risk (Score≥2)	77 (4.1)	38 (4.2)	33 (3.5)	6 (17.6)
Total	1873 (100.0)	901 (48.1)	938 (50.1)	34 (1.8)

p<0.01

Among those who said that they used cannabis (Table 5.12b), 37.6% of students were classified as high-risk cannabis users. Female students who used cannabis were more likely than male students to be classified as high-risk users (36.8% vs 35.6%).

# Table 5.12b Problem cannabis use in the last 12 months among cannabis users: CannabisAbuse Screening Test (CAST)

Problem cannabis use (CAST Score) among cannabis users	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
Low Risk (score<2)	123 (62.4)	65 (54.4)	55 (63.2)	3 (33.3)
High Risk (Score≥2)	74 (37.6)	36 (35.6)	32 (36.8)	6 (66.7)
Total	197 (100.0)	101 (51.3)	87 (44.2)	9 (4.6)

p=0.03






### Associations with Teenager Cannabis Use

#### Truancy

Skipping school in the last 30 days was significantly associated with lifetime and current cannabis use. Students who skipped 7 or more days were most likely to have tried cannabis in their lifetime (51.7%), while those who skipped 5-6 days were most likely to have used cannabis in the last 30 days (28.6%). Students who did not skip school were the least likely to have tried cannabis in their lifetime (7.4%) or to be current users (3.1%). Table 5.13 shows the relationship between cannabis use and school truancy.

Cannabis Use			School	School Absence – Truancy					
	Total	Never	1 day	2 days	3-4 days	5-6 days	7 days or more		
Never	1425	1188	110	51	50	12	14		
	(88.0)	(92.6)	(74.3)	(71.8)	(74.6)	(57.1)	(48.3)		
Lifetime, <i>p</i> <0.001	194	95	38	20	17	9	15		
	(12.0)	(7.4)	(25.7)	(28.2)	(25.4)	(42.9)	(51.7)		
Last 30 days,	81	40	14	9	6	6	6		
p<0.001	(5.0)	(3.1)	(9.5)	(12.9)	(9.0)	(28.6)	(21.4)		

#### Table 5.13 Associations between truancy and cannabis use

#### **Parental Monitoring**

As in previous reports, a strong relationship was found between parental monitoring of students' whereabouts on Saturday nights and students' cannabis use, with parental awareness acting as a protective factor against both lifetime and last 30-day use. Table 5.14 shows that 28.6% of students whose parents usually don't know their whereabouts on Saturday nights had tried cannabis, compared to 6.9% whose parents always know. Similarly, students whose parents usually don't know where they are were more likely to be current cannabis users (18.4%) than those whose parents always know (2.3%).

#### Table 5.14 Associations between parental monitoring and teenager cannabis use

Cannabis Use	Parental Monitoring of Saturday Night Whereabouts							
	Total	Know always	Know quite often	Know sometimes	Usually don't know			
Never	1568 (88.7)	1155 (93.1)	307 (84.3)	71 (62.3)	35 (71.4)			
Lifetime, p<0.001	199 (11.3)	85 (6.9)	57 (15.7)	43 (37.7)	14 (28.6)			
Last 30 days, <i>p</i> <0.001	82 (4.7)	29 (2.3)	25 (6.9)	19 (16.8)	9 (18.4)			

ToC

3H)



#### Parental Cannabis Use

Parental cannabis use was strongly linked to students' cannabis use. Table 5.15 shows that students who reported that one or both of their parents had used cannabis were more likely to report lifetime use and also last 30-day use.

Cannabis Use	Parental Cannabis Use						
	Total	None	Only father	Only mother	Both	Don't know	
Never	1491 (89.0)	1083 (95.2)	91 (75.2)	13 (41.9)	72 (62.6)	232 (85.6)	
Lifetime, p<0.001	185 (11.0)	55 (4.8)	30 (24.8)	18 (58.1)	43 (37.4)	39 (14.4)	
Last 30 days, p<0.001	75 (4.5)	22 (1.9)	14 (11.7)	5 (16.7)	16 (14.0)	18 (6.6)	

#### Table 5.15 Associations between parental cannabis use and teenager cannabis use

#### Peer Cannabis Use

Peer cannabis use was strongly linked to students' lifetime and current cannabis use. Table 5.16 shows that students who reported all of their friends use cannabis were much more likely to have tried it (66.7%) compared to those who reported none of their friends use it (1.9%). A similar pattern was observed for current cannabis use, with 64.3% of students whose friends all use cannabis being current users, compared to only 0.6% of those whose friends don't use it.

<b>Fable 5.16 Associations bet</b>	ween peer cannabis use	and teenager cannabis use
------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------

Cannabis Use	Peer Cannabis Use						
	Total	None	A few	Some	Most	All	
Never	1519 (88.9)	1128 (98.1)	301 (80.3)	61 (54.5)	24 (42.9)	5 (33.3)	
Lifetime, p<0.001	189 (11.1)	22 (1.9)	74 (19.7)	51 (45.5)	32 (57.1)	10 (66.7)	
Last 30 days, p<0.001	78 (4.6)	7 (0.6)	22 (5.9)	17 (15.5)	23 (41.1)	9 (64.3)	



Summary

ToC

**OTHER DRUG USE** 



#### Percentage of students who ever used



### Risk Perception of Occasional Drug Use

<b>~~ ~</b>	
3 🛞	/MDMÁ
۲	Ecstasy

36.2% No/Slight Risk27.0% Moderate Risk

24.5% Great Risk

#### Regular Synthetic Opioid Use

- 36.2% No/Slight Risk
- 27.0% Moderate Risk
- 24.5% Great Risk

	<b>Occasional Synthetic</b>
	Opioid Use

28.4% No/Slight Risk

- 28.0% Moderate Risk
- 26.8% Great Risk



### Amphetamines

28.9% No/Slight Risk28.4% Moderate Risk

28.7% Great Risk

#### **Difficulty in Accessing Substances** (Amphetamines Example)

32.5%	Impossible
18.0%	Very Difficult
11.5%	Fairly Difficult
4.2%	Fairly Easy
1.2%	Very Easy
32.2%	Don't Know

#### Lifetime Prevalence of Other Substances



**2.2%** New Psychoactive Substances





Tranquilisers and Sedatives without prescription





### Other Illicit Drugs and Substances

The 2024 ESPAD Ireland survey explored students' use of well-established substances – such as inhalants, tranquillisers, and ecstasy – as well as emerging substances in the Irish market, including synthetic opioids fentanyl and nitazenes<sup>11</sup>, which had not been previously measured or reported in ESPAD. New psychoactive substances (NPS) were also included in the survey and these data are reported separately below. In addition to prevalence data (lifetime and last-year use), the survey included specific questions on age of first use, ease of access, and perceived risks. All variables reported below are derived from the ESPAD Ireland 2024 Student Questionnaire in Appendix A. Additional data analyses reported here are presented in the linked Supplementary Analysis Report.

#### Prevalence of Other Illicit Drug and Substance Use

Students were asked several questions regarding their lifetime use of a range of 19 substances, including ecstasy/MDMA, amphetamines, methamphetamines, synthetic cannabinoids, synthetic cathinones, synthetic opioids, nitrous oxide, cocaine, crack, heroin, inhalants, LSD, magic mushrooms, GHB, drugs by injection, ketamine, anabolic steroids, nitazenes, and fentanyl. They were also asked about their use of alcohol with pills. Students were asked about a fictitious drug, Sprack, listed among the real drugs. 0.6% of students reported using the drug and were excluded from this section of the analysis.

Table 5.17 shows that the substance most frequently used was inhalants (6.3%), followed by synthetic cannabinoids (3.2%) and alcohol with pills (3%). The least commonly used substance was nitazenes (0.4%) which, together with the somewhat more frequently used substance fentanyl (0.9%), are new drugs in the Irish context. Significant gender differences were observed in the lifetime use of all substances apart from ketamine and LSD. Considerably more females (4.3%) than males (1%) had taken alcohol and pills, whereas use of nitrous oxide was notably more common among males than females (3.4% and 0.6%, respectively).

Lifetime Drug Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Ecstasy/MDMA	29 (1.5)	11 (1.2)	13 (1.4)	5 (14.7)	<.001
Amphetamines	15 (0.8)	7 (0.8)	5 (0.5)	3 (8.8)	<.001
Methamphetamines	13 (0.7)	8 (0.9)	2 (0.2)	3 (8.8)	<.001
Synthetic cannabinoids	60 (3.2)	33 (3.6)	22 (2.3)	5 (14.7)	<.001
Synthetic cathinones	12 (0.7)	6 (0.6)	3 (0.3)	3 (8.8)	<.001
Synthetic opioids	12 (0.6)	6 (0.6)	4 (0.4)	2 (5.9)	<.001
Nitrous oxide	40 (2.1)	31 (3.4)	6 (0.6)	3 (8.8)	<.001
Cocaine	37 (2.0)	17 (1.9)	16 (1.7)	4 (12.2)	.001
Crack	20 (1.1)	12 (1.4)	5 (0.5)	3 (9.1)	<.001
Heroin	13 (0.7)	7 (0.8)	4 (0.4)	2 (6.0)	.003
Inhalants	115 (6.3)	52 (5.9)	56 (6.1)	7 (21.9)	<.001

#### Table 5.17 Other illicit drugs and substances: prevalence of lifetime use

11 The emergence of nitazenes on the Irish heroin market and national preparation for possible future outbreaks. Killeen N, Lakes R, Webster M, Killoran S, McNamara S, Kavanagh P, Eagleton M, McCormack S, Micheau E, Moughty A, O'Donnell C. *Addiction* (Abingdon, England). 2024 Sep;119(9):1657-8, doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/add.16525.



ToC



Lifetime Drug Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
LSD	29 (1.6)	11 (1.3)	15 (1.7)	3 (9.4)	.006
Magic mushrooms	37 (2.0)	20 (2.3)	14 (1.5)	3 (9.4)	<.001
GHB	10 (0.5)	5 (0.6)	3 (0.3)	2 (6.5)	<0.001
Fictitious drug (Sprack)	11 (0.6)	6 (0.7)	2 (0.2)	3 (9.4)	<.001
Drugs by injection	15 (0.8)	6 (0.7)	6 (0.6)	3 (9.4)	<.001
Ketamine	20 (1.1)	9 (1.0)	9 (1.0)	2 (6.4)	.050
Alcohol and pills	55 (3.0)	9 (1.0)	40 (4.3)	6 (17.7)	<.001
Anabolic steroids	22 (1.2)	14 (1.6)	5 (0.5)	3 (8.8)	<.001
Nitazenes	7 (0.4)	4 (0.5)	1 (0.1)	2 (5.8)	<0.001
Fentanyl	17 (0.9)	13 (1.4)	3 (0.3)	1 (2.9)	<0.001

Students were also asked if they had used some of these substances in the last 12 months. Table 5.18 shows that inhalants were the most used (4.8%) during this period, while the least commonly used were synthetic opioids (0.5%). Significant gender differences were observed in last-year use of all substances apart from cocaine and heroin. More males than females had used all substances in the previous 12 months.

Last 12-Months Drug Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Ecstasy/MDMA	22 (1.2)	10 (1.1)	8 (0.8)	4 (11.7)	<.001
Amphetamines	12 (0.6)	8 (0.8)	1 (0.1)	3 (8.8)	<.001
Methamphetamines	11 (0.6)	6 (0.7)	2 (0.2)	3 (8.8)	<.001
Synthetic cannabinoids	56 (3.0)	31 (3.4)	21 (2.2)	4 (11.7)	0.01
Synthetic cathinones	11 (0.6)	5 (0.5)	3 (0.3)	3 (8.8)	<.001
Synthetic opioids	10 (0.5)	5 (0.5)	3 (0.3)	2 (5.8)	<.001
Nitrous oxide	33 (1.7)	25 (2.8)	5 (0.5)	3 (8.8)	<.001
Cocaine	23 (1.3)	11 (1.3)	11 (1.2)	1 (3.0)	0.47
Crack	14 (0.8)	10 (1.2)	3 (0.3)	1(3.0)	0.03
Heroin	11 (0.6)	7 (0.8)	3 (0.3)	1(3.0)	0.14
Inhalants	88 (4.8)	49 (5.6)	32 (3.5)	7 (21.9)	<0.001

#### Table 5.18 Other illicit drugs and substances: prevalence of use in the last 12 months

#### Perceived Availability of Other Illicit Drugs and Substances

Students were asked how difficult they thought it would be to get certain substances (amphetamines, methamphetamines, tranquillisers/sedatives, ecstasy/MDMA, cocaine, and crack). Table 5.19 shows that about one in three students reported that it would be impossible to get these substances. The substance with the highest proportion of students who answered 'fairly easy' or 'very easy' was cocaine (14.3%). Perceived accessibility differed significantly by gender for all substances except ecstasy/MDMA. Males were more likely than females to find the substances 'very easy' to obtain, although numbers were small.



3Ð



Substance	Difficulty Level	Total	Male (%)	Female (%)	Rather not say (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Amphetamines	Impossible	608 (32.5)	301 (33.4)	292 (31.2)	15 (44.1)	
	Very difficult	337 (18.0)	153 (17.0)	180 (19.2)	4 (11.8)	0.05
	Fairly difficult	215 (11.5)	107 (11.9)	106 (11.3)	2 (5.9)	
	Fairly easy	78 (4.2)	36 (4.0)	39 (4.2)	3 (8.8)	
	Very easy	23 (1.2)	15 (1.7)	6 (0.6)	2 (5.9)	
	Don't know	612 (1.2)	290 (32.2)	314 (33.5)	8 (23.5)	
	Total	1873 (100.0)	902 (48.2)	937 (50.0)	34 (1.8)	
Meth-	Impossible	632 (33.9)	320 (35.7)	295 (31.7)	17 (50.0)	
ampnetamines	Very difficult	364 (19.5)	171 (19.1)	189 (20.3)	4 (11.8)	0.03
	Fairly difficult	198 (10.6)	92 (10.3)	102 (10.9)	4 (11.8)	
	Fairly easy	58 (3.1)	27 (3.0)	29 (3.1)	2 (5.9)	
	Very easy	22 (1.2)	17 (1.9)	4 (0.4)	1 (2.9)	
	Don't know	589 (31.6)	270 (30.1)	313 (33.6)	6 (17.6)	
	Total	1863 (100.0)	897 (48.1)	932 (50.0)	34 (1.8)	
Tranquillisers/	Impossible	573 (30.7)	277 (30.9)	282 (30.2)	14 (41.2)	
Sedatives	Very difficult	386 (20.7)	199 (22.2)	181 (19.4)	6 (17.6)	0.04
	Fairly difficult	242 (13.0)	99 (11.0)	136 (14.6)	7 (20.6)	
	Fairly easy	112 (6.0)	46 (5.1)	64 (6.9)	2 (5.9)	
	Very easy	35 (1.9)	23 (2.6)	11 (1.2)	1 (2.9)	
	Don't know	516 (27.7)	253 (28.2)	259 (27.8)	4 (11.8)	
	Total	1864 (100.0)	897 (48.1)	933 (50.0)	34 (1.8)	
Ecstasy/MDMA	Impossible	590 (31.6)	286 (31.8)	291 (31.2)	13 (38.2)	
	Very difficult	335 (18.0)	168 (18.7)	162 (17.4)	5 (14.7)	0.44
	Fairly difficult	23618.0	106 (11.8)	125 (13.4)	5 (14.7)	
	Fairly easy	135 (7.2)	59 (6.6)	73 (7.8)	3 (8.8)	
	Very easy	44 (2.4)	29 (3.2)	14 (1.5)	1 (2.9)	
	Don't know	525 (28.2)	250 (27.8)	268 (28.7)	7 (20.6)	
	Total	1865 (100.0)	898 (48.2)	933 (50.0)	34 (1.8)	

#### Table 5.19 Perceived availability of other illicit drugs and substances



### Summary

ESPAD Ireland 2024



Substance	Difficulty Level	Total	Male (%)	Female (%)	Rather not say (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Cocaine	Impossible	612 (32.8)	309 (34.4)	291 (31.2)	12 (35.3)	
	Very difficult	343 (18.4)	184 (20.5)	154 (16.5)	5 (14.7)	<0.01
	Fairly difficult	243 (13.0)	96 (10.7)	143 (15.3)	4 (11.8)	
	Fairly easy	181 (9.7)	68 (7.6)	106 (11.4)	7 (20.6)	
	Very easy	85 (4.6)	43 (4.8)	40 (4.3)	2 (5.9)	
	Don't know	401 (21.5)	198 (22.0)	199 (21.3)	4 (11.8)	
	Total	1865 (100.0)	898 (48.2)	933 (50.0)	34 (1.8)	
Crack	Impossible	627 (33.6)	320 (35.6)	296 (31.7)	11 (32.4)	
	Very difficult	349 (18.7)	182 (20.3)	159 (17.0)	8 (23.5)	0.03
	Fairly difficult	240 (12.9)	98 (10.9)	137 (14.7)	5 (14.7)	
	Fairly easy	118 (6.3)	43 (4.8)	71 (7.6)	4 (11.8)	
	Very easy	66 (3.5)	34 (3.8)	31 (3.3)	1 (2.9)	
	Don't know	465 (24.9)	221 (24.6)	239 (25.6)	5 (14.7)	
	Total	1865 (100.0)	898 (48.2)	933 (50.0)	34 (1.8)	

#### **Risk Perception of Other Illicit Drug and Substance Use**

Students were asked about the perceived risk of trying, and occasionally or regularly using, certain substances (ecstasy/MDMA, amphetamines, synthetic cannabinoids, and synthetic opioids). Table 5.20 shows that fewer than one in ten perceived no risk in using these substances. Regular use was perceived as carrying greater risk. More than half of students (53%) believed there to be great risk attached to regular use of synthetic opioids, whereas only about a quarter (26.8%) considered this to be the case with occasional use. Perceived risk differed significantly by gender for all substances. More males than females perceived no risk, while slightly more females than males perceived a moderate or great risk.

Risk Perception of Drug Use	Risk	Total	Male (%)	Female (%)	Rather not say (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Ecstasy/MDMA	No risk	167 (9.2)	84 (9.6)	76 (8.3)	7 (20.6)	<0.01
	Slight risk	493 (27.0)	221 (25.2)	267 (29.3)	5 (14.7)	
	Moderate risk	492 (27.0)	222 (25.3)	256 (28.1)	14 (41.2)	
	Great risk	446 (24.5)	226 (25.7)	215 (23.6)	5 (14.7)	
	Don't know	225 (12.3)	125 (14.2)	97 (10.6)	3 (8.8)	
	Total	1823 (100.0)	878 (48.2)	911 (50.0)	34 (1.9)	

#### Table 5.20 Risk perception of other illicit drug and substance use

Summary

ТоС

<u>A</u>



Risk Perception of Drug Use	Risk	Total	Male (%)	Female (%)	Rather not say (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Amphetamines	No risk	130 (7.1)	65 (7.4)	56 (6.1)	9 (26.5)	<0.001
(uppers, pep pills, bennie,	Slight risk	399 (21.8)	175 (19.9)	220 (24.0)	4 (11.8)	
speed)	Moderate risk	519 (28.4)	235 (26.7)	279 (30.5)	5 (14.7)	
	Great risk	525 (28.7)	261 (29.7)	252 (27.5)	12 (35.3)	
	Don't know	256 (14.0)	143 (16.3)	109 (11.9)	4 (11.8)	
	Total	1829 (100.0)	879 (48.1)	916 (50.1)	34 (1.9)	
Synthetic	No risk	151 (8.3)	79 (9.0)	64 (7.0)	8 (23.5)	<0.001
cannabinoids once or twice	Slight risk	433 (23.8)	197 (22.5)	229 (25.1)	7 (20.6)	
	Moderate risk	498 (27.3)	223 (25.4)	266 (29.2)	9 (26.5)	
	Great risk	431 (23.6)	204 (23.3)	223 (24.5)	4 (11.8)	
	Don't know	310 (17.0)	174 (19.8)	130 (14.3)	6 (17.6)	
	Total	1823 (100.0)	877 (48.1)	912 (50.0)	34 (1.9)	
Synthetic	No risk	130 (7.1)	69 (7.9)	54 (5.9)	7 (20.6)	<0.001
opioids (occasional)	Slight risk	389 (21.3)	173 (19.7)	210 (23.0)	6 (17.6)	
	Moderate risk	510 (28.0)	222 (25.3)	282 (30.9)	6 (17.6)	
	Great risk	488 (26.8)	247 (28.1)	232 (25.4)	9 (26.5)	
	Don't know	307 (16.8)	167 (19.0)	134 (14.7)	6 (17.6)	
	Total	1824 (100.0)	878 (48.1)	912 (50.0)	34 (1.9)	
Synthetic	No risk	84 (4.6)	50 (5.7)	29 (3.2)	5 (15.2)	<0.01
opioids (regular)	Slight risk	143 (7.9)	59 (6.8)	81 (8.9)	3 (9.1)	
	Moderate risk	335 (18.4)	157 (18.0)	174 (19.1)	4 (12.1)	
	Great risk	963 (53.0)	450 (51.5)	497 (54.6)	16 (48.5)	
	Don't know	292 (16.1)	157 (18.0)	130 (14.3)	5 (15.2)	
	Total	1817 (100.0)	873 (48.0)	911 (50.1)	33 (1.8)	

### New Psychoactive Substances (NPS)

#### Prevalence of New Psychoactive Substance (NPS) Use

New psychoactive substances (NPS) were defined as substances that imitate the effects of illicit drugs, such as cannabis or ecstasy, and are sometimes called 'legal highs', 'ethno botanicals', or 'research chemicals', and can come in different forms (herbal mixtures, powders, crystals or tablets). Students were asked on how many occasions in their lifetime they had used these new substances. Table 5.21 shows that 96.5% of students reported never using them, while 2.2% had used them. In the total student population, 1.1% had used them 1-2 times, and 1.1% had used them at least 3 times.

ToC

GH)



Significant gender differences were observed, with students who preferred not to state their gender (8.8%) four times more likely than either males (2.2%) or females (2%) to have used these new psychoactive substances in their lifetime.

Lifetime NPS Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1807 (96.5)	868 (96.3)	912 (97.2)	27 (79.4)
Ever	41 (2.2)	20 (2.2)	18 (2.0)	3 (8.8)
1-2 times	20 (1.1)	9 (1.0)	10 (1.1)	1 (2.9)
3 or more	21 (1.1)	11 (1.2)	8 (0.9)	2 (5.9)
Don't Know	25 (1.3)	13 (1.4)	8 (0.9)	4 (11.8)
Total	1873 (100.0)	901 (48.1)	938 (50.1)	34 (1.8)

#### Table 5.21 New psychoactive substances: prevalence of lifetime use

p<0.001

Students were also asked about their use of new psychoactive substances in the last 12 months. Table 5.22 shows that 1.5% of students used these substances in the last year, with 0.9% using them 3 or more times. Significant gender differences were found in last-year NPS-use intensity. Again, students who preferred not to state their gender (8.8%) were even more likely than either males (1.5%) or females (1.2%) to have used these new psychoactive substances during this period.

Last 12-Months NPS Use	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Never	1821 (97.3)	875 (97.3)	919 (98.0)	27 (79.4)
Ever	28 (1.5)	13 (1.5)	12 (1.2)	3 (8.8)
1-2 times	12 (0.6)	6 (0.7)	5 (0.5)	1 (2.9)
3 or more	16 (0.9)	7 (0.8)	7 (0.7)	2 (5.9)
Don't Know	22 (1.2)	11 (1.2)	7 (0.7)	4 (11.8)
Total	1871 (100.0)	899 (48.0)	938 (50.1)	34 (1.8)

#### Table 5.22 New psychoactive substances: prevalence of use in the last 12 months

p<0.001

#### **Reported Content of New Psychoactive Substances**

Students were asked about the appearance/form of the new substances that they had used in the previous 12 months and they could select all that applied. Table 5.23 shows that, of the specified forms, herbal smoking mixtures were most commonly used (1.4%), followed by liquid (1%) and powder/crystal/tablet (0.6%) forms. Forms other than herbal, powder/crystal/tablet, or liquid were, however, more commonly used (3.4%). There were significant gender differences in the form of NPS used. Although numbers were small, males were more likely to use liquids, and females to use powders/crystal/tablets and herbal smoking mixtures.



Summary



Last 12-Months NPS Content	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
I have not used such substances in the last 12 months	1828 (98.3)	882 (98.5)	918 (98.6)	28 (84.8)	<.001
Herbal smoking mixtures with drug-like effects	26 (1.4)	9 (1.0)	13 (1.4)	4 (12.1)	<.001
Powders, crystals or tablets with drug-like effects	11 (0.6)	2 (0.2)	6 (0.6)	3 (9.1)	<.001
Liquids with drug-like effects	19 (1.0)	11 (1.2)	5 (0.5)	3 (9.1)	<.001
Other	63 (3.4)	31 (3.5)	27 (2.9)	5 (15.2)	<.001

#### Table 5.23 Content of new psychoactive substances

### Performance Enhancers

Students were asked whether they had ever in their lives used, on their own initiative (without having been prescribed by a doctor), any stimulant substance with the purpose to improve their performance in their studies, for instance to keep them awake and studying during the whole night or to study faster. They were instructed not to include coffee, tea or cola refreshments, or energy drinks.

About one in eight (11.6%) of the total sample had used performance enhancers, and there were not significant differences between male students, female students and those who preferred not to answer this question.

#### Table 5.24 Performance enhancers: prevalence of lifetime use

Have you ever used Performance Enhancers?	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
No	1468 (88.4)	694 (87.4)	750 (89.4)	24 (88.9)
Yes	192 (11.6)	100 (12.6)	89 (10.6)	3 (11.1)
Total	1660 (100)	794 (47.8)	839 (50.5)	27 (1.6)

p=0.45

If they had used such stimulant substances (without a doctor's prescription) with the aim of improving their performance in their studies, they were asked to state where they had obtained the substance. 2.7% of the total sample stated that they had been offered them by a family member, friend or an acquaintance, while 1% stated that they obtained them from a street dealer.



### Summary ToC



Where did you obtain the Performance Enhancers?	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Never used	1577 (95.7)	739 (94.4)	818 (97.5)	20 (80.0)	<.001
Offered by family/friend	45 (2.7)	27 (3.4)	16 (1.9)	2 (8.0)	.04
Street dealer	17 (1.0)	10 (1.3)	5 (0.6)	2 (8.0)	<.001
Internet	3 (0.2)	2 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	1(4.0)	<.001
From a pharmacy without medical prescription	7 (0.4)	6 (0.8)	0 (0.0)	1(4.0)	<.01

#### Table 5.25 Performance enhancers: sources of access

### Summary: Cannabis and Other Illicit Drugs and Substances

Overall, 11.1% of students had tried cannabis, with slightly more males (12.1%) than females (11.3%) having done so. Ten percent of students had used cannabis in the last 12 months, and 4.9% had used it in the last 30 days. The typical age of first use was 14 years.

Nearly a third of students (28.5%) found it 'fairly easy' or 'very easy' to obtain cannabis, with males perceiving easier access than females. 19.2% of males and 14.7% of females reported having had one or two opportunities to try cannabis without doing so, while 9.3% had this opportunity three or more times. Of those who used cannabis in the last 12 months (10.2%), 3.3% had often mixed it with tobacco.

Regarding perceived risk of cannabis use, females generally perceived more risk in using cannabis than males: 67% of females compared to 56% of males perceived a moderate or great risk in using cannabis occasionally, and 60.2% of females compared to 49.5% of males perceived a great risk from smoking cannabis regularly.

In terms of cannabis-related experiences in the last 12 months, 4.9% of students had smoked cannabis before midday and 4.5% had smoked it alone. Students reported experiencing memory problems (5%) and other problems such as arguments, fights, accidents, and poor school results (2.8%). 2.9% had been encouraged by family and friends to reduce or stop their use of cannabis, and 2.7% had tried to adjust their habit without success. Compared with males and females, those who preferred not to state their gender were more likely to report these experiences.

Using the Cannabis Abuse Screening Test (CAST) score, among the total sample (both users and non-users of cannabis in the last 12 months), 4.1% of students were classified as high-risk cannabis users, with male students more likely than female students to be classified as high-risk users (4.2% vs 3.5%). Among those who had used cannabis, 37.6% of students were classified as high-risk users.

Truancy was associated with cannabis use. Just over half of students (51.7%) who said that they had skipped class on 7 or more days in the last 30 days had used cannabis in their lifetime, and 21.4% were current cannabis users. 7.4% who had not skipped class at all had tried cannabis in their lifetime, and 3.1% were current cannabis users.



Summary



Parental monitoring was significantly associated with cannabis use. 28.6% of students whose parents usually don't know their whereabouts on Saturday nights had tried cannabis compared to 6.9% whose parents always know. Similarly, those whose parents usually don't know where they are were more likely to be current cannabis users (18.4%) than students whose parents always know (2.3%).

Peer cannabis use was significantly associated with students' cannabis use. Students whose friends all used cannabis were far more likely to have ever tried it (66.7%) and to have used it in the last 30 days (64.3%) compared with those whose friends did not use cannabis (1.9% and 0.6%, respectively). Parental cannabis use was strongly linked to students' cannabis use. Students who reported that one or both of their parents had used cannabis were more likely to report lifetime and last 30-day use.

Regarding other illicit drugs and substances, students were asked several questions regarding their lifetime use of a range of substances, including a fictitious drug, Sprack. Those who reported using Sprack were excluded from the analysis. Inhalants were most frequently used (6.3%), followed by synthetic cannabinoids (3.2%) and alcohol with pills (3%). Of the drugs listed, the least commonly used were nitazenes (0.4%). Significant gender differences were observed in the lifetime use of all substances apart from ketamine and LSD, with male students tending to be more likely than female students to report drug use. Students who preferred not to say whether they were male or female were most likely of all students to report using drugs. Students were also asked about their use of some of these substances in the last 12 months. Again, inhalants were the most used (4.8%), while the least used were synthetic opioids (0.5%). Significant gender differences were observed in last-year use of all substances apart from cocaine and heroin.

About a third of students reported that it would be impossible to get amphetamines, methamphetamines, tranquillisers/sedatives, ecstasy/MDMA, cocaine, and crack. Cocaine was considered to be the most easily accessible drug (14.3%). Perceived accessibility differed significantly by gender for all substances except ecstasy/MDMA. More males than females reported that access to drugs would be 'very easy'.

Regarding perceived risk of substance use, less than one-tenth of students perceived no risk in use of these drugs. Regular use of substances such as synthetic opioids was perceived as carrying much greater risk (53%) than occasional use (26.8%). Perceived risk differed significantly by gender for all substances. More males than females perceived no risk, while slightly more females than males perceived a moderate or great risk.

2.2% of students had used new psychoactive substances (NPS) in their lifetime, and 1.5% in the last year. Significant gender differences were observed in lifetime and last-year NPS use. The most common specified type used was herbal smoking mixtures (1.4%), followed by liquid (1%) and powder/crystal/tablet (0.6%) forms. Forms other than these were, however, more commonly used (3.4%). There were significant gender differences in the form of NPS used. Males were more likely to use liquids, and females to use powders/crystal/tablets and herbal smoking mixtures.

About one in eight (11.6%) of the total sample had used performance enhancers – stimulant substances to improve their performance in their studies – to keep them awake and studying during the whole night or to study faster. There were no significant gender differences in use of performance enhancers.







# Gambling, Gaming, and Social Media







Percentage of students who gambled in the last 12 months

**8.1%** of students are problem gamblers

# **47.0%**

of students who gambled report a problem gambling marker

### Forms of On-Site Gambling

Percentage who gambled on-site in physical locations





**9.8%** Card or dice







### Forms of Online Gambling

Percentage who gambled online











**10.5%** Sports or animals

#### **Gambling and Other Substances** Of students who gambled in the last 12 months





**48.0%** Ever used E-cigarettes



82.0% Ever Used Alcohol



#### In the last 12 months,



**3.1%** gambled for money on a typical day for more than an hour

9.4%

gambled at least once for more than 2 hours on a single occasion



#### Problem Gambling Markers

**28.5%** Felt the need to bet more and more



Lied about gambling



Returned to try to win back losses



10.7%

Gambled more than had planned



Felt bad about gambling

Wanted to stop gambling but could not



### Introduction

This chapter presents analyses on six outcome variables related to gambling – prevalence of gambling using two separate measures, time spent gambling on a typical day, frequency of gambling for more than 2 hours on a single occasion, forms of on-site and online gambling, and measures of problem gambling. The questions used in the ESPAD questionnaire do not capture whether the gambling activities were licensed (legal) activities, unlicensed (illegal) or gambling within social groups. ESPAD 2024 also included a number of items related to gaming and social media use, specifically regarding time spent on gaming; perceived behaviours associated with gaming and social media use; and types of posts related to e-cigarettes seen on social media. Findings are detailed below in this chapter, and additional data analyses not reported here are presented in the linked Supplementary Analysis Report. All questions pertaining to gambling, gaming, and social media use are as shown in the ESPAD Ireland 2024 Student Questionnaire in Appendix A.

### Gambling

#### **Measures of Gambling Prevalence**

The prevalence of gambling for money was measured in two separate ways. In previous ESPAD Ireland cycles, we reported responses from a direct question that asked how often (if ever) the respondent gambled for money in the previous 12 months. In this ESPAD 2024 report, we include responses from this question (Gambling Direct Measure) and also from a second question that asked if students gambled for money in the previous 12 months, to report which games they had played (Gambling Composite Measure). This second measure was calculated as the rate of those who had gambled for money on at least one of the four games of chance (playing on slot machines, playing cards or dice for money, playing the lottery, betting on sports or animal races) in the last 12 months. We have used this second approach in our recent analyses of gambling in children<sup>12</sup> and it is also the measure that is used in the ESPAD Europe 2019 report of data from all participating European countries<sup>13</sup>.

Gambling prevalence varied by 19% depending on whether the direct question or composite data was used (13.2% vs 32.2%). Although the composite data provides a higher gambling prevalence, it may still be an underrepresentation of true gambling among 15-16-year-olds in Ireland due to a number of biases typically present in self-reported data, such as recall bias<sup>14</sup> and social desirability bias<sup>15</sup> that we have described previously.

Below, where we report associations with gambling, we do so for both measures of gambling prevalence – gambling (direct) and gambling (composite) – and also for problem gambling. A full description of the questions and responses are discussed in the methodology section and the full questionnaire is appended to this report.



<sup>13</sup> ESPAD Group. ESPAD Report 2019: Results from the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs Luxembourg; 2020. Available from: https://www.espad.org/sites/default/files/2020.3878\_EN\_04.pdf



Summary

ToC

<sup>14</sup> A systematic error caused by differences in the accuracy or completeness of the recollections retrieved by study participants regarding events or experiences from the past.

<sup>15</sup> A type of response bias that is the tendency of survey students to answer questions in a manner that will be viewed favourably by others.



#### **Prevalence of Gambling (Direct)**

About one in eight (13.2%) students said that they had gambled for money in the previous 12 months, significantly more male (18.6%) than female (7.5%) students. Those who preferred not to state their gender were the most likely of all students (29%) to have gambled for money in the previous 12 months. About one in ten (9.7%) students gambled monthly or less, while 1.6% gambled 2-3 times or more per week, the majority of whom were male, 2.7% of whom reported gambling for money several times a week. Gambling prevalence using this direct measure is lower than in ESPAD 2019 when it was 15.7%.

How often (if ever) did you gamble for money in the LAST 12 MONTHS?	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)
Never	1574 (86.8)	711 (81.4)	841 (92.5)	22 (71.0)
At Least Once	240 (13.2)	163 (18.6)	68 (7.5)	9 (29.0)
Monthly or Less	177 (9.7)	113 (12.9)	59 (6.5)	5 (16.1)
2-4 Times/Month	34 (1.9)	26 (3.0)	7 (0.8)	1 (3.2)
2-3 Times or More/Week	29 (1.6)	24 (2.7)	2 (0.2)	3 (9.7)
Total	1814 (100)	874 (48.2)	909 (50.1)	31 (1.7)

#### Table 6.1a Prevalence of gambling for money in the last 12 months (Direct Measure)

p<0.001

#### Prevalence of Gambling (Composite)

Almost one third of students reported gambling for money in the previous 12 months when the composite measure was analysed (answering yes to any form of gambling activity, online or on-site). Gender differences were less pronounced for the composite measure than for the direct measure but differences in the distributions of observed and expected measures did reach statistical significance ( $\rho$ =0.02).

Gambling (any form of gambling activity, online or on-site)	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)
No	1170 (67.8)	539 (64.8)	612 (71.0)	19 (61.3)
Yes	555 (32.2)	293 (35.2)	250 (29.0)	12 (38.7)
Total	1725 (100.0)	832 (48.2)	862 (50.0)	31 (1.8)

#### Table 6.1b Prevalence of gambling for money in the last 12 months (Composite Measure)

*p=*0.02

#### **Time Spent Gambling**

The most frequently reported amount of time spent gambling for money on a typical day in the previous 12 months was 'less than 30 minutes', reported by 7.6% of students. 1.4% spent between 1 and 2 hours gambling on a typical day, and significantly more male (2.3%) than female (0.7%) students did so. 1.3% reported spending more than 3 hours gambling on a typical day, almost all of whom were male.



Summary



How much time (if any) did you spend gambling for money on a TYPICAL DAY in the LAST 12 MONTHS?	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)
I have not gambled for money during the last 12 months	1585 (88.1)	719 (82.8)	844 (93.7)	22 (71.0)
Less than 30 minutes	137 (7.6)	90 (10.4)	43 (4.8)	4 (12.9)
Between 30 minutes and 1 hour	21 (1.2)	12 (1.4)	7 (0.8)	2 (6.5)
Between 1 and 2 hours	26 (1.4)	20 (2.3)	6 (0.7)	0 (0.0)
Between 2 and 3 hours	7 (0.4)	5 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (6.5)
3 hours or more	24 (1.3)	22 (2.5)	1 (0.1)	1(3.2)
Total	1800 (100)	868 (48.2)	901 (50.1)	31 (1.7)

#### Table 6.2 Time spent gambling on a typical day in the last 12 months

p<0.001

#### Frequency of Gambling for More Than 2 Hours on a Single Occasion

Almost one in ten (9.4%) students said that they had gambled for more than 2 hours on a single occasion at least once in the previous 12 months, and significantly more male than female students reported doing so (12.1% vs 6.8%). 1.1% reported doing so daily or almost daily, again significantly more male (1.7%) than female (0.3%) students.

### Table 6.3 Frequency of gambling for more than 2 hours on a single occasion in the last 12 months

How often (if ever) did you gamble for money more than 2 hours (on a single occasion) in the LAST 12 MONTHS?	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)
I have not gambled for money during the last 12 months	1546 (85.9)	702 (80.7)	821 (91.3)	23 (74.2)
Never on a single occasion	169 (9.4)	105 (12.1)	61 (6.8)	3 (1.8)
At least once	169 (9.4)	105 (12.1)	61 (6.8)	3 (9.7)
Less than monthly	47 (2.6)	35 (4.0)	11 (1.2)	1 (3.2)
Monthly	9 (0.5)	6 (0.7)	2 (0.2)	1 (3.2)
Weekly	9 (0.5)	7 (0.8)	1 (0.1)	1 (3.2)
Daily or almost daily	20 (1.1)	15 (1.7)	3 (0.3)	2 (6.5)
Total	1800 (100)	870 (48.3)	899 (49.9)	31 (1.7)

p<0.001

Summary

ToC

CH)



#### Forms of On-Site Gambling

On-Site gambling for money was defined in the questionnaire as taking place in physical places such as betting shops (bookies), racecourses, casinos, and clubs. Asked about the games they had played if they had gambled On-Site for money in the previous 12 months, lotteries (15.6%) and betting on sports or animals (14.7%) were the most frequently reported, followed by card playing such as poker or dice (9.8%), and slot machines (4.4%). Statistically significant gender differences were reported for slot machines and card/dice playing, with more male than female students reporting each of these, and those who preferred not to state their gender reporting the highest prevalence (slot machines 5.5% vs 3% vs 16.1%; card/dice playing 12.2% vs 6.8% vs 29%).

#### Table 6.4 Forms of on-site gambling

If you have gambled for money ON-SITE (in physical places such as betting shops (bookies), racecourses, casinos, clubs) in the LAST 12 MONTHS, which games have you played?	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Slot machines (fruit machine, new slot etc.)					
Never	1720 (95.6)	819 (94.5)	875 (97.0)	26 (83.9)	
At least once	80 (4.4)	48 (5.5)	27 (3.0)	5 (16.1)	
Total	1800 (100.0)	867 (48.2)	902 (50.1)	31 (1.7)	<0.001
Play card or dice (poker, bridge, dice etc.)					
Never	1570 (90.2)	735 (87.8)	813 (93.2)	22 (71.0)	
At least once	170 (9.8)	102 (12.2)	59 (6.8)	9 (29.0)	
Total	1740 (100.0)	837 (48.1)	872 (50.1)	31 (1.8)	<0.001
Lotteries (scratch, bingo, keno etc.)					
Never	1479 (84.4)	711 (84.8)	745 (84.4)	23 (74.2)	
At least once	273 (15.6)	127 (15.2)	138 (15.6)	8 (25.8)	
Total	1752 (100.0)	838 (47.8)	883 (50.4)	31 (1.8)	0.28
Betting on sports or animals (horses, dogs etc.)					
Never	1493 (85.3)	707 (84.4)	762 (86.4)	24 (77.4)	
At least once	258 (14.7)	131 (15.6)	120 (13.6)	7 (22.6)	
Total	1751 (100.0)	838 (47.9)	882 (50.4)	31 (1.8)	0.23

#### Forms of Online Gambling

Asked about the games they had played if they had gambled Online for money in the previous 12 months, betting on sports or animals (horses, dogs etc.) was the most frequently reported (10.5%), followed by lotteries (7.2%), card/dice playing (5.1%), and slot machines (3.7%). For all forms of gambling, male students were more likely than female students to report gambling online for money at least once in the previous 12 months, and those who preferred not to state their gender were the most likely of all (slot machines 5.1% vs 2% vs 12.5%; card/dice 6.5% vs 3.2% vs 19.4%; betting on sports and animals 13.2% vs 7.6% vs 16.1%, all p<0.001).



Summary



#### Table 6.5 Forms of online gambling

If you have gambled for money ONLINE in the LAST 12 MONTHS, which games have you played?	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Slot machines (fruit machine, new slot etc.)					
Never	1672 (96.2)	793 (94.9)	851 (98.0)	28 (87.5)	
At least once	64 (3.7)	43 (5.1)	17 (2.0)	4 (12.5)	
Total	1736 (100.0)	836 (48.2)	868 (50.0)	32 (1.9)	<.001
Play card or dice (poker, bridge, dice etc.)					
Never	1633 (94.9)	774 (93.5)	834 (96.8)	25 (80.6)	
At least once	88 (5.1)	54 (6.5)	28 (3.2)	6 (19.4)	
Total	1721 (100.0)	828 (48.1)	862 (50.1)	31 (1.8)	<0.001
Lotteries (scratch, bingo, keno etc.)					
Never	1597 (98.2)	764 (92.4)	806 (93.4)	27 (87.1)	
At least once	124 (7.2)	63 (7.6)	57 (6.6)	4 (12.9)	
Total	1721 (100.0)	827 (48.1)	863 (50.1)	31 (1.8)	0.34
Betting on sports or animals (horses, dogs etc.)					
Never	1540 (89.5)	716 (86.8)	798 (92.4)	26 (83.9)	
At least once	180 (10.5)	109 (13.2)	66 (7.6)	5 (16.1)	
Total	1720 (100.0)	825 (48.0)	864 (50.2)	31 (1.8)	<0.001

#### **Problem Gambling**

Although there have been, to date, no internationally recognised measures for problem gambling in adolescents and estimates of problem gambling in child/adolescent populations and adult populations cannot be compared as they use different tools, problem gambling has been assessed in ESPAD surveys by using a composite variable from a screening questionnaire based on whether students reported that they felt the need to lie to important people about how much money they gambled and whether they felt the need to bet more and more money. This is called the Lie/Bet Questionnaire<sup>16</sup>. This is the Problem Gambling measure that has been used previously in ESPAD Ireland and which we designated Problem Gambling (Measure 1) in this report. In ESPAD 2024, it is used alongside a new 12-item Problem Gambling Measure, discussed below.

#### Problem Gambling (Measure 1): Lie/Bet Screening

As described in the methodology section, the Lie/Bet screening instrument was used to assess the presence of possible problem gambling behaviour. In Table 6.6, estimates of problem gamblers in the sample are reported.



<sup>16</sup> The Lie/Bet Questionnaire for screening pathological gamblers. Johnson, E. E., Hamer, R., Nora, R. M., Tan, B., Eisenstein, N. and Engelhart, C. Psychological Reports (1997) 80 (1), pp. 83-88, doi: 10.2466/pr0.1997.80.1.83.



The Lie/Bet Questionnaire screening tool has two questions: 'Have you ever felt the need to bet more and more money?' and 'Have you ever had to lie to people important to you about how much you gambled?'. In this report, we present the responses for these two questions separately and, to indicate problem gambling, we present responses for those who answered yes to either 'lie' or 'bet' (variable: 'lie or bet more'). Our approach reflects differences in how this screening tool has been used previously. For example, in the 2019 ESPAD Europe report, problem gambling was indicated when students answered 'Yes' to both 'lie' and 'bet more' (a score of 2). However, other studies<sup>17</sup> <sup>18</sup> have used 'lie' or 'bet more' or 'lie' and 'bet more' (i.e., a score of 1 or 2) to indicate problem gambling prevalence using 'lie' and 'bet more' is likely to be an underestimate. This opinion is confirmed by data from the item statements in the new variable, Problem Gambling (Measure 2) below.

As regards the Lie/Bet Screening instrument, 7.7% of students in the overall sample reported feeling the need to bet more and more money and 2.8% that they had to lie to people important to them about how much they gambled. Combined, these questions were answered in the affirmative by 8.1% of students, i.e., those who answered 'Yes' to either 'lie' or 'bet more'. Gender differences reflect differences in prevalence estimates for gambling, with males being more likely than females to answer yes to one of these questions (10.9% vs 4.5%) while over a third (36.7%) of those who preferred not to state their gender did so.

Problem Gambling	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Have you ever felt the need to bet more and more money?					
No	1657 (92.3)	778 (89.7)	860 (95.7)	19 (63.3)	
Yes	139 (7.7)	89 (10.3)	39 (4.3)	11 (36.7)	
Total	1796 (100.0)	867 (48.3)	899 (50.1)	30 (1.7)	<0.001
Have you ever had to lie to people important to you about how much you gambled?					
No	1736 (97.2)	825 (95.9)	884 (98.7)	27 (90.0)	
Yes	50 (2.8)	35 (4.1)	12 (1.3)	3 (10.0)	
Total	1786 (100.0)	860 (48.2)	896 (50.2)	30 (1.7)	<0.001
Problem Gambling (Lie or Bet)					
No	1639 (91.9)	765 (89.1)	855 (95.5)	19 (63.3)	
Yes	145 (8.1)	94 (10.9)	40 (4.5)	11 (36.7)	
Total	1784 (100.0)	859 (48.2)	895 (50.2)	30 (1.7)	<.001

#### Table 6.6a Problem Gambling in the total sample (Measure 1)

17 The Lie/Bet Questionnaire for screening pathological gamblers. Johnson, E. E., Hamer, R., Nora, R. M., Tan, B., Eisenstein, N. and Engelhart, C. Psychological Reports (1997) 80 (1), pp. 83-88, doi: 10.2466/pr0.1997.80.1.83.

Summary

ТоС

<sup>18</sup> Problem gambling among Czech adolescents: An exploration of its relationship to early initiation of tobacco smoking. Špolc M, Mravčík V, Drbohlavová B, Chomynová P. Journal of Behavioral Addictions. (2019) Mar;8(1):114-22. https://akjournals.com/view/ journals/2006/8/1/article-p114.xml



As regards the Lie/Bet Screening instrument, among students who said that they had gambled for money, 28.5% of students reported feeling the need to bet more and more money, and 12.6% that they had to lie to people important to them about how much they gambled. Combined (those who answered 'Yes' to either 'lie' or 'bet more'), these questions were answered in the affirmative by 29.3% of students who gambled. Again, male students were more likely than female students to report problem gambling (29.6% vs 20.6%). Students who preferred not to answer the question on gender reported the highest prevalence of problem gambling.

Problem Gambling	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Have you ever felt the need to bet more and more money?					
No	171 (71.5)	116 (71.6)	54 (79.4)	1 (11.1)	
Yes	68 (28.5)	46 (28.4)	14 (20.6)	8 (88.9)	
Total	239 (100.0)	162 (67.8)	68 (28.5)	9 (3.8)	0.001
Have you ever had to lie to people important to you about how much you gambled?					
No	209 (87.4)	141 (87.0)	62 (91.2)	6 (66.7)	
Yes	30 (12.6)	21 (13.0)	6 (8.8)	3 (33.3)	
Total	239 (100.0)	162 (67.8)	68 (28.5)	9 (3.9)	0.11
Problem Gambling (Lie or Bet)					
No	169 (70.7)	114 (70.4)	54 (79.4)	1 (11.1)	
Yes	70 (29.3)	48 (29.6)	14 (20.6)	8 (88.9)	
Total	239 (100.0)	162 (67.8)	68 (28.50	9 (3.8)	<0.001

#### Table 6.6b Problem Gambling among those who gambled (Measure 1)

#### **Indicators of Problem Gambling (Measure 2)**

The new 12-item Problem Gambling Measure (2), included in ESPAD Ireland for the first time in 2024, asks students about indicators of how frequently they have 'gone back another day to try and win back money [they] lost gambling'; whether, when they were betting, they had ever told others they were winning money when they weren't; whether their betting money ever caused any problems for them such as arguments with family and friends, or problems at school or work; whether they had ever gambled more than they had planned to; whether anyone had criticised their betting, or told them that they had a gambling problem whether they thought it true or not; whether they had ever felt bad about the amount of money they bet, or about what happens when they bet money; whether they had ever felt like they would like to stop betting, but didn't think they could; whether they had ever hidden from family or friends any betting slips, IOUs, lottery tickets, money that they won, or any signs of gambling; whether they had borrowed money to bet and not paid it back; whether they had ever skipped or been absent from school or work due to betting activities; and whether they had borrowed money or stolen something in order to bet or to cover gambling activities.



Summary



At least 2-3% of students answered yes to all of the items and more than 3% answered yes to a number of items. 5.6% said that they had gone back another day to try and win back money they had lost gambling, and more than four times as many male as female students said that they did this every time (3.5% vs 0.8%). 7.2% of male students and 2.4% of female students said that they had ever gambled more than they had planned to. 4.3% said that they had ever felt bad about the amount of money they bet, or about what happens when they bet money, 6.4% of male students and 2.4% of female students. 5.6% of male students and 1.6% of female students said that (when they were betting), they had ever told others they were winning money when they weren't. 5% and 1.7% of male and female students respectively said that they had borrowed money to bet and not paid it back. About one in eight students (12.1%) answered 'Yes' to at least one of these indicators, with male students being significantly more likely than female students to report a problem (16.6% vs 6.7%).

Problem Gambling	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Any problem gambling ('Yes' to any of the statements below)					
No	1401 (87.9)	638 (83.4)	750 (93.3)	13 (54.2)	
Yes	192 (12.1)	127 (16.6)	54 (6.7)	11 (45.8)	<0.01
How often have you gone back another day to try and win back money you lost gambling?*					
Never	1613 (94.3)	752 (91.4)	842 (97.7)	19 (76.0)	
Every time	40 (2.3)	29 (3.5)	7 (0.8)	4 (16.0)	
Most of the time	17 (1.0)	15 (1.8)	2 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	
Some of the time	40 (2.3)	27 (3.3)	11 (1.3)	2 (8.0)	<0.001
How often have you gone back another day to try and win back money you lost gambling?					
Never	1613 (94.3)	752 (91.4)	842 (97.7)	19 (76.0)	
Yes	97 (5.7)	71 (8.6)	20 (2.3)	6 (24.0)	<0.001
When you were betting, have you ever told others you were winning money when you weren't?					
No	1590 (96.3)	746 (94.4)	823 (98.4)	21 (84.0)	
Yes	61 (3.7)	44 (5.6)	13 (1.6)	4 (16.0)	<0.001
Has your betting money ever caused any problems for you such as arguments with family and friends, or problems at school or work?					
No	1592 (97.2)	748 (95.3)	821 (99.0)	23 (95.8)	
Yes	46 (2.8)	37 (4.7)	8 (1.0)	1(4.2)	<0.001

### Table 6.7a Indicators of Problem Gambling (Measure 2) in total sample - responsesto individual item statements

nmary



Problem Gambling	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Have you ever gambled more than you had planned to?					
No	1549 (95.1)	723 (92.8)	806 (97.6)	20 (83.3)	
Yes	80 (4.9)	56 (7.2)	20 (2.4)	4 (16.7)	<0.001
Has anyone criticised your betting, or told you that you had a gambling problem whether you thought it true or not?					
No	1571 (96.9)	733 (94.7)	814 (98.8)	24 (100.0)	
Yes	51 (3.1)	41 (5.3)	10 (1.2)	0 (0.0)	<0.001
Have you ever felt bad about the amount of money you bet, or about what happens when you bet money?					
No	1546 (95.7)	722 (93.6)	801 (97.6)	23 (95.8)	
Yes	70 (4.3)	49 (6.4)	20 (2.4)	1 (4.2)	<0.001
Have you ever felt like you would like to stop betting, but didn't think you could?					
No	1564 (97.5)	739 (96.2)	803 (98.9)	22 (91.7)	
Yes	40 (2.5)	29 (3.8)	9 (1.1)	2 (8.3)	<0.001
Have you ever hidden from family or friends any betting slips, IOUs, lottery tickets, money that you won, or any signs of gambling?					
No	1560 (97.5)	737 (96.2)	800 (98.8)	23 (95.8)	
Yes	40 (2.5)	29 (3.8)	10 (1.2)	1 (4.2)	0.01
Have you had money arguments with family or friends that centred on gambling?					
No	1561 (97.4)	739 (96.5)	801 (98.6)	21 (87.5)	
Yes	41 (2.6)	27 (3.5)	11 (1.4)	3 (12.5)	<0.001
Have you borrowed money to bet and not paid it back?					
No	1545 (96.6)	727 (95.0)	797 (98.3)	21 (87.5)	
Yes	55 (3.4)	38 (5.0)	14 (1.7)	3 (12.5)	<0.001
Have you ever skipped or been absent from school or work due to betting activities?					
No	1569 (98.0)	742 (97.0)	806 (99.3)	21 (87.5)	
Yes	32 (2.0)	23 (3.0)	6 (18.8)	3 (12.5)	<0.001



Summary



Problem Gambling	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Have you borrowed money or stolen something in order to bet or to cover gambling activities?					
No	1564 (97.9)	740 (96.7)	802 (99.1)	22 (91.7)	
Yes	34 (2.1)	25 (3.3)	7 (0.9)	2 (8.3)	<0.001

\* Note: the 4-point frequency response categories for this statement were recoded for this analysis into the binary 'Yes'/'No' response shown in the next row.

Among students who gambled for money, almost half (47%) answered 'Yes' to at least one of these indicators, with male students being significantly more likely than female students to report a problem (50.3% vs 33.8%). Almost a quarter (24.5%) said that they had gone back another day to try and win back money they had lost gambling, and more than twice as many male as female students said that they had done this (27.5% vs 13.2%). Almost a quarter (23%) agreed that they had ever gambled more than they had planned to, and males students were almost twice as likely as female students to say they had done this (25.8% vs 13.4%). 17.9% said that they had felt bad about the amount of money they bet or about what happens when they bet money, and 16.1% reported that, when they were betting, they had told others that they were winning money when they weren't. About one in ten students who gambled for money agreed with each of the remaining item statements and, for all statements, male students were more likely than female students to agree with the 12 statements indicating problem gambling behaviour.

### Table 6.7b Indicators of Problem Gambling among those who gambled (Measure 2)- individual item responses

Problem Gambling	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Any problem gambling					
No	125 (53.0)	79 (49.7)	45 (66.2)	1 (11.1)	
Yes	111 (47.0)	80 (50.3)	23 (33.8)	8 (88.9)	<0.01
How often have you gone back another day to try and win back money you lost gambling?					
Never	179 (75.5)	116 (72.5)	59 (86.8)	4 (44.4)	
Yes	58 (24.5)	44 (27.5)	9 (13.2)	5 (55.6)	0.01
When you were betting, have you ever told others you were winning money when you weren't?					
No	198 (83.9)	131 (81.9)	60 (89.6)	7 (77.8)	
Yes	38 (16.1)	29 (18.1)	7 (10.4)	2 (22.2)	0.31





CH) F

Problem Gambling	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Has your betting money ever caused any problems for you such as arguments with family and friends, or problems at school or work?					
No	211 (89.4)	140 (87.5)	62 (92.5)	9 (100.0)	
Yes	25 (10.6)	20 (12.5)	5 (7.5)	0 (0.0)	0.31
Have you ever gambled more than you had planned to?					
No	181 (77.0)	118 (74.2)	58 (86.6)	5 (55.6)	
Yes	54 (23.0)	41 (25.8)	9 (13.4)	4 (44.4)	0.04
Has anyone criticised your betting, or told you that you had a gambling problem whether you thought it true or not?					
No	206 (88.0)	134 (84.8)	63 (94.0)	9 (100.0)	
Yes	28 (12.0)	24 (15.2)	4 (6.0)	0 (0.0)	0.08
Have you ever felt bad about the amount of money you bet, or about what happens when you bet money?					
No	192 (82.1)	127 (80.4)	57 (85.1)	8 (88.9)	0.01
Yes	42 (17.9)	31 (19.6)	10 (14.9)	1 (11.1)	0.61
Have you ever felt like you would like to stop betting, but didn't think you could?					
No	209 (89.3)	140 (88.6)	62 (92.5)	7 (77.8)	
Yes	25 (10.7)	18 (11.4)	5 (7.5)	2 (22.2)	0.36
Have you ever hidden from family or friends any betting slips, IOUs, lottery tickets, money that you won, or any signs of gambling?	200 (00 7)	170 (070)	60 (00 E)	0.(00.0)	
No	208 (89.3)	138 (87.9)	62 (92.5)	8 (88.9)	0.50
Yes	25 (10.7)	19 (12.1)	5 (7.5)	1 (11.1)	0.59
Have you had money arguments with family or friends that centred on gambling?					
No	209 (88.9)	141 (89.2)	62 (91.2)	6 (66.7)	
Yes	26 (11.1)	17 (10.8)	6 (8.8)	3 (33.3)	0.09
Have you borrowed money to bet and not paid it back?					
No	210 (89.7)	140 (88.6)	62 (92.5)	8 (88.9)	
Yes	24 (10.3)	18 (11.4)	5 (7.5)	1 (11.1)	0.67



Problem Gambling	All N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not Say N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Have you ever skipped or been absent from school or work due to betting activities?					
No	215 (91.9)	144 (91.1)	64 (95.5)	7 (77.8)	
Yes	19 (8.1)	14 (8.9)	3 (4.5)	2 (22.2)	0.16
Have you borrowed money or stolen something in order to bet or to cover gambling activities?					
No	211 (90.2)	142 (89.9)	62 (92.5)	7 (77.8)	
Yes	23 (9.8)	16 (10.1)	5 (7.5)	2 (22.2)	0.37

### Summary: Gambling

Two measures of gambling prevalence are reported, a direct question (asking how often, if ever, they had gambled for money in the last 12 months) and a composite measure that computed prevalence from students' responses to participation in different types of gambling, both On-site and Online. Using the direct measure, more than one in eight students reported gambling in the previous year (13.2%), a decrease on ESPAD 2019 figures (17.2%). Using the composite measure, gambling prevalence was 32.2%, a significant increase on the 2019 figures that we reported in ESPAD Ireland 2019 and also in our more recent reporting on gambling<sup>19</sup><sup>20</sup>.

As in previous reports, gambling prevalence was significantly higher in male students than in female students, and students who preferred not to state their gender, on whom we report for the first time in 2024, were the most likely to report gambling in the previous 12 months.

The most frequently reported amount of time spent gambling for money on a typical day in the previous 12 months was 'less than 30 minutes' (7.6% of students) but 1.3% reported spending more than 3 hours gambling on a typical day, almost all of whom were male. Almost one in ten (9.4%) students said that they had gambled for more than 2 hours on a single occasion at least once in the previous 12 months, and significantly more male than female students reported doing so (12.1% vs 6.8%).

We report on both On-Site gambling for money (taking place in physical places such as betting shops (bookies), racecourses, casinos, and clubs) and Online gambling. As regards On-Site gambling, lotteries (15.6%) and betting on sports or animals (14.7%) were the most frequently reported, followed by card playing such as poker or dice (9.8%), and slot machines (4.4%). As regards Online gambling, betting on sports or animals (horses, dogs etc.) was the most frequently reported (10.5%), followed by lotteries (7.2%), card/dice playing (5.1%), and slot machines (3.7%). For all forms of gambling, male students were more likely than female students to report gambling online for money at least once in the previous 12 months and those who preferred not to state their gender were the most likely of all to do so.



Summary

ToC

<sup>19</sup> ESPAD Ireland 2019. Results of the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs. Sunday S, Keogan S, Hanafin J, Clancy L. (2020). Dublin: TobaccoFree Research Institute Ireland for the Department of Health Ireland, doi: https://doi.org/10.21427/9tfn-s318.

<sup>20</sup> Children and gambling – evidence to inform regulation and responses in Ireland. H McAvoy, CME Reynolds, S Sunday, J Hanafin, L Clancy (2023). Dublin: Institute of Public Health and TFRI, doi: https://doi.org/10.14655/11971-1084912.



Around 8% of all 16-year-olds met the criteria for problem gambling using the Lie/Bet Screening Instrument. More than a quarter of 16-year-olds (29.3%) who gambled for money in the previous 12 months met the criteria for problem gambling. Among 16-year-olds who gambled for money in the last 12 months, 25% were getting into difficulty with controlling their gambling (score of 1 – either lied about money spent on gambling or felt the need to bet more and more money), higher than the 21.3% that we reported in ESPAD Ireland 2019.

Using the new measure of Problem Gambling in ESPAD 2024, among students who gambled for money, almost half (47%) answered 'Yes' to at least one of the indicators, with male students being significantly more likely than female students to report a problem (50.3% vs 33.8%). Almost a quarter (24.5%) said that they had gone back another day to try and win back money they had lost gambling (24.5%) and that they had ever gambled more than they had planned to (23%). About one in ten students who gambled for money agreed with each of the remaining item statements and, for all statements, male students were more likely than female students to agree with the 12 statements indicating problem gambling behaviour.





# **GAMING AND OCIAL MEDIA USE**







### **Time Spent** Gaming



**On School** Days

- Θ 122 **On Non** ===
- 22.9% None
- 17.6% Half an hour
- **19.2%** About 1 hour
- **24.1%** 2-3 hours
- 9.2% 4-5 hours
- 6.9% 6 hours or more



- 15.1% None
- 9.8% Half an hour
- 13.3% About 1 hour
- 24.5% 2-3 hours
- 18.9% 4-5 hours
- 18.4% 6 hours or more



26.5% Played games on 6 or more days per week

25.6% ..... Did not play games during the week

#### **Highest Frequency Reported**

Males - 33.1% played 6/7 days



### Perceptions of Gaming

26.6% agreed (strongly or partly) that they spend too much time gaming

12.2% agreed that they get in a bad mood when they can't game

22.1% say their parents agree that they spend too much time gaming

# Social Media

#### **Time and Emotional** Response

### 

agreed (strongly or partly) that they spend too much time on social media

### **DOO** 30,9%

agreed that they get in a bad mood when they cannot use social media



say their parents agree that they spend toó much time on social media

#### Social Media Exposure to E-cigarette Content

Type of Post Seen	Percentage
Hashtags about e-cigarettes	46.4%
Buying/getting e-cigarettes	25.6%
Positive images of e-cigarette use	33.0%
Negative images of e-cigarette use	44.1%
E-cigarette "challenges" (competitions)	16.6%
Harm from e-cigarettes	42.7%
Promoting e-cigarettes as alternative to smoking	29.5%



### Gaming

#### **Time Spent on Gaming**

Students were asked how many hours they spent playing games using a computer, tablet, console, smartphone, or other electronic device during the last 30 days on a school day and a non-school day. Table 6.8 shows that more than three-quarters of students (77%) had spent some time playing games on a school day during this period, with the largest proportion (24.1%) spending 2-3 hours. Significant gender differences were observed, with more males (82.9%) than females (71%) spending time playing games. Males were also more likely to spend longer gaming on a school day than females.

Time Spent	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
None	420 (22.9)	151 (17.1)	266 (29.0)	3 (8.8)
Half an hour	324 (17.6)	131 (14.8)	187 (20.4)	6 (17.6)
About 1 hour	353 (19.2)	211 (23.8)	135 (14.7)	7 (20.6)
2-3 hours	443 (24.1)	236 (26.7)	198 (21.6)	9 (26.5)
4-5 hours	169 (9.2)	86 (9.7)	80 (8.7)	3 (8.8)
6 hours+	127 (6.9)	70 (7.9)	51 (5.6)	6 (17.6)
Total	1836 (100)	885 (48.2)	917 (49.9)	34 (1.9)

#### Table 6.8 Time spent gaming on a school day in the last 30 days

p<0.001

Table 6.9 shows that the majority of students (84.9%) spent some time playing games on a non-school day in the last 30 days, with the largest proportion (24.5%) again spending 2-3 hours. Time spent playing games on a non-school day differed significantly by gender. More males (92.4%) than females (77.4%) spent time playing games, with males more likely to spend longer gaming on a non-school day than females.

#### Table 6.9 Time spent gaming on a non-school day in the last 30 days

Time Spent	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
None	275 (15.1)	66 (7.5)	205 (22.6)	4 (11.8)
Half an hour	178 (9.8)	50 (5.7)	127 (14.0)	1 (2.9)
About 1 hour	242 (13.3)	115 (13.1)	123 (13.5)	4 (11.8)
2-3 hours	446 (24.5)	280 (31.9)	157 (17.3)	9 (26.5)
4-5 hours	343 (18.9)	185 (21.1)	153 (16.9)	5 (14.7)
6 hours+	335 (18.4)	181 (20.6)	143 (15.7)	11 (32.4)
Total	1819 (100)	877 (48.2)	908 (49.9)	34 (1.9)

p<0.001



Summary



Students were asked how many days they spent playing games using a computer, tablet console, smartphone, or other electronic device during the last seven days. Overall, almost three-quarters of them (74.3%) spent time gaming during this period. The largest proportion of students (26.5%) played games on at least six of the seven days. Intensity of gaming (playing on 5, 6 or more days) was greater for male students than for female students.

Days Spent	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
None	469 (25.6)	138 (15.6)	328 (35.8)	3 (9.1)
1 day	207 (11.3)	85 (9.6)	118 (12.9)	4 (12.1)
2 days	226 (12.3)	102 (11.6)	121 (13.2)	3 (9.1)
3 days	186 (10.2)	100 (11.3)	84 (9.2)	2 (6.1)
4 days	129 (7.0)	85 (9.6)	43 (4.7)	1(3.0)
5 days	129 (7.0)	80 (9.1)	44 (4.8)	5 (15.2)
6 or more days	484 (26.5)	292 (33.1)	177 (19.4)	15 (45.5)
Total	1830 (100)	882 (48.2)	915 (50.0)	33 (1.8)

#### Table 6.10 Number of days spent gaming in the last 7 days

p<0.001

#### **Indicators of Problem Gaming**

Students were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with statements about their time spent on gaming. Table 6.11 shows that 26.3% strongly disagreed that they spend too much time gaming, while only 8.4% strongly agreed. Significant gender differences were found. Females (50.6%) were more likely than males (21.8%) to strongly disagree that they spend too much time playing games, whereas males (11.3%) were more likely than females (5.4%) to strongly agree.

#### Table 6.11 Perception of time spent on gaming

l spend way too much time playing games	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Strongly agree	152 (8.4)	98 (11.3)	49 (5.4)	5 (14.7)
Partly agree	329 (18.2)	225 (25.8)	99 (10.9)	5 (14.7)
Neither/nor	369 (20.4)	202 (23.2)	156 (17.2)	11 (32.4)
Partly disagree	305 (16.8)	156 (17.9)	144 (15.9)	5 (14.7)
Strongly disagree	657 (36.3)	190 (21.8)	459 (50.6)	8 (23.5)
Total	1812 (100)	871 (48.1)	907 (50.1)	34 (1.9)

#### p<0.001

Table 6.12 shows that over half of students (50.8%) strongly disagreed that they get in a bad mood when they cannot spend time on games, while only 4.2% strongly agreed. Perceptions differed significantly by gender. Compared with males (38.1%) and those who preferred not to state their gender (41.3%), females (63.3%) were more likely to strongly disagree that being unable to spend time playing games negatively affects their mood.



Summary



l get in a bad mood when l cannot spend time on games	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Strongly agree	75 (4.2)	43 (5.0)	29 (3.2)	3 (8.8)
Partly agree	144 (8.0)	89 (10.4)	50 (5.5)	5 (14.7)
Neither/nor	324 (18.0)	195 (22.7)	126 (13.9)	3 (8.8)
Partly disagree	341 (19.0)	205 (23.9)	127 (14.0)	9 (26.5)
Strongly disagree	913 (50.8)	327 (38.1)	572 (63.3)	14 (41.2)
Total	1797 (100)	859 (47.8)	904 (50.3)	34 (1.9)

#### Table 6.12 Perception of mood when time cannot be spent on gaming

p<0.001

Table 6.13 shows that 47% strongly disagreed that their parents say they spend too much time gaming, while only 8.3% strongly agreed. Significant gender differences were found. Females (65.7%) were more than twice as likely as males (27.7%) to strongly disagree that their parents perceive their time spent on gaming to be too great, whereas males (11.6%) were more than twice as likely as females (4.9%) to strongly agree.

#### Table 6.13 Parents' perception of time spent on gaming

My parents say that I spend way too much time on gaming	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Strongly agree	148 (8.3)	99 (11.6)	44 (4.9)	5 (15.2)
Partly agree	246 (13.8)	184 (21.6)	56 (6.2)	6 (18.2)
Neither/nor	302 (16.9)	183 (21.5)	114 (12.7)	5 (15.2)
Partly disagree	251 (14.1)	151 (17.7)	95 (10.6)	5 (15.2)
Strongly disagree	839 (47.0)	236 (27.7)	591 (65.7)	12 (36.4)
Total	1786 (100)	853 (47.8)	900 (50.4)	33 (1.8)

p<0.001

### Social Media

#### **Indicators of Problem Social Media Use**

Students were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with statements about their time spent on social media. Table 6.14 shows that the largest proportions of students either partly agreed (45.1%) or strongly agreed (28.1%) that they spend too much time on social media. Significant gender differences were observed. Compared with males (24.7%) and those who preferred not to state their gender (23.5%), females (31.5%) were more likely to strongly agree that they spend too much time on social media.







l spend way too much time on Social Media	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Strongly agree	517 (28.1)	219 (24.7)	290 (31.5)	8 (23.5)
Partly agree	831 (45.1)	397 (44.8)	423 (45.9)	11 (32.4)
Neither/nor	268 (14.6)	143 (16.1)	119 (12.9)	6 (17.6)
Partly disagree	139 (7.6)	82 (9.3)	54 (5.9)	3 (8.8)
Strongly disagree	86 (4.7)	45 (5.1)	35 (3.8)	6 (17.6)
Total	1841 (100)	886 (48.1)	921 (50.0)	34 (1.8)

#### Table 6.14 Perception of time spent on social media

p<0.001

Table 6.15 shows that almost a quarter of students (24.5%) neither agreed nor disagreed that they get in a bad mood when they cannot spend time on social media. Overall, more disagreed, either partly or strongly (44.6%), than agreed (30.9%). Significant gender differences were found. Compared with females (8.1%) and those who preferred not to state their gender (8.8%), males (4.9%) were less likely to strongly agree that being unable to spend time on social media negatively affects their mood.

l get in a bad mood when I cannot spend time on Social Media	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Strongly agree	120 (6.6)	43 (4.9)	74 (8.1)	3 (8.8)
Partly agree	446 (24.3)	192 (21.8)	250 (27.3)	4 (11.8)
Neither/nor	449 (24.5)	210 (23.8)	233 (25.4)	6 (17.6)
Partly disagree	397 (21.7)	205 (23.3)	184 (20.1)	8 (23.5)
Strongly disagree	420 (22.9)	231 (26.2)	176 (19.2)	13 (38.2)
Total	1832 (100)	881 (48.1)	917 (50.1)	34 (1.9)

#### Table 6.15 Perception of mood when time cannot be spent on social media

p<0.001

Table 6.16 shows that the largest proportions of students either partly agreed (29.9%) or strongly agreed (25.3%) that their parents say they spend too much time on social media, while a further 20.5% neither agreed nor disagreed. Perceptions varied significantly by gender. Compared with males (12.5%) and females (10.9%), those who preferred not to state their gender (23.5%) were approximately twice as likely to strongly disagree that their parents perceive their time spent on social media to be too great, although numbers were small.



Summary



My parents say that I spend way too much time on Social Media	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not say N (%)
Strongly agree	464 (25.3)	223 (25.3)	236 (25.7)	5 (14.7)
Partly agree	548 (29.9)	244 (27.7)	293 (31.9)	11 (32.4)
Neither/nor	376 (20.5)	196 (22.3)	174 (19.0)	6 (17.6)
Partly disagree	226 (12.3)	107 (12.2)	115 (12.5)	4 (11.8)
Strongly disagree	218 (11.9)	110 (12.5)	100 (10.9)	8 (23.5)
Total	1832 (100)	880 (48.0)	918 (50.1)	34 (1.9)

#### Table 6.16 Parents' perception of time spent on social media

p<0.001

### Summary: Gaming and Social Media

77% of students had spent time playing games on a school day in the last 30 days, while 84.9% had done so on a non-school day. About a quarter of students had spent 2-3 hours gaming on both school and non-school days. Significant gender differences were observed. More males than females spent time playing games on both school and non-school days, with males more likely to spend longer gaming than females. Almost three-quarters of students (74.3%) spent time gaming during the last seven days, with more than one in four (26.5%) playing games on at least six of the seven days. Intensity of gaming (playing on 5, 6 or more days) was greater for male students than for female students.

26.3% of students strongly disagreed that they spend too much time gaming, while only 8.4% strongly agreed. 50.8% strongly disagreed that they get in a bad mood when they cannot spend time on games, while only 4.2% strongly agreed. 47% strongly disagreed that their parents say they spend too much time gaming, while only 8.3% strongly agreed. Perceptions differed significantly by gender. Females were more likely than males to strongly disagree that they spend too much time playing games; that being unable to spend time gaming negatively affects their mood; and that their parents perceive their time spent on gaming to be too great.

The majority of students either partly agreed (45.1%) or strongly agreed (28.1%) that they spend too much time on social media. Likewise, the majority either partly agreed (29.9%) or strongly agreed (25.3%) that their parents say they spend too much time on social media. Almost a quarter (24.5%) neither agreed nor disagreed that they get in a bad mood when they cannot spend time on social media, while more disagreed, either partly or strongly (44.6%), than agreed (30.9%). Significant gender differences were observed. Females were more likely to strongly agree that they spend too much time on social media; those who preferred not to state their gender were more likely to strongly disagree that their parents perceive their time spent on social media to be too great; while males were less likely to strongly agree that being unable to spend time on social media negatively affects their mood.



Summary



# Student Wellbeing, Substance Use Prevention, and Skills Training



### Student Well-being

Students were asked to respond to five statements (WHO-5 Index) about their well-being and to indicate, for each of the five, which response was closest to how they had been feeling over the last two weeks, from 'All the time' to 'No time'. Overall, students reported high positive scores on the five statements. Fewer than one in every ten students reported that they had not felt 'cheerful and in good spirits'; 'calm and relaxed'; 'active and vigorous'; or that their daily life had been filled with things that interested them at any time in the previous two weeks. However, almost one in five reported that at no time in the previous two weeks had they 'woke[n] up feeling fresh and rested'.

For each of the five statements which is closest to how you have been feeling over the LAST TWO WEEKS	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)	p-value
I have felt cheerful and in good spirits					
At no time	103 (5.5)	47 (5.2)	52 (5.5)	4 (11.8)	
Yes	1772 (94.5)	857 (94.8)	885 (94.5)	30 (88.2)	<0.001
I have felt calm and relaxed					
At no time	135 (7.2)	56 (6.2)	73 (7.8)	6 (17.6)	
Yes	1730 (92.8)	841 (93.8)	861 (92.2)	28 (95.6)	<0.001
I have felt active and vigorous					
At no time	160 (8.6)	62 (6.9)	93 (10.0)	5 (14.7)	
Yes	1703 (91.4)	834 (93.1)	840 (90.0)	29 (85.3)	<0.001
I woke up feeling fresh and rested					
At no time	350 (18.8)	131 (14.6)	207 (22.1)	12 (35.3)	
Yes	1516 (81.2)	766 (85.4)	728 (77.9)	22 (64.7)	<0.001
My daily life has been filled with things that interest me					
At no time	155 (8.3)	53 (5.9)	100 (10.7)	2 (5.9)	
Yes	1705 (91.7)	842 (94.1)	831 (89.3)	32 (94.1)	<0.001

#### Table 7.1 Responses to statements about well-being in last two weeks

When overall student well-being was calculated into a Well-being Score as described in the Methodology section, a majority of students reported a high level of well-being with a score of 5 or 6. Male students were significantly more likely to report good well-being than were female students (82.2% vs 70.7%). About one in eight students (13.2%) reported moderate well-being, significantly more female than male students (16.3% vs 9.9%). Students who preferred not to say if they were male or female were least likely to report a high level of well-being.



Summary

ТоС



Level of Well-being	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
Low level of Well-being (score≤2)	117 (6.3)	49 (5.5)	64 (6.9)	4 (11.8)
Moderate Well-being (3≤score≤4)	244 (13.2)	88 (9.9)	151 (16.3)	5 (14.7)
High level of Well-being (Score=5)	1401 (75.6)	733 (82.2)	649 (70.7)	19 (55.9)
Total	1853 (100.0)	892 (48.1)	927 (50.0)	34 (1.8)

#### Table 7.2 Level of well-being (low, moderate, or high)

p<0.001

### Prevention Activities: Alcohol, Tobacco, Drugs, Gambling, Gaming or Internet Disorders

Students were asked about their participation in prevention activities during the previous two years and whether they had participated ever, once, or more than once in awareness events or information activities about the effects and possible harms of alcohol, tobacco, other drugs, or gambling.

About half of students (51.4%) had participated during the previous two years in awareness events or information activities about the effects and possible harms of alcohol. There were not significant gender differences in participation in these events or activities.

#### Alcohol Total N (%) Male N (%) Female N (%) **Rather not** answer N (%) Never 852 (48.6) 428 (50.9) 409 (46.4) 15 (48.4) Once 411 (23.4) 188 (22.4) 215 (24.4) 8 (25.8) More than once 490 (28.0) 225 (26.8) 257 (29.2) 8 (25.8) Total 1753 (100.0) 841 (48.0) 881 (50.3) 31 (1.8)

#### Table 7.3 Participation in alcohol prevention activities

p=0.47

More than two-thirds of students (70.7%) had not participated during the previous two years in awareness events or information activities about the effects and possible harms of tobacco. 14.5% had participated once and 14.8% had participated more than once in these events or activities.

#### Table 7.4 Participation in tobacco prevention activities

Tobacco	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
Never	1231 (70.7)	593 (70.9)	625 (71.4)	13 (41.9)
Once	253 (14.5)	113 (13.5)	131 (15.0)	9 (29.0)
More than once	258 (14.8)	130 (15.6)	119 (13.6)	9 (29.0)
Total	1742 (100.0)	836 (48.0)	875 (50.2)	31 (1.8)

p<0.01

Summary


More than seven out of every ten students (71.2%) reported that they had not participated during the previous two years in awareness events or information activities about the effects and possible harms of other drugs. 15.5% had participated once and 13.3% had participated more than once in these events or activities.

Other drugs	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
Never	1242 (71.2)	591 (70.7)	635 (72.3)	16 (51.6)
Once	271 (15.5)	123 (14.7)	143 (16.3)	5 (16.1)
More than once	232 (13.3)	122 (14.6)	100 (11.4)	10 (32.3)
Total	1745 (100.0)	836 (47.9)	878 (50.3)	31 (1.8)

## Table 7.5 Participation in drugs (other than tobacco and alcohol) prevention activities

p<0.01

Almost three-quarters (74%) of students reported that they had not participated during the previous two years in awareness events or information activities about the effects and possible harms of gambling, gaming or internet disorders. 13.9% had participated once and 12% had participated more than once in these activities. Male students were significantly more likely than female students to have participated in these events or activities.

## Table 7.6 Participation in gambling, gaming or internet disorder prevention activities

Gambling, Gaming or Internet disorders	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
Never	1290 (74.0)	568 (68.1)	706 (80.4)	16 (51.6)
Once	243 (13.9)	138 (16.5)	98 (11.2)	7 (22.6)
More than once	210 (12.0)	128 (15.3)	74 (8.4)	8 (25.8)
Total	1743 (100.0)	834 (47.8)	878 (50.4)	31 (1.8)

p<0.01

## **Training Activities**

Students were also asked to recall whether they had participated in interactive training activities in the areas of social skills and personal skills, or in training in media literacy.

## **Social Skills**

Social skills training included interactive training (not lessons) about better interaction and communication with others, such as expressing feelings, empathy, compliments, and dealing with peer pressure. A majority (57.6%) reported that they had never participated in social skills training activities, with almost two-thirds of male students never having participated compared with over just half of female students (63.1% vs 52.7%). Almost one in four participated once (22.9%) or more than once (19.5%).



Summary



Training about better interaction and communication with others	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
Never	1007 (57.6)	529 (63.1)	463 (52.7)	15 (48.4)
Once	400 (22.9)	174 (20.8)	220 (25.1)	6 (19.4)
More than once	340 (19.5)	135 (16.1)	195 (22.2)	10 (32.3)
Total	1747 (100.0)	838 (48.0)	878 (50.3)	31 (1.8)

## Table 7.7 Participation in training activities: social skills

p<0.01

## **Personal Skills**

Regarding personal skills training about better dealing with oneself, including controlling impulses, anger, setting goals and objectives, and being mindful, 60% had never participated in such training, with male students being more likely than female students to have never participated (63.4% vs 57%). About a fifth of female students had participated more than once in media literacy training (20.5%).

## Table 7.8 Participation in training activities: personal skills

Training about dealing with oneself	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
Never	1047 (60.0)	531 (63.4)	499 (57.0)	17 (54.8)
Once	378 (21.7)	172 (20.5)	197 (22.5)	9 (29.0)
More than once	319 (18.3)	134 (16.0)	180 (20.5)	5 (16.1)
Total	1744 (100.0)	837 (48.0)	876 (50.2)	31 (1.8)

p=0.05

## **Media Literacy**

Asked about whether they had received training in media literacy such as how to analyse ads and media messages and to detect the intended messages in order to be less manipulated, almost twothirds of students (62.4%) had never participated in such training. Females were slightly more likely to have participated in media literacy training than were males (38.9% vs 36.6%).

## Table 7.9 Participation in training activities: media literacy

Training about analysing ads and media messages	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)
Never	1086 (62.4)	537 (64.4)	534 (61.1)	15 (48.4)
Once	387 (22.3)	170 (20.4)	211 (24.1)	6 (19.4)
More than once	266 (15.3)	127 (15.2)	129 (14.8)	10 (32.3)
Total	1739 (100.0)	834 (48.0)	874 (50.3)	31 (1.8)

p=0.03

ТоС

Summary



## **Delivery of Training Activities**

Regarding who predominantly delivered prevention and training activities, four in ten students (40.1%) had not participated in any of the activities in the past 2 years. Teachers were the group most likely to deliver these activities (33.5%), and a further 9.1% cited school staff. External professionals were cited by 17.8% of students, An Garda Síochána by 10.7%, and ex-substance users by 2.9%.

Who predominantly delivered these activities?	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Did not participate	684 (40.1)	355 (43.4)	325 (37.8)	4 (13.3)	<0.01
Teacher	572 (33.5)	252 (30.8)	306 (35.6)	14 (46.7)	0.03
School Staff	156 (9.1)	60 (7.3)	89 (10.4)	7 (23.3)	<0.01
An Garda Síochána	184 (10.7)	88 (10.8)	91 (10.6)	4 (13.3)	0.89
External Professional	303 (17.8)	126 (15.4)	172 (20.0)	5 (16.7)	0.05
Ex-substance user	50 (2.9)	27 (3.3)	21 (2.4)	2 (6.7)	0.28
Other	252 (14.8)	120 (14.7)	124 (14.4)	8 (26.7)	0.18

## Table 7.10 Delivery of prevention and training activities

## **Location of Training Activities**

Asked where they predominantly participated in training activities, more than four in ten students (41.9%) had not participated in any of the activities in the past 2 years. 46% participated in these activities in school and 15% participated out-of-school.

## Table 7.11 Location of prevention and training activities

Where did you predominantly participate in these activities?	Total N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Rather not answer N (%)	<i>p</i> -value
Did not participate	709 (41.9)	368 (45.5)	336 (39.4)	5 (16.7)	<0.01
In School	779 (46.0)	350 (43.3)	411 (48.2)	18 (60.0)	0.04
Out-of-school	254 (15.0)	114 (14.1)	132 (15.5)	8 (26.7)	0.14
After Class	27 (1.6)	13 (1.6)	12 (1.4)	2 (6.7)	0.08



Summary ToC



## Summary

Students reported high positive scores on the five statements assessing well-being, with 75.6% reporting a high level of well-being score.

Students were asked about their participation in prevention activities during the previous two years and whether they had participated ever, once, or more than once in awareness events or information activities about the effects and possible harms of alcohol, tobacco, other drugs, or gambling. About half of students (51.4%) had participated in events or activities about the effects and possible harms of alcohol but fewer had participated in events or activities about effects and possible harms of tobacco (29.3%), other drugs (28.8%), or gambling, gaming or internet disorders (25.9%).

Asked about their participation in training activities, 42.4% had participated in social skills training, 40% had participated in personal skills training, and 37.6% had participated in media literacy training.

Students reported that training was most likely to be delivered by school personnel (teachers, 33.5%; other school staff, 9.1%). External professionals were cited by 17.8% of students, An Garda Síochána by 10.7%, and ex-substance users by 2.9%. Almost half (46%) participated in these activities in school and 15% participated out-of-school.

No trend analyses are available for these activities as they are included in ESPAD for the first time in 2024.



Summary ToC

# Trends in Teenager Substance Use in Ireland 1995-2024



## Introduction

The overall aim of the ESPAD project is to repeatedly collect comparable data on substance use among 15- and16-year-old students in as many European countries as possible. Thus, ESPAD Ireland contributes considerably to our knowledge of the use of tobacco, alcohol, and other substances among Irish 15- and 16-year-olds, allowing us to examine associations between substance use and demographic, psychosocial, environmental, and behavioural factors. Additionally, the repeated crosssectional nature of the project allows substance use to be measured and compared over time. In this chapter, we report on changes over time between 1995, when the first ESPAD survey was carried out, and 2024, the eighth cycle of the ESPAD survey.

We note that in previous ESPAD Ireland surveys (1995-2019), all students were categorised as either male or female. The 2024 ESPAD Ireland survey included an additional answer category 'Rather not say', and all three answer categories have been included throughout this report. In this chapter on trends, for comparison purposes across the 30-year period 1995-2024, male/female categories only for 2024 are reported.

## Trends in Lifetime and Current Cigarette Use

Lifetime smoking (ever-smoking) reported by 15- and 16-year-olds in Ireland has declined from 73% in 1995 to 24% in 2024. In 2019, lifetime smoking was only slightly less (31%) than in 2015 (32%), and boys' smoking had not decreased at all (33% in both 2015 and 2019). Following this slow-down, we report a 23% decrease in lifetime smoking between 2019 and 2024, the decrease being more pronounced among boys (33%) than among girls (17%). We note that data on lifetime smoking are not available for the second and third cycles of the ESPAD Ireland surveys in 2000 and 2005.



## Figure 8.1 Trend in lifetime cigarette use 1995-2024

Summary



Year	Total	Male	Female
1995	73%	72%	75%
1999	-	-	-
2003			
2007	52%	50%	53%
2011	43%	42%	45%
2015	32%	33%	32%
2019	31%	33%	30%
2024	24%	22%	25%

## Table 8.1 Trend in lifetime cigarette use 1995-2024

Overall, current smoking declined from 41% in 1995 to 12% in 2024. After more than 20 years of declining rates between 1995 and 2015, current smoking increased among boys between 2015 and 2019 (from 13% to 16%). Between 2019 and 2024, current smoking among boys decreased again to 10%. In 1995, current smoking among girls was higher than among boys (45% vs 37%) and remained higher in each ESPAD survey until 2015 when girls and boys reported similar rates (13%). In 2024, rates among girls were again higher than among boys (13% vs 10%). We note that the computation of the measure 'current smoking' varied slightly between 2015 and 2019.







Summary



Year	Total	Male	Female
1995	41%	37%	45%
1999	37%	32%	42%
2003	33%	28%	37%
2007	23%	19%	27%
2011	21%	19%	23%
2015	13%	13%	13%
2019	14%	16%	13%
2024	12%	10%	13%

## Table 8.2 Trend in last 30-day (current) cigarette use 1995-2024

## Trends in Lifetime and Current E-Cigarette Use

Prevalence of e-cigarette lifetime use was first measured in ESPAD Ireland in 2015, at which time it was 23%. Reported prevalence increased to 39% in 2019 and was higher in male students (46%) than in female students (32%). Overall lifetime prevalence decreased in 2024 to 32%, with male use decreasing from 46% to 29% but female use increased to 34% (from 32% in 2019) and, in 2024, female lifetime use was higher than that of males (34% vs 29%).



## Figure 8.3 Trend in lifetime e-cigarette use 2015-2024



Summary



Year	Total	Male	Female
2015	23%	26%	20%
2019	39%	46%	32%
2024	32%	29%	34%

## Table 8.3 Trend in lifetime e-cigarette use 2015-2024

Current e-cigarette use was also first reported in 2015 and prevalence was 10%. Prevalence increased in 2019 to 18%, with more male students than female students reporting last 30-day use (23% vs 14%). Lower overall prevalence of current e-cigarette use was reported in 2024 than in 2019, accounted for by the decrease in prevalence reported by male students (23% in 2019 vs 14% in 2024). Female students reported higher current e-cigarette use in 2024 than they had in 2019 (17% vs 14%), indicating that the situation as regards newer nicotine/tobacco products may not yet have stabilised.



Figure 8.4 Trend in last 30-day (current) e-cigarette use 2015-2024

## Table 8.4 Trend in last 30-day (current) e-cigarette use 2015-2024

Year	Total	Male	Female
2015	10%	12%	9%
2019	18%	23%	14%
2024	16%	14%	17%

## Trends in Lifetime and Current Alcohol Use

Prevalence of lifetime alcohol use by 15-16-year-olds has decreased from 86% in 2007 to 67% in 2024. Decreasing overall prevalence has been reported in every ESPAD Ireland cycle. Lifetime alcohol prevalence has been similar for male and female students in all cycles between 2007 and 2024.

Summary ToC



Table	8.5	Trend	in	lifetime	alcohol	use	2007-20	)24
TUNIC	0.0	II CIIM		meenic	arconor	asc	2007 20	

Year	Total	Male	Female
2007	86%	87%	86%
2011	81%	80%	81%
2015	73%	73%	72%
2019	72%	73%	72%
2024	67%	66%	67%

Prevalence of current alcohol use (last 30 days) has more than halved since 1999 when three out of every four 15-16-year-olds (74%) reported alcohol use in the previous 30 days. In 2024, this figure had decreased to about one in three (35%), with female students reporting higher current alcohol use then did their male peers (36% vs 33%).



## Figure 8.5 Trend in lifetime alcohol use 2007-2024



Year	Total	Male	Female
1995	69%	69%	69%
1999	74%	73%	75%
2003	73%	71%	74%
2007	56%	57%	56%
2011	50%	48%	52%
2015	36%	35%	37%
2019	41%	42%	40%
2024	35%	33%	36%

Summary

ТоС

<u>}</u>





## Figure 8.6 Trend in last 30-day (current) alcohol use 1995-2024

## Trends in Lifetime and Current Cannabis Use

Overall, reported prevalence of lifetime cannabis use decreased by 68% between 1995 and 2024. In 1995, more than one in three 15- and 16-year-olds reported lifetime use of cannabis compared with one in eight in 2024. Between 1995 and 2019, reported lifetime prevalence was generally considerably higher among male students than among female students. In 2024, lifetime prevalence reported by male and female students was almost equal (12% vs 11%).

Year	Total	Male	Female
1995	37%	42%	31%
1999	32%	35%	29%
2003	39%	38%	39%
2007	20%	23%	17%
2011	18%	22%	15%
2015	19%	22%	16%
2019	19%	24%	15%
2024	12%	12%	11%

### Table 8.7 Trend in lifetime cannabis use 1995-2024

Current cannabis use has been measured since 2007 and prevalence 9%-10% in 2007, 2015, and 2019. Reported current use decreased in 2024 to 5%. As with lifetime cannabis use, reported prevalence has been consistently higher among male students than among female students and that remains the case in 2024 (6% vs 4%) but the gap is closing.



Summary





## Figure 8.7 Trend in lifetime cannabis use 1995-2024

## Table 8.8 Trend in last 30-day (current) cannabis use 2007-2024

Year	Total	Male	Female
2007	9%	11%	7%
2011	7%	10%	5%
2015	10%	12%	7%
2019	9%	12%	7%
2024	5%	6%	4%







Summary

ToC

117



## Trend in Inhalant Use

Lifetime use of inhalants by 15-16-year-olds has decreased from 22% in 1999, when it was first measured, to 6% in 2024. Prevalence was higher among females between 2003 and 2011 but, since 2015, male and female students have reported similar use of inhalants.

Year	Total	Male	Female
1999	22%	22%	21%
2003	18%	14%	21%
2007	15%	14%	16%
2011	9%	8%	11%
2015	10%	10%	10%
2019	10%	11%	10%
2024	6%	6%	6%

## Table 8.9 Trend in lifetime inhalant use 1999-2024

## Trend in Last 12-Month Gambling

Using the Gambling (Direct Measure), between 2019 and 2024, prevalence of last-year gambling declined from 16% to 13%. Gambling among boys decreased from 23% to 19%, while it increased among girls from 7% to 8%. Nonetheless, more than twice as many boys report gambling as do girls. As with other measures, we note the high prevalence of gambling reported in 2024 by those who preferred not to answer the question 'Male/Female?'. Additionally, problem gambling predominantly remains an issue for male students more than for female students.

## Table 8.10a Trend in last 12-month gambling (Direct Measure) 2015-2024

Year	Total	Male	Female
2015	16%	26%	7%
2019	16%	23%	7%
2024	13%	19%	8%

Using the Gambling (Composite Measure), which we believe to be a more reliable measure, prevalence of last-year gambling increased from 26% to 32%. There was almost a 50% increase between 2019 and 2024 in prevalence of female students' last-year gambling (from 20% to 29%).

## Table 8.10b Trend in last 12-month gambling (Composite Measure)\* 2019-2024

Year	Total	Male	Female
2019	26%	33%	20%
2024	32%	35%	29%

\* Note: In 2019 gambling activities were assessed without separating the four games of chance by whether they occurred on-site or online. In 2024, two questions were used to assess on-site and online gambling separately.

Summary





## Figure 8.9 Trend in last 12-month gambling (Composite Measure)\* 2019-2024

## Summary

In the 30 years since the first ESPAD survey in 1995, overall use of alcohol, tobacco, cannabis, inhalants, and other substances by 15-16-year-olds has declined in Ireland. The reduction of 71% in current smoking during that period points to the success of multiple policy and legislative initiatives, but we note that the attainment of the Tobacco Free Ireland target of 5% smoking prevalence by 2025 is still a long way off. Other reductions in substance use are noted, including a reduction of 49% in current alcohol use in the 30 years since 1995. We note that prevalence of lifetime cannabis use has decreased by 68% since 1999, and is now 12%. Prevalence of current cannabis use, which has been measured since 2007, has decreased by some 44% to 5% in 2024, having remained stable at some 9% between 2007 and 2019. We report on newer substances such as nicotine pouches and e-cigarettes, and note that trends in these substances merit attention, as do trends in use of newer illicit drugs and substances. Prevalence of gambling for money (using the Composite Measure reported across Europe) increased between 2019 and 2024 from 26% to 32%, with betting on sports or animals being the most frequently reported Online gambling activity (10.5%). Gambling prevalence is significantly higher in male students than in female students, and is also higher among students who preferred not to state their gender, on whom we report for the first time in 2024. Prevalence of problem gambling among students who gamble for money is 29% to 47% depending on the measure used, and high prevalence among male students is a particular cause for concern.



Summary

ToC

ESPAD Ireland 2024 119



## **TFRI ESPAD Publications 2015-2024**

- 1. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. Hashtags, images, and promotions: E-cigarette messaging on social media associated with teenager smoking and e-cigarette use in Ireland. In Dublin. Abstract WCTC2025: 15.; 2025. Available from: https://www.tri.ie/uploads/5/2/7/3/52736649/ abstract\_1621\_social\_media\_and\_e-cigs.pdf
- 2. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. Capturing changes in youth tobacco and nicotine use - a new composite measure. In Dublin. Abstract WCTC2025: 15.; 2025. Available from: https://www.tri.ie/ uploads/5/2/7/3/52736649/abstract\_wctc\_2025\_dublin\_abst.1abstract\_15.pdf
- Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. Trends and gender differences 2019-2024 in use of alternative 3. smoking products (excluding e-cigarettes) by teenagers in Ireland. Tobacco Prevention & Cessation [Internet]. 2024;10(Supplement 1). doi:10.18332/tpc/194442.
- 4. Sunday S, Clancy L, Hanafin J. Teenage problem gambling in Ireland - shared risk factors with tobacco, e-cigarette and cannabis use. European Respiratory Journal 2023. 2023;62(67). doi: https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.congress-2023.PA5323
- Reynolds CME, Hanafin J, Sunday S, McAvoy H, Clancy L. Odds of gambling among adolescents: 5. a secondary analysis of the cross-sectional European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs. Lancet. 2023 Nov;402 Suppl 1:S79. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(23)02118-9. PMID: 37997124
- McAvoy H, Reynolds C, Sunday S, Hanafin J, Clancy L. Children and gambling evidence to 6. inform regulation and responses in Ireland. Based on a secondary analysis of the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs (ESPAD). Dublin Institute of Public Health. 2023; Dublin. Institute of Public Health. Available from: Gambling and children report final.pdf
- McAvoy H, Reynolds C, Sunday S, Hanafin J, Clancy L. Children and gambling evidence to 7. inform regulation and responses in Ireland. Plain Language Summary. (2023). Dublin. Institute of Public Health.
- Hanafin J, Sunday S, Reynolds C, McAvoy H, Clancy L. Links between Smoking, E-cigarette and 8. Cannabis use, and Gambling in Ireland: What are the odds? Tobacco Prevention & Cessation. 2023;9(Supplement). A156 https://doi.org/10.18332/tpc/162906
- Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. E-cigarettes and smoking in Irish teens: a logistic regression 9. analysis of current (past 30-day) use of e-cigarettes. J Public Health (Berl). 2023 Jun;31(6):955-66. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-021-01610-1
- 10. Sunday S, Hanafin J, Clancy L. Why has the decline in smoking among Irish teenagers stopped? Irish Journal of Medical Science. Ir J Med Sci 191 (Suppl 5), 129-185 (2022). https://doi. org/10.1007/s11845-022-03209-1.
- 11. Sunday S, Hanafin J, Clancy L. Teen Smoking is a Challenge to Ireland's TobaccoFree Endgame. Annual Meeting of the Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco SRNT, Baltimore, MD 15-18 March 2022. Available from: srnt2022\_tfri.pdf
- Sunday S, Clancy L, Hanafin J. Factors Associated with E-Cigarette Use in Young Adults. Irish 12. Journal of Medical Science 191 (Suppl 5), 129-185 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11845-022-03209-1
- 13. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. Teenagers' perceptions of risk from cigarettes and e-cigarettes. Tobacco Prevention & Cessation. 2022;8(Supplement). A68. https://doi.org/10.18332/tpc/151001





- 14. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. Sociodemographic, personal, peer, and familial predictors of e-cigarette ever use in ESPAD Ireland: A forward stepwise logistic regression model. Tobacco Induced Diseases. 2022 Feb;20(February):1-12. https://doi.org/10.18332/tid/
- 15. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. High parental education a risk factor for teenage e-cigarette use in Ireland. European Respiratory Journal 2022 60: 1936; doi: https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003. congress-2022.1936
- 16. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. Geography, gender and smoking in Europe. European Respiratory Journal 2022 60: 1954; doi: 10.1183/13993003.congress-2022.1954
- 17. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. The decline in teenage smoking has reversed in Ireland-how can we intervene?. European Respiratory Journal 2022 60: 2084; DOI: 10.1183/13993003. congress-2022.2084
- 18. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. Gender differences in teenage e-cigarette prevalence and predictive variables. European Respiratory Journal 2022 60: 2071; DOI: 10.1183/13993003. congress-2022.2071
- 19. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. E-cigarettes in Ireland - prevalence, motivations, and relationship with tobacco. European Respiratory Journal 2022 60: 2073; DOI: 10.1183/13993003. congress-2022.2073
- 20. Clancy L, Sunday S, Hanafin J. Do high achievers have the same relationship with e-cigarettes as with cigarettes? Tobacco Prevention & Cessation. 2022;8(Supplement). A78. https://doi.org/10.18332/tpc/151000
- 21. Sunday S, Hanafin J, Keogan S, Clancy L. Smoking in Schools in Ireland. The Physician Journal of International Health. 2021 Jan 4;6(3). https://doi.org/10.38192/1.6.3.firmst20
- 22. Sunday S, Hanafin J, Clancy L. Increased smoking and e-cigarette use among Irish teenagers: A new threat to Tobacco Free Ireland 2025. ERJ Open Research. 2021 Oct 1;7(4). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1183/23120541.00438-2021
- 23. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Keogan S, Clancy L. Worrying changes in adolescent e-cigarette use 2014-2019: A secondary analysis of five Irish health datasets. Irish Journal of Medical Science. 2021 Jan 7;190:3.3. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11845-020-02450-w.
- 24. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Keogan S, Clancy L. What's Happening with E-Cigarette Use. A Secondary Analysis of five Irish health datasets. The Physician Journal of International Health [Internet]. 2021 Jan 4;6(3). Available from: https://doi.org/10.38192/1.6.3.firmst20
- 25. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Keogan S, Clancy L. Increase in boys' smoking threatens Ireland's Endgame Projections - European trend analysis of smoking prevalence 1995-2019. Poster at SRNT 27th Annual Meeting 2021. Available from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1lz0vtp I6EU6bV7b96YTeaPYN4XUA76p/view
- 26. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Keogan S, Clancy L. Gender difference results in increase in adolescent smoking in 2019 in Ireland-European trend analysis of current smoking prevalence 1995-2019. Irish Journal of Medical Science. 2021 Jan 7;190:3.11. Available from: Irish Thoracic Society Annual Scientific Meeting 2020 | Irish Journal of Medical Science (1971 -)
- 27. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Keogan S, Clancy L. E-cigarette prevalence, motivations for use, and relationship with tobacco - the changing situation in Ireland. Poster at SRNT 27th Annual Meeting 2021. Available from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/163FQ9bbVwRR\_ selZz0tnd5mkguVHcUxQ/view



- 28. Hanafin J, Sunday S, Clancy L. Friends and family matter Most: a trend analysis of increasing e-cigarette use among Irish teenagers and socio-demographic, personal, peer and familial associations. BMC Public Health. 2021;21(1):1-12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-12113-9
- 29. Sunday S, Keogan S, Hanafin J, Clancy L. ESPAD 2019 Ireland: Results from the European Schools Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs in Ireland. Dublin: TFRI; 2020. Available from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qyaQwcxQhLbiDQrl2ap6SuNMmHa\_NWcy/view
- Li S, Keogan S, Clancy L. Does smoke-free legislation work for teens too? A logistic regression analysis of smoking prevalence and gender among 16 years old in Ireland, using the 1995-2015 ESPAD school surveys. BMJ Open. 2020 Aug 1;10(8):e032630. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-032630.PMID: 32801188.
- 31. ESPAD Group. ESPAD Report 2019: Results from the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs [Internet]. EMCDDA Joint Publications, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.; 2020. Available from: https://www.espad.org/sites/ default/files/2020.3878\_EN\_04.pdf
- 32. Kraus L, Seitz NN, Piontek D, Molinaro S, Siciliano V, Guttormsson U, et al. 'Are The Times A-Changin'? Trends in adolescent substance use in Europe. Addiction. 2018; doi: 10.1111/add.14201
- Kraus L, Guttormsson U, Leifman H, Arpa S, Molinaro S, Monshouwer K, et al. ESPAD Report 2015: Results from the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs. 2016. Report No.: 9789291689187. DOI: 10.1121/1.1610459.
- 34. Clancy L, Taylor K, Babineau K, Keogan S, Whelan E. European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs (ESPAD) 2015. TFRI for the Department of Health, Ireland.; 2016. Available from: https://www.tri.ie/uploads/5/2/7/3/52736649/espad\_2015\_ireland\_final.pdf
- Clancy L, Babineau K. E-cigarettes: effective cessation tools or public health threat? QJM: An International Journal of Medicine. 2016;109(2):79–81. https://doi.org/10.1093/qjmed/hcv223
- Hibell B, Guttormsson U, Ahlström S, Balakireva O, Bjarnason T, Kokkevi A, et al. The 2011 ESPAD Report: Substance Use Among Students in 36 European Countries. 978-91-7278-233-4. Available from; ESPAD\_Report\_2011.pdf
- Kabir Z, Morgan M, Clancy L. Smoking status and academic performance of adolescents in Ireland. Irish Journal of Medical Science. *Irish Journal of Medical Science* 180 (Suppl 12), 411 (2011). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11845-011-0759-4
- Hibell B, Andersson B, Bjarnasson T, Ahlström S, Balakireva O, Kokkevi A, et al. ESPAD report 2003: alcohol and other drug use among students in 35 European countries. Report No.: 9172781033. Available at; https://www.espad.org/content/espad-report-2003-alcohool-andother-drug-use-among-students-35-european-countries
- Keogan S, Taylor K, Babineau K, Clancy L. A 2015 national survey of e-cigarette use among Irish youth. European Respiratory Journal 2016 48(suppl 60): PA2019; DOI: https://doi. org/10.1183/13993003.congress-2016.PA2019
- Li S, Keogan S, Clancy L. Trends in Youth Smoking in Ireland and Analysis of Factors Associated with Youth Smoking. The European Conference on Tobacco or Health (ECToH 2017). DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.24073.24167
- 41. Clancy L, Keishia T, Li S, Keogan S. E-Cigarettes Before Tobacco among Irish Adolescents. The European Conference on Tobacco or Health (ECToH 2017). https://www.tri.ie/ uploads/5/2/7/3/52736649/shahsa\_ectoh\_e-cig.pdf



## ESPAD Ireland 2024 Student Questionnaire



The European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs www.espad.org

## ESPAD Ireland 2024

## Student Online Questionnaire on substance use

### Read this first please!

This questionnaire is part of an international study called ESPAD that will be answered by more than 100,000 students in over 35 countries in Europe. It is a survey of substance use with questions on use of tobacco, e-cigarettes, alcohol, drugs, gambling and gaming. It will take about 30-40 minutes to complete.

This is a totally anonymous questionnaire. You should not state your name or any other information which identifies you. The survey does not store information about the device with which it is answered, including the IP address.

Your class has been randomly selected to take part in this study. In Ireland the survey is carried out by the TobaccoFree Research Institute Ireland (TFRI). It is voluntary to take part and you can change your mind at any time. If there is any question you find objectionable for any reason, just leave it blank. It is important that you answer as thoughtfully and frankly as possible. The results will not be presented by single classes or schools and your answers are and will remain totally anonymous.

If you do not find an answer that fits exactly, indicate the one that comes closest. Please mark the appropriate answer to each question. If you have any technical question, please raise your hand and your designated teacher or researcher will assist you but they will not look at your answers.

**REMEMBER** - Participation is voluntary. You do not have to take part in the survey and you do not have to answer any question in the survey that you do not want to answer. You can withdraw from the survey at any time and your data will not be used or stored. Your answers are completely anonymous.

### Thank you in advance for your participation! Please begin.





## The first questions ask for some background information about yourself and the kind of things you might do.

## C01 What is your sex?

- 1 🔲 Male
- 2 🔲 Female
- 4 🔲 Rather not answer

### 001 What is your current gender identity?

- 1 🔲 Male
- 2 🔲 Female
- 3 🔲 Other
- 4 🔲 Rather not answer

### C02 When were you born?



### OC02c In which country were you born?

	Mark one box.	Ireland	UK	Poland	Romania	India	Ukraine	Other country
OC02c	Country of birth.							
		372	826	616	642	356	804	999

### OC02d For how long have you lived in Ireland?

	Mark one box.	Basically, since my birth	For more than 10 years	For 5-10 years	For 2-5 years	For 2 years or less	
OC02d	How many years.						
		1	2	3	4	5	

### CO3 How often do you do any of the following activities?

	Mark one box for each line	Never	A few times a year	Once or twice a month	At least once a week	Almost every day
C03a	Play computer games					
C03b	Actively take part in sports or athletics or do exercise					
C03c	Read books for enjoyment (not counting schoolbooks)					
C03d	Go out in the evening (to a disco, a bar, a party etc.)					
C03e	Other hobbies (play an instrument, sing, paint, write etc.)					
C03f	Go around with friends to shopping centres, streets, parks etc. just for fun					
		1	2	3	4	5

ESPAD Ireland 2024 Student Questionnaire

 $\mathcal{Y}$ 



### CO4 During the LAST 30 DAYS on how many days have you missed one or more lessons?

	Mark one box for each line.	Never	1 dav	2 days	3-4 days	5-6 days	7 days or more
C04a	Because of illness						
CO4b	Because you skipped or 'cut'						
CO4c	For other reasons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6

The following questions are about tobacco smoking (traditional cigarettes, rolled cigarettes, cigarillos, cigars) EXCLUDING e-cigarettes (vapes) and alternative products (nicotine pouches, heated tobacco products, water pipe, moist snuff etc.)

## C05 How difficult do you think it would be for you to access cigarettes (excluding e-cigarettes (vapes) and alternative smoking products) if you wanted?

1	Impossible
2	Very difficult
3	Fairly difficult
4	Fairly easy
5	Very easy
6	Don't know

## CO6 Have you ever smoked cigarettes (excluding e-cigarettes (vapes) and alternative smoking products)?

1	Yes, in the last 30 days

- 2 Yes, in the last 12 months but not in the last 30 days
- 3 Yes, more than 12 months ago
- 4 🔲 Never

## C07 How often have you smoked cigarettes (excluding e-cigarettes (vapes) and alternative smoking products) during the LAST 30 DAYS?

1	Not at all
2	Less than 1 cigarette a week
3	Less than 1 cigarette a day
4	1–5 cigarettes a day
5	6–10 cigarettes a day
6	11-20 cigarettes a day
7	More than 20 cigarettes a day





#### **C08** When (if ever) did you FIRST do each of the following things?

	• • •		-							
	Mark one box for each line.	Never	9 years old or less	10 years old	11 years old	12 years old	13 years old	14 years old	15 years old	16 years or older
C08a	Smoke your first cigarette (excluding e-cigarettes (vapes) and alternative smoking products)									
C08b	Smoke cigarettes on a daily basis (excluding e-cigarettes (vapes) and alternative smoking products)									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

The next questions are about e-cigarettes (vapes, mods) and alternative smoking products (nicotine pouches, water pipe (shisha), snus, heated tobacco products).

#### **C09** How difficult do you think it would be for you to access the following products if you wanted?

	Mark one box for each line.	Impossible	Very difficult	Fairly difficult	Fairly easy	Very easy	Don't know
C09a	E-cigarettes						
C09b	Water pipe (shisha)						
OC09c	Moist snuff (snus)						
OC09d	Heated tobacco products						
OC09e	Nicotine pouches						
		1	2	3	4	5	6

#### **C10** Have you ever used e-cigarettes?

1	Yes, in the last 30 days
2	Yes, in the last 12 months but not in the last 30 days
3	Yes, more than 12 months ago
4	Never

#### **C11**

### How often have you used e-cigarettes during the LAST 30 DAYS?

1	Not at all
---	------------

- 2 Less than once per week
- 3 At least once a week
- 4 Almost every day or every day

ToC

 $\mathcal{Y}$ 



#### If you have used e-cigarettes during the LAST 30 DAYS, what did they contain? C12 , rk all that annly

 	IVIa	i k all ul	at appiy.
C12a	1		I have not used e-cigarettes in the last 30 days
C12b	1		Nicotine
 C12c	1		Flavouring
 C12d	1		CBD
 C12e	1		тнс
 C12f	1		Don't know

#### **C13** When (if ever) did you FIRST do each of the following things?

	Mark one box for each line.	Never	9 years old or less	10 years old	11 years old	12 years old	13 years old	14 years old	15 years old	16 years or older
C13a	Use your first e-cigarette									
C13b	Use e-cigarettes on a daily basis									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

#### **C14** When you first tried e-cigarettes (if ever), what was your relationship with traditional cigarettes?

1	I have never tried e-cigarettes
2	I had never used traditional cigarettes
3	I had occasionally used traditional cigarettes
4	I was regularly using traditional cigarettes

#### 002 Why did you try e-cigarettes for the first time?

	Ma	rk all th	nat apply.
O02a	1		I have never tried e-cigarettes
002b	1		To stop smoking cigarettes
002c	1		Out of curiosity
O02d	1		Because my friends/other people offered an e-cigarette to me
002e	1		None of the above reasons

#### 003 The first time you used e-cigarettes what did your e-cigarette contain? Mark all that apply. 1 I have never tried e-cigarettes 003a

O03b	1	Nicotine
003c	1	Flavouring
003d	1	CBD
003e	1	ТНС
003f	1	Don't know



### C15 Have you ever used the following alternative smoking products?

	Mark one box for each line.	Yes, in the last 30 days	Yes, in the last 12 months but not in the last 30 days	Yes, more than 12 months ago	Never
C15a	Water pipe (shisha)				
OC15b	Moist snuff (snus)				
OC15c	Heated tobacco products				
OC15d	Nicotine pouches				
		1	2	3	4

## 004 When (if ever) did you FIRST use

O04b Moist snuff (snus)





6/31

ТоС



## The next questions are about alcoholic beverages – including beer, cider, premixed drinks, wine and spirits.

## C16 How difficult do you think it would be for you to get each of the following, if you wanted?

	Mark one box for each line.	Impossible	Very difficult	Fairly difficult	Fairly easy	Very easy	Don't know
C16a	Beer						
OC16b	Cider						
OC16c	Premixed drinks (spritz, alcopops)						
C16d	Wine						
C16e	Spirits						
		1	2	3	4	5	6

### C17 On how many occasions (if any) have you had any alcoholic beverage to drink?

	Mark one box for each line.	Number of occasions							
		0	1-2	3-5	6-9	10-19	20-39	40 or	
								more	
C17a	In your lifetime								
C17b	During the last 12 months								
C17c	During the last 30 days								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

## **C18** Think back over the LAST 30 DAYS. On how many occasions (if any) have you had any of the following to drink?

	Mark one box for each line.	Number of occasions								
		0	1-2	3-5	6-9	10-19	20-39	40 or		
C18a	Beer									
OC18b	Cider									
OC18c	Premixed drinks (spritz, alcopops)									
C18d	Wine									
C18e	Spirits									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

# C19 Think back again over the LAST 30 DAYS. How many times (if any) have you had five or more drinks on one occasion? "A `drink´ is defined as 1 glass/bottle/can of beer (33 cl), 1 glass of wine (15 cl), 1 glass of spirits (4 cl)

1	None
2	1
3	2
4	3-5
5	6-9
6	10 or more times

ToC

Y)



### O05 How do you usually get alcohol?

1	Buy in store / off-license
2	Purchase smuggled goods or homemade alcohol
3	Get or buy from other youth
4	My parents give / buy me alcohol
5	Siblings buy for me / give to me
6	I take alcohol at home without permission
7	Other adults buy / give to me
8	Buy at pubs/bars etc
9	Other way

### The following questions are about the last day you drank alcohol.

### O06 When was the last day you drank alcohol?

1	I never drink alcohol
2	1–7 days ago
3	8–14 days ago
4	15–30 days ago
5	1 month - 1 year ago
6	More than 1 year ago

## O07f Please indicate on this scale from 1 to 10 how drunk you would say you were that last day you drank alcohol. (If you felt no effect at all you should mark "1".)

	•					-		He	eavily intoxicated,	l never
Not at								for exa	nple, not remembering	drink
all									what happened	alcohol
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11





ТоС



## The next questions are also about alcohol.

#### **C20** On how many occasions (if any) have you been intoxicated from drinking alcoholic beverages, for example staggered when walking, not being able to speak properly, throwing up or not remembering what happened?

Number of rcasi

Mark one box for each line.			Number of occasions							
		0	1-2	3-5	6-9	10-19	20-39	40 or		
								more		
C20a	In your lifetime									
C20b	During the last 12 months									
C20c	During the last 30 days									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

#### **C21** When (if ever) did you FIRST do each of the following things?

	Mark one box for each line.	Never	9 years old or less	10 years old	11 years old	12 years old	13 years old	14 years old	15 years old	16 years or older
C21a	Drink alcohol (at least one glass)									
C21b	Get drunk on alcohol									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

#### C22 In the LAST 12 MONTHS, how often did you drink ...

	Mark one box for each line.	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
C22a	because it helps you enjoy a party?					
C22b	because it helps you when you feel depressed or nervous?					
C22c	to cheer up when you're in a bad mood?					
C22d	because you like the feeling?					
C22e	to get high?					
C22f	because it makes social gatherings more fun?					
C22g	to fit in with a group you like?					
C22h	because it improves parties and celebrations?					
C22i	to forget about your problems?					
C22j	because it's fun?					
C22k	to be liked?					
C22I	so you won't feel left out?					
		1	2	3	4	5





Tranquillisers and sedatives, like benzos, as well as painkillers, like codeine, are sometimes prescribed by doctors to help people to calm down, get to sleep or to relax. Pharmacies are not supposed to sell them without a prescription.

## C23 Have you ever taken one or more of the following drugs because a <u>doctor</u> told you to take them?

	Mark one box for each line.	No, never	Yes, but for less than 3	Yes, for 3 weeks or
			weeks	more
C23a	Tranquillisers or sedatives			
OC23b	Drugs for attention or hyperactivity			
		1	2	3

## C24 On how many occasions in your lifetime (if any) have you used any of the following drugs without a doctor's prescription?

	Mark one box for each line.	0	1-2	3 or more
C24a	Tranquillisers or sedatives			
C24b	Painkillers in order to get high			
OC24c	Drugs for attention or hyperactivity			
OC24d	Sleeping tablets			
		1	2	3

## The following questions are about your well-being.

## C25 Please indicate for each of the five statements which is closest to how you have been feeling over the LAST TWO WEEKS.

	Mark one box for each line.	All the time	Most of the time	More than half of the time	Less than half of the time	Some of the time	At no time
C25a	I have felt cheerful and in good spirits						
C25b	I have felt calm and relaxed						
C25c	I have felt active and vigorous						
C25d	I woke up feeling fresh and rested						
C25e	My daily life has been filled with things that interest me						
		1	2	3	4	5	6







## The next questions ask about cannabis (marijuana or hashish).

## C26 Hov

### How difficult do you think it would be for you to get cannabis if you wanted?

1	Impossible
2	Very difficult
3	Fairly difficult
4	Fairly easy
5	Very easy
6	Don't know

### C27 On how many occasions (if any) have you used cannabis?

	Mark one box for each line.	Number of occasions						
		0	1-2	3-5	6-9	10-19	20-39	40 or
								more
C27a	In your lifetime							
C27b	During the last 12 months							
C27c	During the last 30 days							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

### C28 When (if ever) did you FIRST try cannabis?

1	Never
2	9 years old or less
3	10 years old
4	11 years old
5	12 years old
6	13 years old
7	14 years old
8	15 years old
9	16 years or older

### 009

### Have you ever had the possibility to try cannabis without trying it?

1	No
2	Once or twice
3	3 times or more



### C29 During the past 12 MONTHS, did you use the following types of cannabis?

	Mark one box for each line.	Never	Rarely	Often
C29a	Cannabis mixed with tobacco			
C29b	Cannabis resin/hashish			
C29c	Herbal cannabis/Weed			
OC29d	Cannabis oil			
OC29e	Edible cannabis-based products			
OC29f	Cannabis-based e-liquids			
		1	2	3

### C30 Have you used cannabis in the LAST 12 MONTHS?

	1		No							
	2		$\neg$ Yes $\rightarrow$ Has the following happened to you during the LAST 12 MONTHS?							
		-		Mark one box for each line.	Never	Rarely	From time to time	Fairly often	Very often	
C30a				Have you smoked cannabis before midday?						
C30b				Have you smoked cannabis alone?						
C30c				Have you had memory problems after smoking cannabis?						
C30d				Have friends or members of your family told you that you ought to reduce or stop your cannabis use?						
C30e				Have you tried to reduce or stop using cannabis without success?						
C30f				Have you had problems due to your consumption of cannabis (arguments, fights, accidents, poor school results etc.)?						
		-			1	2	3	4	5	



12/31



## The next questions ask about other drugs.

## C31 How difficult do you think it would be for you to get each of the following, if you wanted?

	Mark one box for each line.	Impossible	Very difficult	Fairly difficult	Fairly easy	Very easy	Don't know
C31a	Amphetamines						
C31b	Methamphetamines						
C31c	Tranquillisers or sedatives without a doctor's prescription						
C31d	Ecstasy/MDMA						
C31e	Cocaine						
OC31f	Crack						
OC31g	Fentanyl						
		1	2	3	4	5	6

### C32a On how many occasions (if any) have you ever used...?

	Mark one box for each line.	Ν	Number of occasio	ns
		0	1-2	3 or more
C32aa	Ecstasy/MDMA in your lifetime			
C32ab	Ecstasy/MDMA during the last 12 months			
C32ac	Amphetamines in your lifetime			
C32ad	Amphetamines during the last 12 months			
C32ae	Methamphetamines in your lifetime			
C32af	Methamphetamines during the last 12 months			
OC32ag	Synthetic cannabinoids in your lifetime*			
OC32ah	Synthetic cannabinoids during the last 12 months*			
OC32ai	Synthetic cathinones in your lifetime*			
OC32aj	Synthetic cathinones during the last 12 months*			
OC32ak	Synthetic opioids in your lifetime (Eg Fentanyl, Nitazenes)			
OC32al	Synthetic opioids during the last 12 months (Eg Fentanyl, Nitazenes)			
OC32am	Nitrous oxide in your lifetime *			
OC32an	Nitrous oxide during the last 12 months *			
		1	2	3



ТоС



### C32b On how many occasions (if any) have you ever used...?

	Mark one box for each line.	1	Number of occasions				
		0	1-2	3 or more			
C32ba	Cocaine in your lifetime						
C32bb	Cocaine during the last 12 months						
C32bc	Crack in your lifetime						
C32bd	Crack during the last 12 months						
C32be	Heroin in your lifetime						
C32bf	Heroin during the last 12 months						
		1	2	2			

### C33 On how many occasions (if any) have you used inhalants to get high?

	Mark one box for each line.	N	Number of occasions				
		0	1-2	3 or more			
C33a	In your lifetime						
C33b	During the last 12 months						
C33c	During the last 30 days						
		1	2	3			

## C34 On how many occasions in your lifetime (if any) have you used any of the following drugs?

	Mark one box for each line.	l	Number of occasio	ns
		0	1-2	3 or more
C34a	LSD or some other hallucinogens			
C34b	"Magic mushrooms"			
C34c	GHB			
C34d	Sprack			
C34e	Drugs by injection with a needle (like heroin, cocaine, amphetamine)			
OC34f	Ketamine			
		1	2	3

## C35 On how many occasions in your lifetime (if any) have you used any of the following drugs?

	Mark one box for each line.	Ν	lumber of occasio	ns
		0	1-2	3 or more
C35a	Alcohol together with pills (medicaments) in order to get high			
C35b	Anabolic steroids			
OC35c	Nitazenes			
OC35d	Fentanyl			





The next questions ask about new substances that imitate the effects of illicit drugs [such as cannabis or ecstasy] and that may now be sometimes available. They are sometimes called ['legal highs', 'ethno botanicals', 'research chemicals'] and can come in different forms, for example – herbal mixtures, powders, crystals or tablets.

### C36 On how many occasions (if any) have you used new psychoactive substances?

	Mark one box for each line.			Number of occasions			
		0	1-2	3 or more	Don't know / not sure		
C36a	In your lifetime						
C36b	During the last 12 months						
		1	2	3	4		

## 011 If you have used new psychoactive substances in the LAST 12 MONTHS, what was the appearance/form of the new substance/s?

	IVI	ark all	that apply.
O11a	1		I have not used such substances in the last 12 months
011b	1		Herbal smoking mixtures with drug-like effects
011c	1		Powders, crystals or tablets with drug-like effects
011d	1		Liquids with drug-like effects
 011e	1		Other





## The next questions ask about various substances.

## C37 How much do you think PEOPLE RISK harming themselves (physically or in other ways), if they ...

	Mark one box for each line.	No	Slight	Moderate	Great	Don't
		risk	risk	risk	risk	know
C37a	smoke cigarettes occasionally?					
C37b	smoke one or more packs of cigarettes per day?					
C37c	try e-cigarettes once or twice?					
C37d	use e-cigarettes on a daily basis?					
C37e	have one or two drinks nearly every day?					
C37f	have four or five drinks nearly every day?					
C37g	have five or more drinks in one occasion nearly each weekend?					



16/31

ТоС



## C38 Again: how much do you think PEOPLE RISK harming themselves (physically or in other ways), if they ...

	Mark one box for each line.	No risk	Slight risk	Moderate risk	Great risk	Don't know
C38a	try cannabis once or twice?					
C38b	smoke cannabis occasionally?					
C38c	smoke cannabis regularly?					
C38d	try ecstasy/MDMA once or twice?					
OC38e	take ecstasy/MDMA regularly? *					
C38f	try amphetamines (uppers, pep pills, bennie, speed) once or twice?					
OC38g	take amphetamines regularly?					
C38h	try synthetic cannabinoids once or twice?					
OC38i	use synthetic cannabinoids regularly?					
OC38j	try synthetic cathinones once or twice?					
OC38k	use synthetic cathinones regularly?					
OC38I	try synthetic opioids once or twice?					
OC38m	use synthetic opioids regularly?					
		1	2	3	4	5

### **O12** During the LAST 12 MONTHS have you experienced the following?

	Mark all that apply.	Never	Yes, while using alcohol	Yes, while using drugs	Yes, but NOT while using alcohol/drugs
012a	Physical fight				
012b	Accident or injury				
012c	Damaged or lost objects or clothing				
012d	Serious arguments				
012e	Victimized by robbery or theft				
012f	Trouble with police				
012g	Hospitalised or admitted to an emergency room because of severe intoxication				
O12h	Hospitalised or admitted to an emergency room because of accident or injury				
012i	Engaged in sexual intercourse without a condom				
012j	Being a victim of unwanted sexual advance				
O12k	Deliberately hurt yourself				
012	Driven a moped, car or other motor vehicle				
012m	Being involved in an accident while driving yourself				
012n	Been swimming in deep water (swimming pool, river, lake or sea)				
		1	1	1	1





## The next questions ask about Social Media.

# C39 How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about communicating with others on Social Media? [using for example Instagram, TikTok, WhatsApp, Twitter (X), Telegram, Facebook, Snapchat etc]

	Mark one box for each line.	Strongly	Partly	Neither	Partly	Strongly
		agree	agree	nor	disagree	disagree
C39a	I think I spend way too much time on Social Media					
C39b	I get in bad mood when I cannot spend time on Social Media					
C39c	My parents say that I spend way too much time on Social Media					
		1	2	3	4	5



18/31

ТоС



## The next questions ask about gaming.

# C40 During the LAST 30 DAYS, how many hours (if any) did you play games using a computer, tablet, console, smartphone or other electronic device (strategy, puzzle, adventure, football, war games etc.)?

	Mark one box for each line.	None	Half an	About	About 2-	About 4-	6 hours
			hour or	1	3 hours	5 hours	or
			less	hour			more
C40a	On a school day						
C40b	On a non-school day (weekend, holidays)						
		1	2	3	4	5	6

# C41 During the LAST 7 DAYS, on how many days (if any) were you playing games using a computer, tablet, console, smartphone or other electronic device (strategy, puzzle, adventure, football, war games etc.)?

1	None
2	1 day
3	2 days
4	3 days
5	4 days
6	5 days
7	6 days
8	7 days

## C42 How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about gaming on a computer, tablet, console, smartphone or other electronic device?

	Mark one box for each line.	Strongly agree	Partly agree	Neither nor	Partly disagree	Strongly disagree
C42a	I think I spend way too much time playing games					
C42b	I get in a bad mood when I cannot spend time on games					
C42c	My parents say that I spend way too much time on gaming					
		1	2	3	4	5




# The next questions ask about gambling for money (slot machines, playing card or dice, lotteries, sport bookmakers (bookies) etc.) both on the Internet and not on the Internet (in physical settings).

#### C43 How often (if ever) did you gamble for money in the LAST 12 MONTHS?

I have not gambled for money during the last 12 months
 Monthly or less
 2-4 times a month
 2-3 times or more a week

## C44 How much time (if any) did you spend gambling for money on a TYPICAL DAY in the LAST 12 MONTHS?

1	I have not gambled for money during the last 12 months
2	Less than 30 minutes
3	Between 30 minutes and 1 hour
4	Between 1 and 2 hours
5	Between 2 and 3 hours
6	3 hours or more

# C45 How often (if ever) did you gamble for money more than 2 hours (on a single occasion) in the LAST 12 MONTHS?

1	I have not gambled for money during the last 12 months
2 🔲	Never on a single occasion
3	Less than monthly
4	Monthly
5	Weekly
6 🔲	Daily or almost daily



ToC



## C46 If you have gambled for money ON-SITE (in physical places such as betting shops (bookies), racecourses, casinos, clubs) in the LAST 12 MONTHS, which games have you played?

	Mark one box for each line.	I have not played	Monthly	2-4 times a	2-3 times or	
		these games	or less	month	more a week	
C46a	Slot machines (fruit machine, new slot etc.)					
C46b	Play card or dice (poker, bridge, dice etc.)					
C46c	Lotteries (scratch, bingo, keno etc.)					
C46d	Betting on sports or animals (horses, dogs etc.)					
		1	2	3	4	

## C47 If you have gambled for money ONLINE in the LAST 12 MONTHS, which games have you played?

	Mark one box for each line.	I have not played these games	Monthly or less	2-4 times a month	2-3 times or more a week
C47a	Slot machines (fruit machine, new slot etc.)				
C47b	Play card or dice (poker, bridge, dice etc.)				
C47c	Lotteries (scratch, bingo, keno etc.)				
C47d	Betting on sports or animals (horses, dogs etc.)				
		1	2	3	4



ТоС



#### Now think again about gambling for money in general

## C48 Have you ever felt the need to bet more and more money?

1	Yes
4	No

#### **C49**

#### Have you ever had to lie to people important to you about how much you gambled?

1	Yes
4	No

#### **013** If you have gambled in the LAST 12 MONTHS...

	Mark one box for each line.	Every time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Never
O13a	How often have you gone back another day to try and win back money you lost gambling?				
		1	2	3	4
				Yes	No
013b	When you were betting, have you ever told others you were winning money v	vhen you w	eren't?		
013c	Has your betting money ever caused any problems for you such as arguments or problems at school or work?	with family	and friends,		
013d	Have you ever gambled more than you had planned to?				
013e	Has anyone criticised your betting, or told you that you had a gambling proble it true or not?	m whether	you thought		
013f	Have you ever felt bad about the amount of money you bet, or about what ha money?	ppens whe	n you bet		
013g	Have you ever felt like you would like to stop betting, but didn't think you cou	ld?			
O13h	Have you ever hidden from family or friends any betting slips, IOUs, lottery tic won, or any signs of gambling?	kets, mone	y that you		
013i	Have you had money arguments with family or friends that centred on gambli	ng?			
013j	Have you borrowed money to bet and not paid it back?				
O13k	Have you ever skipped or been absent from school or work due to betting acti	vities?			
013	Have you borrowed money or stolen something in order to bet or to cover ga	mbling activ	vities?		
				1	2





X

ToC

#### The next questions ask about your parents.

If mostly foster parents, step-parents or others brought you up answer for them. For example, if you have both a stepfather and a biological father, answer for the one who is the most important in bringing you up.

<b>C50</b>	What	is the highest level of education your father completed?
	1 🔲	Completed primary school or less
	2	Some secondary school
	3 🔲	Completed secondary school
	4 🗖	Some college or university
	5 🗖	Completed college or university
	6 🔲	Don't know
	7 🗖	Does not apply

#### C51 What is the highest level of education your mother completed?

1	Completed primary school or less
2	Some secondary school
3	Completed secondary school
4	Some college or university
5	Completed college or university
6	Don't know
7 [	Does not apply

#### C52 How well off is your family compared to other families in your country?

1	Very much better off
 2	Much better off
 3	Better off
 4	About the same
 5	Less well off
 6	Much less well off
 7	Very much less well off

## C53 Which of the following people live in the same house in which you stay most of the time?

	iviark ai	i trat apply.
C53a	1	I live alone
C53b	1 🔲	Father
C53c	1	Stepfather
C53d	1	Mother
C53e	1	Stepmother

ESPAD Ireland 2024 Student Questionnaire

23/31



C53f	1	Brother(s)
C53g	1	Sister(s)
C53h	1	Grandparent(s)
C53i	1	Other relative(s)
C53j	1	Non-relative(s) (e.g. when living in a boarding school or equivalent)

#### **C54** How often do the following statements apply to you?

	Mark one box for each line.	Almost always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Almost never
C54a	My parent(s) set definite rules about what I can do at home					
C54b	My parent(s) set definite rules about what I can do outside the home					
C54c	My parent(s) know whom I am with in the evenings					
C54d	My parent(s) know where I am in the evenings					
C54e	I can easily borrow money from my mother and/or father					
C54f	I can easily get money as a gift from my mother and/or father					
		1	2	3	4	5

#### **C55** We are interested in how you feel about the following statements.

Read each statement carefully. Indicate how you feel about each statement.

	Mark one box for each line.	Very						Very
		strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	strongly agree
C55a	My family really tries to help me							
C55b	I get the emotional help and support I need from my family							
C55c	I can talk about my problems with my family							
C55d	My family is willing to help me make decisions							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

#### **C56** We are interested in how you feel about the following statements.

Read each statement carefully. Indicate how you feel about each statement.

	Mark one box for each line.	Very strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	Very strongly agree
C56a	My friends really try to help me							
C56b	I can count on my friends when things go wrong							
C56c	I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows							
C56d	I can talk about my problems with my friends							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

#### C57 Does your mother or your father know where you spend Saturday nights?

1 Know always 2 Know quite often з 🔲 Know sometimes 4 Usually don't know

ESPAD Ireland 2024 Student Questionnaire

24/31

ToC

CK

St



#### The next questions are about your participation in prevention activities.

Think about the LAST TWO YEARS. Do you recall having participated in the following activities?

C58	Awareness events/information activities about effects and	possible harms of:
-----	---	--------------------

	Mark one box for each line.	Never	Once	More than once
C58a	Alcohol			
C58b	Торассо			
C58c	Other drugs			
C58d	Gambling, Gaming or Internet disorders			
		1	2	3

C59 Training (i.e. interactive, not lessons) about better interaction and communication with others: expressing feelings, empathy, compliments, dealing with peer pressure (social skills training)

1	Ш	Never
2		Once
3		More than once

#### C60 Training (i.e. interactive, not lessons) about better dealing with yourself: controlling impulses, anger, setting goals and objectives, being mindful (personal skills training)

 1
 Image: Never

 2
 Image: Once

 3
 Image: More than once

C61 Training in how to analyse ads and media messages and to detect the intended messages in order to be less manipulated (media literacy)

1	Never
2	Once
3	More than once



ToC

 $\mathcal{Y}$ 



#### Who predominantly delivered these activities? **C62** Mark all that apply. I did not participate in any of the above activities in the past 2 years C62a 1 1 A teacher C62b C62c 1 Other school staff C62d 1 Law enforcement officers (gardaí) C62e 1 An external professional C62f 1 Ex-substance user C62g 1 Other

<b>C63</b>	Where Mark all	e did you predominantly participate in these activities? that apply.
C63a	1	I did not participate in any of the above activities in the past 2 years
C63b	1 🔲	In school
C63c	1	Out-of-school
C63d	1	In school after class hours





26/31



## The next questions are about yourself and what you think about others.

015

#### Which of the following best describes your average grade at the end of the last term?

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	G

#### O16 How satisfied are you usually with ...

	Mark one box for each line.	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither nor	Not so satisfied	Not at all satisfied	There is no such person
O16a	your relationship with your mother?						
O16b	your relationship with your father?						
016c	your relationship with your friends?						
		1	2	3	4	5	6

#### 017 What do you think your mother's reaction would be if you did the following things?

	Mark one box for each line.	She would not allow it	She would discourage it	She would not mind	She would approve it	Don't know
017a	Get drunk					
O17b	Smoke cigarettes					
017c	Use cannabis					
017d	Use e-cigarettes					
		1	2	3	4	5

#### **O18** What do you think your father's reaction would be if you did the following things?

			-			
	Mark one box for each line.	He would not allow it	He would discourage it	He would not mind	He would approve it	Don't know
018a	Get drunk					
018b	Smoke cigarettes					
018c	Use cannabis					
018d	Use e-cigarettes					
		1	2	3	4	5

30

<del>س</del>



019a	now many of your menus would you estimate					
	Mark one box for each line.	None	A few	Some	Most	All
O19aa	smoke cigarettes?					
O19ab	use e-cigarettes?					
O19ac	drink alcoholic beverages (beer, cider, premixed drinks, wine, spirits)?					
O19ad	get drunk?					
O19ae	smoke cannabis?					
O19af	take tranquillisers or sedatives (without a doctor's prescription)?					
O19ag	take ecstasy/MDMA?					
O19ah	use inhalants?					
O19ai	use energy drinks?					
		1	2	3	4	5

#### O19a How many of your friends would you estimate ...

#### O19b Do you think one or both of your parents have had any of these experiences?

	Mark one box for each line.	None	Only father	Only mother	Both	Don't know
O19ba	smoke cigarettes					
O19bb	use e-cigarettes					
O19bc	drink alcoholic beverages (beer, cider, premixed drinks, wine, spirits)					
O19bd	get drunk					
O19be	smoke cannabis					
O19bf	take tranquillisers or sedatives (without a doctor's prescription)					
O19bg	take tranquillisers or sedatives (with a doctor's prescription)					
O19bh	use other illicit substances					
O19bi	gamble for money					
		1	2	3	4	5



28/31

ТоС



## Now follow some more questions about Internet use and gaming.

<b>O26</b>	Please read the statements below regarding Internet use.							
	Please indicate how often these statements appl Mark one box for each line.	l <b>y to you</b> Never	• Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very often		
O26a	How often do you find it difficult to stop using the Internet when you are online?							
O26b	How often do you continue to use the Internet despite your intention to stop?							
O26c	How often do others (e.g. parents, friends) say you should use the Internet less?							
O26d	How often do you prefer to use the Internet instead of spending time with others (e.g. parents, friends)?							
O26e	How often are you short of sleep because of the Internet?							
O26f	How often do you think about the Internet, even when not online?							
O26g	How often do you look forward to your next Internet session?							
O26h	How often do you think you should use the Internet less often?							
O26i	How often have you unsuccessfully tried to spend less time on the Internet?							
O26j	How often do you rush through your (home) work in order to go on the Internet?							
O26k	How often do you neglect your daily obligations (work, school or family life) because you prefer to go on the Internet?							
O26l	How often do you go on the Internet when you are feeling down?							
026m	How often do you use the Internet to escape from your sorrows or get relief from negative feelings?							
O26n	How often do you feel restless, frustrated, or irritated when you cannot use the Internet?							
		1	2	3	4	5		





29/31



#### **O27** Please read the statements below regarding gaming.

	Thinking of the LAST 12 MONTHS, how strongly do you agree with the following statements?							
	Mark one box for each line.	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Partially Agre Partially disagr	ee Somewh ree agree	at Strongly agree		
O27a	I often play games more frequently and longer than I planned to or agreed upon with my parents							
O27b	I often cannot stop gaming even though it would be sensible to do so or for example my parents have told me to stop							
027c	I often do not pursue interests outside the digital world (e.g. meeting friends or partner in real life, attending sports clubs/societies, reading books, making music) because I prefer gaming							
O27d	I neglect daily duties (e.g. grocery shopping, cleaning, tidying up after myself, tidying my room, obligations for school/apprenticeship/job) because I prefer gaming							
O27e	I often continue gaming even though it causes me stress with others (e.g. my parents, siblings, friends, partner, teachers)							
027f	I continue gaming although it harms my performance at school (e.g. by being late, not participating in class, neglecting homework, worse grades)							
O27g	Due to gaming, I neglect my appearance, my personal hygiene, and/or my health (e.g. sleep, nutrition, exercise)							
027h	Due to gaming, I risk losing important relationships (friends, family, partner) or have lost them already							
027i	Due to gaming I have disadvantages at school (e.g. bad grades, warning/suspension)							
	How often did you experience such prob	1	2 Histo or di	3 fficultion due	4	5 Juring the		
	nast year?	Jenis, com	incls, of u	inculties due	e to gaming t	uning the		
	Mark one box.	Not at a	ll Only o	on single Fo lays p	or longer periods	Nearly daily		
027j	Did this only occur on single days, during longer periods of several days to weeks, or was it almost daily?							
		1		2	3	4		



30/31

ТоС



## The next questions are about PERFORMANCE ENHANCERS.

M01	Have you ever used in your life on your own initiative (without having been prescribed by a doctor) any stimulant substance with the purpose to improve your performance in your studies?					
	For instance, to keep you awake and studying during the whole night or to study faster. Don't include coffee, tea or cola refreshments, or energy drinks.					
	1 🔲 No					
	2 🔲 Yes					

# M02 If you have used such stimulant substances (without a doctor's prescription) with the aim of improving your performance in your studies, where did you obtain the substance/s? Mark all that apply.

		nu uppry.
a 1		Never used
b 1		Offered by a family member, a friend or an acquaintance
<mark>c 1</mark>		From a street dealer
d 1		Through the Internet
e 1		From a pharmacy without a medical prescription
	a 1 b 1 c 1 d 1 e 1	a 1 0 b 1 0 c 1 0 d 1 0

#### O28 On an average day, how often do you see posts on any Social Media platform [Instagram, TikTok, WhatsApp, X, Facebook, Snapchat etc] about e-cigarettes (vapes)?

	Mark one box for each line.	Never	Less than 5 times a day	5-10 times a day	10-20 times a day	More than 20 times a day
O28a	Posts with hashtags about e-cigarettes (e.g. #vapes)					
C28b	Posts with information about how to buy or get e-cigarettes					
C28c	Posts showing positive images of people using e-cigarettes					
C28d	Posts showing negative images of people using e-cigarettes					
C28e	Posts with e-cigarettes "challenges" (e.g. competitions)					
C28f	Posts about possible harm from e-cigarettes					
C28g	Posts promoting e-cigarettes as an alternative to smoking					





ESPAD Ireland 2024 Student Questionnaire



# **Research Team**

#### TobaccoFree Research Institute Ireland (TFRI), TU Dublin

Professor Joan Hanafin, Co-Principal Investigator, ESPAD Ireland. ORCID:0000-0002-8016-2266 Professor Luke Clancy, Co-Principal Investigator, ESPAD Ireland. ORCID:0000-0003-2407-2263 Salome Sunday, Research Fellow and IRC Doctoral Scholar. ORCID: 0000-0001-8396-788X Dr Helen Fitzmaurice, Post-Doctoral Research Fellow. ORCID: 0000-0002-7764-3392 Martin Wallace, Technology Consultant, Dovetail Technologies





# Acknowledgements

ESPAD Ireland Principal Investigators Professor Joan Hanafin and Professor Luke Clancy of the TobaccoFree Research Institute Ireland, TU Dublin acknowledge with immense gratitude the contributions of the following to ESPAD Ireland 2024.

The students, teachers, and school personnel who, despite huge inconvenience, generously participated in the study, and the parents who agreed that their children participate in the study. The outstanding input of the designated teachers was invaluable to the successful completion of the study.

The Department of Health for funding this national ESPAD Ireland study and to Claire Gordon, Éamonn Courtney and Yann Chalmers for their ongoing support.

The ESPAD Coordination team at the National Research Council, Pisa, Italy led by Dr. Sabrina Molinaro and Dr. Elisa Benedetti. The smoothness of the ESPAD centralised Data Collection was a tribute to the comprehensive training, liaison and support provided for Ireland-specific customisation of the centralised platform and student questionnaire, the coordinated supply of timely and functional access codes, and the ready availability of personal support from the ESPAD support and communications team: Dr. Daniela Gasperini, Dr. Stefania Pieroni, Dr. Marco Scalese Urciuoli, Dr. Giada Anastasi, and Dr. Sonia Cerrai.

Martin Wallace, Technology Consultant, Dovetail Technologies, for the expertise he brought to the assessment of the central platform, and coding and randomisation for sampling. His development of a bespoke survey-management App for ESPAD Ireland 2024 (TFRI-EISOP) made for ordered and efficient management of the fieldwork and survey administration.

Dr. Mary Gilbride and an t-Uas. Seán Ó Broin for invaluable advice on educational matters.

Our colleagues at TU Dublin for support, guidance and assistance, in particular: Dr. Brendan Jennings, Vice President, Research & Innovation; Dr. John Donovan, Head of Research; Frances Madden, Assistant Head of Library Services: Research Services; Aisling Coyne, Open Scholarship Librarian, TU Dublin Library Services; and the Research Ethics and Integrity Committee.

External reviewer Dr Paul Kavanagh, Honorary Senior Lecturer, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, School of Population Health, RCSI, Dublin for his helpful and insightful review of the report.

Internal reviewers at the Department of Health in the Tobacco & Alcohol Control Unit, Drugs Policy and Social Inclusion Unit, and Health & Wellbeing Unit for their helpful observations.

Dearbhla Gowen, Graphic Designer for her expert guidance and exceptional support in the formatting of this report.

The Board of the TobaccoFree Research Institute Ireland: Mr Terence E. Dixon, Ms Valerie Duncan, Professor Pat Goodman, Mr Kevin Halpenny, Mr Walter Young, Dr Blánaid Hayes, Dr Angie Brown, and Dr Muiris Houston.





TobaccoFree Research Institute Ireland (TFRI) TU Dublin, Ireland www.tri.ie

tfri.tobaccoresearch@tudublin.ie