

MARIA ŁUKASZEK

University of Rzeszów

ORCID – 0000-0001-8637-3171

AGNIESZKA WRÓBEL-CHMIEL

University of Rzeszów

ORCID – 0000-0001-8123-6215

RISKY BEHAVIOUR AFTER PSYCHOACTIVE SUBSTANCE USE*

Introduction: The use of psychoactive substances (PAS) is associated with engaging in risky behaviours that violate legal, moral, and social norms. Constructing effective preventive interventions must be based on up-to-date knowledge of the scale, scope, and determinants of risky behaviours undertaken under the influence of psychoactive substances.

Research Aim: The aim is to gain knowledge about the scale of risky behaviours undertaken under the influence of PAS during the 12 months preceding the study, and their determinants: sociodemographic factors and those related to the frequency of PAS use.

Research Method: The method was a diagnostic survey – an online questionnaire containing 33 questions or question blocks, including a pilot version of the author's tool: Substance Abuse Risk Behavior Inventory. A total of 1,265 adults were surveyed, and the analysis included data from 1,104 individuals who had used PAS in the past year.

Results: The most common risky behaviours under the influence of PAS in the last 12 months included: performing household chores (34%), casual sexual intercourse (12%), performing professional duties (11%), driving motor vehicles (10%), reckless behaviour (9%), brawling in public places (9%), and disturbing the peace and public order (9%). A key risk factor is male gender. The factors contributing to 6–9 of the analyzed behaviours include: age (up to 35 years of age) and drinking alcohol at least several times a month.

Conclusion: Dominant risky behaviours undertaken under the influence of PAS are: performing household and professional duties, casual sexual relations, driving motor vehicles, reckless behaviour, quarreling, and disrupting public order. These behaviours are most often undertaken by men, individuals up to 35 years of age, and those who drink alcohol at least several times a month.

* Suggested citation: Łukaszek, M., Wróbel-Chmiel, A. (2025). Risky Behaviour After Psychoactive Substance Use. *Lubelski Rocznik Pedagogiczny*, 44(3), 225–258. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17951/lrp.2025.44.3.225-258>

Keywords: risky behaviours, risky behaviour patterns, consequences of psychoactive substance use

INTRODUCTION

It has been repeatedly proven that engaging in one risky behaviour increases the likelihood of engaging in subsequent behaviours (Jessor, 1991). Thus, over time, this leads an individual to become entangled in a pattern of risky behaviours and to suffer the cumulative consequences in physical, psychological, and social domains (Ostaszewski, 2014).

Patterns of psychoactive substance (PAS) use are primarily analyzed in literature as determinants of addiction, with the risk of addiction increasing as the frequency and intensity of substance use rise. This is supported by Robinson and Berridge's theory of addiction development, which posits that addiction results from progressive, long-lasting neuroadaptive changes in the brain caused by repeated use of a psychoactive substance (Robinson & Berridge, 1993; Zwierzyńska & Pietrzak, 2014).

Patterns of psychoactive substance use are also linked to engaging in various risky behaviours. In this relationship, it is no longer the case that low frequency and intensity of intoxication eliminate the risk of such behaviour. Indeed, it happens that even occasional intoxication leads to highly risky actions.

The new International Classification of Diseases ICD-11 distinguishes three diagnoses related to psychoactive substance use: an episode of harmful substance use, a harmful pattern of substance use, and substance addiction. It also introduces an additional category of risky substance use, according to which it is not treated as a disorder, but as a risk factor for developing addiction (Modrzyński, 2022; WHO, 2024). First, this classification is adequate to the new patterns of substance use in communities (e.g. the popularity of weekend intoxication). Second, it acknowledges that even occasional use of intoxicating substances carries serious risks. It is important to emphasize that this includes not only addiction to substances and its negative effects on physical and mental also various risky behaviours, including aggression, especially physical and sexual aggression, reckless behaviours such as driving vehicles under the influence, risky sexual behaviours or suicidal behaviours.

So far many mechanisms have been described to explain the readiness to engage in various risky behaviours after using psychoactive substances. In a state of intoxication cognitive processes are disrupted, and attention becomes focused on the most prominent stimuli. The intoxicated focus mainly concentrates on positive aspects, neglecting situational threats (cf. "alcohol myopia") (MacDonald et al., 2000; Prause et al., 2011; Staples et al., 2015; Steele & Josephs, 1990). This willingness to take risks can partly be explained by the theory of disinhibi-



tion, which points to a decrease in self-control and a weakening of the tendency to respect social norms when intoxicated (Room & Collins, 1983). Additionally, there is a reduced cognitive reserve, leading to difficulties in making decisions that require complex analysis of potential gains and losses (Abbey et al., 2005). There are also problems with adequate risk assessment, as well as an increased tendency to break through persona barriers, especially sexual ones (Ariely & Loewenstein, 2006; Bruno et al., 2012; Davis et al., 2007) and a greater propensity to for sexual aggression (Abbey et al., 2014; Abbey & Wegner, 2015; Davis et al., 2014; Michalska-Warias & Wolters Kluwer Polska, 2016; Mozgawa & Kozłowska-Kalisz, 2012).

Available data on the problem of psychoactive substance abuse among Poles suggest that the rates of risky behaviours undertaken while intoxicated may also be high. Research shows that 14.2% of Poles – 22.3% of men and 6.8% of women – consume alcohol in a risky manner (Rowicka et al., 2021). Almost 6% of the adult population has used a drug at least once in their lifetime: most often cannabis products, club drugs such as ecstasy, synthetic drugs, hallucinogens, inhalants, and cocaine. Harmful use or addiction to substances other than alcohol affects 1.2% (Moskalewicz & Wciórka, 2021). A significant issue is the simultaneous use of multiple substances; for example, 80% of individuals using drugs also drink alcohol (Malczewski et al., 2020).

Nationwide surveys conducted in 2020 revealed that over the last 12 months before the surveys, 16% of respondents experienced frustration from being involuntarily witnesses to others vomiting, urinating or littering due to being intoxicated with psychoactive substances. Additionally, 10.6% were involved in arguments with an intoxicated person, 8.2% were woken up at night by intoxicated individuals, 7.6% were insulted or verbally attacked by intoxicated persons, 5.7% were involved in a traffic accident caused by an intoxicated person, 1.8% reported a violation of their personal integrity by an intoxicated person, 0.9% traveled in a car driven by an intoxicated driver, 0.4% found themselves in a public place feeling threatened by intoxicated individuals (Postek, 2021).

Polish statistics convincingly show that intoxication is a key determinant of criminal activity. Based on an analysis of available police data regarding intoxicated perpetrators' from 1999–2012, it can be concluded that, on average, among suspects of murder, 76.5% were intoxicated, 57.4% of those suspected of causing bodily harm, 68.8% of suspects in brawls or assaults, 67.3% in cases of rape, 27.3% in theft, 43.2% in burglary, and 60.1% in robbery and extortion (Policja Statystyka, 2025a).

Intoxication with psychoactive substances concerned nearly half of the perpetrators of domestic in 2023–2024. In 2023, 48.0% of perpetrators were intoxicated with alcohol, 0.6% with other psychoactive substances, and 0.2% with both alcohol and other substances. In 2024, these figures were 42.5%, 3.3%, and 0.5%, respectively (Policja Statystyka, 2025c). Intoxicated aggressors usually attack intimate

partners. For example, heavy drinking and cocaine use translated into psychological violence (83%), physical violence (61%), and episodes of injury to a partner (47%) (Serafin et al., 2012).

Between 2014 and 2023, an average of 57,920 crimes of driving under the influence of psychoactive substances were documented annually (Policja Statystyka, 2025b). A meta-analysis of studies conducted in 25 countries indicates that problematic substance use also increases the risk of suicide almost six times (with alcohol 65 times, opioids 5.5 times, and cannabis more than 3 times (Athey et al., 2025). According to Polish police statistics, in 2024, among people with a confirmed intoxication who committed suicide, 54% were intoxicated with alcohol, 10% with medications, and 2% with drugs (Policja Statystyka, 2025d).

Studies indicate that risky behaviours under the influence of psychoactive substances occur not only in the real world but also in the virtual space. Many people, especially young ones, engage in risky activities online that they later regret, such as posting on social media, making random calls, or sending unthoughtful messages and photos (Perez et al., 2021). Research shows that 60.2% of people regretted at least one social media post they made under the influence of alcohol, and 40.5% had such an experience within the past 2 months (González-Ponce et al., 2023). Other studies have shown that among participants at music events who were intoxicated with PAS, 34.3% posted messages on social media, 55.9% sent SMS messages or made calls, and 47.6% sent photos. Notably, 21.4–32.7% deeply regretted their decisions afterward (Palamar & Acosta, 2020).

Sometimes, online posts under the influence of PAS take the form of “patostreams”, where individuals post videos or live streams, often via platforms like Snapchat, YouTube, TikTok, or Instagram, that glorify violence and aim to gain approval for its use (Bek & Popiołek, 2019; Kmieciak-Goławska, 2009). Research has confirmed that risky behaviours presented online, such as drug use and alcohol abuse, correlate with the repetition of these behaviours by viewers of online content, especially adolescents (Branley & Covey, 2017; Purba et al., 2023).

Engaging in risky behaviours after using PAS is often associated with transgressing various social norms. These behaviours have negative consequences not only for the individual but also for society. For the accurate design and effective implementation of social prevention interventions, up-to-date knowledge about the scale, scope, and determinants of risky behaviours undertaken under the influence of PAS is crucial. Previous studies have mainly focused on the relationships between PAS use and risky behaviours over a lifetime, without considering whether the event occurred in a state of intoxication or not.

RESEARCH AIM AND QUESTION

The presented results come from a pilot study titled “Risky Behaviours Associated with the Abuse of Psychoactive Substances”, conducted in May 2025. A total of 1,265 people over the age of 18 were surveyed. Among them, 1,104 individuals had used PAS in the past year. The aim of the research presented in this article was to determine the scale and determinants of engaging in risky behaviours under the influence of PAS in the past 12 months. To achieve this, the following research questions were formulated:

1. What is the scale of risky behaviours undertaken by respondents under the influence of PAS in the past 12 months?
2. What is the relationship between sociodemographic factors and the frequency of PAS use, and the engagement in risky behaviours under the influence of these substances in the past 12 months?

RESEARCH METHOD AND SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

The research method used was diagnostic surveying. The tool employed was a questionnaire consisting of 33 questions or blocks of questions, including measurement scales. The data collection took place in May 2025 online, with the survey distributed to respondents via a Microsoft Forms link, using a snowball sampling method. The recruitment team consisted of 50 students of resocialisation pedagogy. These individuals were trained in the recruitment procedure and ethical principles of conducting social research. The team then sent the survey link to people they knew, asking them to complete the questionnaire and share it with other adults. The team members themselves did not complete the questionnaires. To ensure the feeling of safety, the survey was completely anonymous, and no IP addresses or email addresses were collected.

For the analyses presented in this article, responses from 1,104 individuals over the age of 18 who had used PAS in the past year were included. Of these respondents, 64.9% were women, and 35.1% were men. Among the respondents, 52.3% were aged 18–25, 28.9% were aged 26–35, 11.6% were aged 36–45, and 7.2% were aged 46 or older. Nearly 60% of the respondents lived in cities (13% in cities with fewer than 20,000 residents, 14.9% in cities with 20,000–99,000 residents, 15.9% in cities with 100,000–199,000 residents, and 15.9% in cities with over 200,000 residents).

According to the respondents’ declarations, 91.6% are currently in a stable relationship: 35.4% are married, and 56.2% are in a stable partnership. The vast majority of respondents (about 80%) reported having at least one child.

Among the respondents, 55.6% declared having a secondary education, 36% higher education, and the remaining 8.4% either vocational or lower education. Of the respondents, 64.5% are currently employed, and an additional 11.9% are not employed

but have worked in the past 12 months. The majority of respondents (nearly 87%) stated that they are satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their current employment.

In terms of declared family income, 20.1% of respondents reported earnings below PLN 2,000 per month, 42.5% earned between PLN 2,000–4,000, 24.8% earned between PLN 4,000–6,000, and 12.6% earned more than PLN 6,000. The vast majority of respondents stated that their income allows them to save or invest (77.2%).

The procedure of the project fully adhered to the ethical principles of social research, as outlined in the Helsinki Declaration, the Code of Ethics for Research Staff (Polska Akademia Nauk, 2020), the Code of Ethics of the Polish Psychological Association (2018), and the Code of Ethics of the Polish Sociological Association (2012). Respondents were guaranteed voluntary, anonymous, and informed participation in the study. In case of need for support, a helpline number from the Institute of Health Psychology of the Polish Psychological Association was provided at the end of the questionnaire.

The data presented in this article were based on responses collected using the pilot version of the proprietary Risky Behaviour Inventory related to psychoactive substance abuse – the Substance Abuse Risk Behaviour Inventory (SARB), which contains 19 descriptions of behaviours with frequency labels: never, once, or twice or more (which, due to the distribution of results, were combined into two categories: never, at least once). The inventory also included questions about gender, age, functioning in a stable intimate relationship (marital or partnership), frequency of alcohol consumption and intoxication, and frequency of using other psychoactive substances.

The inspiration for the development of the inventory was the new ICD-11 classification (WHO, 2024), which includes the category of risky use of psychoactive substances, potentially contributing to addiction development as well as risky behaviours. The initial list of behaviours was developed based on the analysis of the scale of substance abuse in Poland (Malczewski et al., 2020; Malczewski & Jabłoński, 2023; Moskalewicz & Wciórka, 2021; Rowicka et al., 2021), statistics on the behaviours of Poles after using psychoactive substances (Kmieciak-Goławska, 2009; Policja Statystyka, 2025a, 2025b, 2025c, 2025d; Postek, 2021; Serafin et al., 2012), and a review of existing tools for measuring various risky behaviours (Fino et al., 2021; Neal et al., 2006; O'Hare, 2001; Read et al., 2006; Sadeh & Baskin-Sommers, 2017). The list was analyzed, supplemented, and reduced by the authors after consultations with three groups of experts: staff from the Department of Social Prevention and Resocialisation and two groups of students of resocialisation pedagogy. The experts consulted the tool regarding the completeness of categories, content, and language accuracy.

The state of intoxication was defined in the survey as the condition after alcohol use, during which coordination disturbances (such as staggering or falling), speech disturbances (slurred speech), decreased intellectual ability (logical rea-

soning errors, lack of criticism), inappropriate emotional reactions, significantly reduced self-control, and increased drowsiness may occur.

STATISTICAL DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Differences between groups were tested using the Chi-square test. The choice of the test was based on the measurement scale level (dichotomous nominal scale) and the type of variables (categorical variables). Due to text length limitations, only percentage data with the sample sizes of the analyzed subgroups are presented in the column headers. All calculations were performed using SPSS 20.

RESULTS

During the study, it was found that out of 1,265 people over the age of 18, 1,104 respondents, or 87.3%, had used psychoactive substances in the 12 months prior to the study. All 1,104 participants reported consuming alcoholic beverages, while 276 respondents (25%) used other psychoactive substances. The analyzed behaviours are presented in the table grouped by thematic relevance.

Table 1.

Undertaking behaviours (in the 12 months prior to the study) under the influence of psychoactive substances and respondents' gender (results in %)*

Risky behaviours undertaken while intoxicated by PAS			Women (N = 717)	Men (N = 387)	Total (N = 1,104)	Chi ²	p
			%	%	%		
Neglect of the obligations arising from social roles	Performing household duties	Never	70.3	59.4	66.5	13.510	0.000
		At least once	29.7	40.6	33.5		
	Performing professional duties	Never	92.4	83.5	89.3	21.201	0.000
		At least once	7.6	16.5	10.7		

Neglect of care for dependent persons	Caring for children under 13 years of age	Never	95.3	93.5	94.7	1.466	0.226
		At least once	4.7	6.5	5.3		
	Caring for people aged 60 or over or people with disabilities	Never	97.2	94.3	96.2	5.734	0.017
		At least once	2.8	5.7	3.8		
Promiscuity	Having a “casual” sexual encounter	Never	90.6	82.2	87.7	16,607	0.000
		At least once	9.4	17.8	12.3		
	Establishing a “casual” sexual relationship on the Internet	Never	93.6	88.1	91.7	9.717	0.002
		At least once	6.4	11.9	8.3		
Brawling behaviours	Brawling at home	Never	90.2	86.6	89.0	3.339	0.068
		At least once	9.8	13.4	11.0		
	Public brawling	Never	94.1	86.6	91.5	18.347	0.000
		At least once	5.9	13.4	8.5		
		total	100.0	100.0	100.0		
Reckless behaviours	Destroying another person’s property	Never	97.6	93.8	96.3	10.104	0.001
		At least once	2.4	6.2	3.7		
	“Courageous” behaviour (showing off the courage to take risky behaviour)	Never	93.9	84.5	90.6	25.609	0.000
		At least once	6.1	15.5	9.4		
	Disturbing the peace of others/ social order	Never	93.3	86.6	90.9	13.487	0.000
		At least once	6.7	13.4	9.1		
	Self-harming	Never	95.9	95.4	95.7	0.206	0.650
		At least once	4.1	4.6	4.3		
	Driving a vehicle	Never	93.6	83.8	90.1	27.058	0.000
		At least once	6.4	16.2	9.9		



Aggression towards the environment	Exposing oneself / being naked in inappropriate circumstances	Never	97.8	93.1	96.1	14.772	0.000
		At least once	2.2	6.9	3.9		
	Deliberately hitting another person	Never	96.8	93.3	95.6	7.193	0.007
		At least once	3.2	6.7	4.4		
	Patostreaming	Never	98.3	95.8	97.4	6.111	0.013
		At least once	1.7	4.2	2.6		
	Forcing another person into sexual activity	Never	98.2	95.4	97.2	7.261	0.007
		At least once	1.8	4.6	2.8		
	Stealing someone else's property	Never	97.9	93.8	96.5	12.158	0.000
		At least once	2.1	6.2	3.5		
	Starting a fight	Never	97.5	88.9	94.5	35.323	0.000
		At least once	2.5	11.1	5.5		

*results are presented only as percentages due to table length limitations

Source: Authors' own study.

The study revealed that, among the 19 risky behaviours engaged in under the influence of psychoactive substances, the most frequently reported were: performing household duties (33.5%), engaging in "casual" sexual encounters (12.3%), performing professional duties (10.7%), driving motor vehicles (9.9%), engaging in "courageous" behaviours (9.4%), arguing in public places (8.5%), and disturbing the peace and public order (9.1%).

It was shown that all 19 risky behaviours analyzed, which respondents declared engaging in under the influence of psychoactive substances, were more frequently undertaken by men than women. It was found that men (11.1%) were four times more likely than women (2.5%) to initiate fights while under the influence of intoxicating substances. Men were three times more likely than women to commit bold thefts (6.2% vs. 2.1%) and expose themselves in inappropriate circumstances (6.9% vs. 2.2%). Men were also two and a half times more likely than women to drive motor vehicles while intoxicated (16.2% vs. 6.4%), engage in "courageous" behaviours, such as climbing dangerous places or jumping from heights (15.5% vs. 6.1%), argue in public places, such as at work or on the street (13.4% vs. 5.9%), destroy others' property (6.2% vs. 2.4%), force others into sexual activity (4.6% vs. 1.8%), and engage in "patostreaming" (4.2% vs. 1.7%). While intoxicated with psychoactive substances, men were also twice as likely as women to have "casual"

sex (17.8% vs. 9.4%), perform their professional duties (16.5% vs. 7.6%), disturb public peace and order (13.4% vs. 6.7%), establish “casual” sexual relationships online (11.9% vs. 6.4%), beat someone (6.7% vs. 3.2%), and care for people with disabilities or the elderly (5.7% vs. 2.8%).

Table 2.
Undertaking risky behaviours (within 12 months prior to the study) while intoxicated with psychoactive substances and the age of respondents (results in %)*

Risky behaviours undertaken while intoxicated with PAS			18–25 years old (N = 576)	26–35 years old (N = 319)	36 and over (N = 209)	Total (N = 1,104)	Chi ²	p
			%	%	%	%		
Neglect of the obligations arising from social roles	Performing house- hold duties	Never	63.9	64.6	76.8	66.5	12.181	0.002
		At least once	36.1	35.4	23.2	33.5		
	Performing profes- sional duties	Never	87.4	89.7	93.8	89.3	6.523	0.038
		At least once	12.6	10.3	6.2	10.7		
Neglect of care for dependent persons	Caring for chil- dren under 13 years of age	Never	95.3	94.4	93.3	94.7	2.269	0.519
		At least once	4.7	5.6	6.7	5.3		
	Caring for people aged 60 or over or people with disabilities	Never	96.9	94.4	97.1	96.2	2.940	0.401
		At least once	3.1	5.6	2.9	3.8		
Promiscuity	Having a “casual” sexual encounter	Never	86.8	86.2	92.3	87.7	4.682	0.197
		At least once	13.2	13.8	7.7	12.3		
	Establishing a “casual” sexual relationship on the Internet	Never	90.6	90.3	96.6	91.7	8.315	0.016
		At least once	9.4	9.7	3.4	8.3		

Brawling behaviours	Brawling at home	Never	88.2	89.7	90.0	89.0	0.605	0.895
		At least once	11.8	10.3	10.0	11.0		
	Public brawling	Never	88.9	93.8	95.2	91.5	11.021	0.004
		At least once	11.1	6.2	4.8	8.5		
Reckless behaviour	Destroying another person's property	Never	95.8	95.3	99.0	96.3	6.142	0.105
		At least once	4.2	4.7	1.0	3.7		
	"Courageous" behaviour (showing off the courage to take risky behaviour)	Never	87.8	90.9	97.6	90.6	17.255	0.000
		At least once	12.2	9.1	2.4	9.4		
	Disturbing the peace of others/ social order	Never	87.5	93.1	97.1	90.9	19.880	0.000
		At least once	12.5	6.9	2.9	9.1		
	Self-harming	Never	94.6	95.9	98.6	95.7	6.142	0.105
		At least once	5.4	4.1	1.4	4.3		
	Driving a vehicle	Never	88.9	90.3	93.3	90.1	3.421	0.299
		At least once	11.1	9.7	6.7	9.9		

Aggression towards the environment	Exposing oneself / being naked in inappropriate circumstances	Never	95.1	97.2	97.1	96.1	3.629	0.304
		At least once	4.9	2.8	2.9	3.9		
	Deliberately hitting another person	Never	94.6	96.2	97.1	95.6	4.381	0.223
		At least once	5.4	3.8	2.9	4.4		
	Patostreaming	Never	97.4	96.8	98.6	97.4	2.925	0.403
		At least once	2.6	3.2	1.4	2.6		
	Forcing another person into sexual activity	Never	96.9	96.9	98.6	97.2	3.440	0.329
		At least once	3.1	3.1	1.4	2.8		
	Stealing someone else's property	Never	96.4	96.2	97.1	96.5	2.145	0.543
		At least once	3.6	3.8	2.9	3.5		
	Starting a fight	Never	93.9	94.0	96.7	94.5	2.651	0.449
		At least once	6.1	6.0	3.3	5.5		

*results are presented only as percentages due to table length limitations

Source: Authors' own study.

The analysis showed that the age of the respondents statistically differentiated 6 out of the 19 risky behaviours under the influence of psychoactive substances, primarily reckless behaviours. It was found that respondents aged 18–25 (12.5%) were twice as likely as those aged 26–35 (6.9%) and four times more likely than those aged 36 and older (2.9%) to disturb others' peace, for example, by persistently calling someone at night, ringing a doorbell, or knocking on someone else's door. It was shown that the younger the age, the higher the percentage of people (in the age groups: 12.2%, 9.1%, 2.4%) who, while intoxicated, climbed dangerous places, jumped from heights, crossed railway tracks or roads in prohibited places, or jumped into water in inappropriate conditions, such as without swimming skills.

It was established that people aged 18–35 were much more likely than older individuals to perform household or professional duties, argue in public places, and establish "casual sexual relationships on the Internet" while intoxicated.

Table 3.

Undertaking risky behaviours (within 12 months before the study) while intoxicated with psychoactive substances and respondents' intimate relationship status (results in %)*

Risky behaviours undertaken while intoxicated with PAS			Yes (N = 709) %	No (N = 395) %	Total (N = 1,104) %	Chi ²	p
Neglect of the obligations arising from social roles	Performing household chores	Never	66.4	66.8	66.5	0.160	0.689
		At least once	33.6	33.2	33.5		
	Performing professional duties	Never	89.7	88.5	89.3	1.306	0.253
		At least once	10.3	11.5	10.7		
Neglect of care for dependent persons	Caring for children under 13 years of age	Never	95.1	93.9	94.7	0.078	0.780
		At least once	4.9	6.1	5.3		
	Caring for people aged 60 or over or people with disabilities	Never	96.5	95.7	96.2	0.447	0.501
		At least once	3.5	4.3	3.8		
Promiscuity	Having a "casual" sexual encounter	Never	88.2	86.8	87.7	0.092	0.761
		At least once	11.8	13.2	12.3		
	Establishing a "casual" sexual relationship on the Internet	Never	92.1	90.9	91.7	0.518	0.369
		At least once	7.9	9.1	8.3		
Brawling behaviours	Brawling at home	Never	89.0	88.9	89.0	0.067	0.796
		At least once	11.0	11.1	11.0		
	Public brawling	Never	91.7	91.1	91.5	0.429	0.513
		At least once	8.3	8.9	8.5		

Reckless behaviour	Destroying another person's property	Never	96.6	95.7	96.3	0.639	0.424
		At least once	3.4	4.3	3.7		
	"Courageous" behaviour (showing off the courage to take risky behaviour)	Never	90.4	90.8	90.6	0.048	0.833
		At least once	9.6	9.2	9.4		
	Disturbing the peace of others/ social order	Never	91.7	89.6	90.9	2.628	0.105
		At least once	8.3	10.4	9.1		
	Self-harming	Never	96.3	94.7	95.7	1.019	0.313
		At least once	3.7	5.3	4.3		
	Driving a vehicle	Never	90.7	89.1	90.1	0.215	0.643
		At least once	9.3	10.9	9.9		
Aggression towards the environment	Exposing oneself / being naked in inappropriate circumstances	Never	96.3	95.7	96.1	0.564	0.453
		At least once	3.7	4.3	3.9		
	Deliberately hitting another person	Never	96.5	93.9	95.6	3.926	0.048
		At least once	3.5	6.1	4.4		
	Patostreaming	Never	97.3	97.7	97.4	0.001	0.970
		At least once	2.7	2.3	2.6		
	Forcing another person into sexual activity	Never	97.7	96.2	97.2	0.976	0.323
		At least once	2.3	3.8	2.8		
	Stealing someone else's property	Never	96.6	96.2	96.5	0.039	0.844
		At least once	3.4	3.8	3.5		
	Starting a fight	Never	94.6	94.2	94.5	0.125	0.724
		At least once	5.4	5.8	5.5		

*results are presented only as percentages due to table length limitations

Source: Authors' own study.

The results demonstrate that being in a relationship differentiates only one risky behaviour undertaken under the influence of psychoactive substances – deliberately hitting another person. Respondents in a committed intimate relationship (3.5%) reported this behaviour in the past 12 months at half the rate of singles (6.1%).

Table 4.

Undertaking risky behaviours while intoxicated with psychoactive substances and the frequency of alcohol consumption by respondents in the past 12 months (results in %)*

Risky behaviours undertaken while intoxicated with PAS			At least a few times a week (N = 172)	Several times a month (N = 476)	Several times a year (N = 456)	Total (N = 1,104)	Chi ²	p
			%	%	%	%		
Neglect of the obligations arising from social roles	Performing household chores	Never	63.4	65.1	69.5	66.5	3.016	0.221
		At least once	36.6	34.9	30.5	33.5		
	Performing professional duties	Never	89.0	89.3	89.4	89.3	0.015	0.992
		At least once	11.0	10.7	10.6	10.7		
Neglect of care for dependent persons	Caring for children under 13 years of age	Never	93.0	93.1	96.9	94.7	7.942	0.019
		At least once	7.0	6.9	3.1	5.3		
	Caring for people aged 60 or over or people with disabilities	Never	92.4	95.2	98.7	96.2	15.713	0.000
		At least once	7.6	4.8	1.3	3.8		
Promiscuity	Having a “casual” sexual encounter	Never	87.8	86.8	88.6	87.7	0.726	0.696
		At least once	12.2	13.2	11.4	12.3		
	Establishing a “casual” sexual relationship on the Internet	Never	90.1	91.6	93.0	91.7	1,516	0.469
		At least once	9.9	8.4	7.0	8.3		

Brawling behaviours	Brawling at home	Never	89.5	90.8	87.3	89.0	2.938	0.230
		At least once	10.5	9.2	12.7	11.0		
	Public brawling	Never	90.7	92.0	91.4	91.5	0.302	0.860
		At least once	9.3	8.0	8.6	8.5		
Reckless behaviour	Destroying another person's property	Never	92.4	96.0	98.0	96.3	11.073	0.004
		At least once	7.6	4.0	2.0	3.7		
	"Courageous" behaviour (showing off the courage to take risky behaviour)	Never	88.4	92.4	89.5	90.6	3.560	0.169
		At least once	11.6	7.6	10.5	9.4		
	Disturbing the peace of others/ social order	Never	87.8	88.4	94.7	90.9	13.647	0.001
		At least once	12.2	11.6	5.3	9.1		
	Self-harming	Never	93.6	94.5	97.8	95.7	8.392	0.015
		At least once	6.4	5.5	2.2	4.3		
	Driving a vehicle	Never	89.0	92.0	88.6	90.1	3.377	0.185
		At least once	11.0	8.0	11.4	9.9		



Aggression towards the environment	Exposing oneself / being naked in inappropriate circumstances	Never	93.6	94.3	98.7	96.1	14.643	0.001
		At least once	6.4	5.7	1.3	3.9		
	Deliberately hitting another person	Never	93.6	94.3	97.4	95.6	6.621	0.036
		At least once	6.4	5.7	2.6	4.4		
	Patostreaming	Never	94.2	96.4	99.3	97.4	14.869	0.001
		At least once	5.8	3.6	0.7	2.6		
	Forcing another person into sexual activity	Never	95.3	96.6	98.2	97.2	1.698	0.428
		At least once	4.7	3.4	1.8	2.8		
	Stealing someone else's property	Never	94.2	94.5	99.3	96.5	18.834	0.000
		At least once	5.8	5.5	0.7	3.5		
	Starting a fight	Never	92.4	93.9	95.8	94.5	3.267	0.195
		At least once	7.6	6.1	4.2	5.5		

*results are presented only as percentages due to table length limitations

Source: Authors' own study.

The study results indicate that the higher the frequency of alcohol consumption, the higher the percentage of individuals who, while intoxicated, provided care for children, elderly people, or those with disabilities, putting them at risk, engaged in reckless behaviours, or were aggressive toward their surroundings. Individuals who drink at least a few times a week, at twice the rate (7.6%) compared to the overall average (3.8%), took care of elderly or disabled people while intoxicated. Those who drank a few times a month or more, at twice the rate compared to those who drank a few times a year (7% vs. 3.1%), cared for children while under the influence of psychoactive substances.

Respondents who reported drinking alcohol at least a few times a month, at an eightfold higher rate than those who drank a few times a year (5.6% vs. 0.7%), committed theft of others' property. Additionally, at three times the rate, they engaged in self-harm (6% vs. 2.2%) and destroyed others' property (5.8% vs. 2%). They also disturbed the peace of others (11.9% vs. 5.3%) and deliberately hit someone (6.1% vs. 2.6%) at twice the rate.



As for “patostreaming” while intoxicated by alcohol or other psychoactive substances, it was found that individuals who drank at least a few times a week did so 1.5 times more frequently in the past year (5.8%) compared to those who drank a few times a month (3.6%) and eight times more frequently than those who drank a few times a year (0.7%).

Table 5.

Undertaking risky behaviours while intoxicated and the frequency of binge drinking by respondents in the past 12 months (results in %)*

Risky behaviours undertaken while intoxicated			Never (N = 464)	Once (N = 204)	2–3 times (N = 243)	4 times or more (N = 175)	Total (N = 1,086)**	Chi ² / p
			%	%	%	%	%	
Neglect of the obligations arising from social roles	Performing household duties	Never	66.4	68.6	64.6	69.7	66.9	1.427 / 0.490
		At least once	33.6	31.4	35.4	30.3	33.1	
	Performing professional duties	Never	89.4	88.7	90.1	87.4	89.1	0.759 / 0.684
		At least once	10.6	11.3	9.9	12.6	10.9	
Neglect of care for dependent persons	Caring for children under 13 years of age	Never	95.0	93.6	95.1	93.7	94.6	0.529 / 0.768
		At least once	5.0	6.4	4.9	6.3	5.4	
	Caring for people aged 60 or over or people with disabilities	Never	97.8	94.6	95.5	94.3	96.1	0.332 / 0.847
		At least once	2.2	5.4	4.5	5.7	3.9	
Promiscuity	Having a “casual” sexual encounter	Never	86.4	89.2	87.7	88.0	87.5	0.277 / 0.871
		At least once	13.6	10.8	12.3	12.0	12.5	
	Establishing a “casual” sexual relationship on the Internet	Never	91.8	91.7	91.4	92.6	91.8	0.206 / 0.902
		At least once	8.2	8.3	8.6	7.4	8.2	

Brawling behaviours	Brawling at home	Never	88.8	89.7	87.7	91.4	89.1	1.560 / 0.458
		At least once	11.2	10.3	12.3	8.6	10.9	
	Public brawling	Never	91.6	91.2	88.9	95.4	91.5	5.617 / 0.060
		At least once	8.4	8.8	11.1	4.6	8.5	
Reckless behaviour	Deliberately hitting another person	Never	96.1	93.6	94.7	96.6	95.4	2.217 / 0.330
		At least once	3.9	6.4	5.3	3.4	4.6	
	Destroying another person's property	Never	96.1	98.0	95.5	96.0	96.3	2.293 / 0.318
		at least once	3.9	2.0	4.5	4.0	3.7	
	“Courageous” behaviour (showing off the courage to take risky behaviour)	Never	90.9	93.1	88.5	89.1	90.5	3.026 / 0.220
		At least once	9.1	6.9	11.5	10.9	9.5	
	Disturbing the peace of others/social order	Never	92.0	90.2	88.9	91.4	90.9	0.740 / 0.691
		At least once	8.0	9.8	11.1	8.6	9.1	
	Self-harming	Never	95.5	97.1	94.7	96.0	95.7	3.552 / 0.169
		At least once	4.5	2.9	5.3	4.0	4.3	
	Driving a vehicle	Never	89.4	92.6	90.1	88.6	90.1	1.893 / 0.388
		At least once	10.6	7.4	9.9	11.4	9.9	

Aggression towards the environment	Exposing oneself / being naked in inappropriate circumstances	Never	95.9	96.6	95.5	96.0	95.9	0.345 / 0.841
		At least once	4.1	3.4	4.5	4.0	4.1	
	Patostreaming	Never	97.6	96.6	96.3	98.3	97.2	0.703 / 0.704
		At least once	2.4	3.4	3.7	1.7	2.8	
	Forcing another person into sexual activity	Never	97.6	96.6	95.9	97.7	97.1	1.047 / 0.593
		At least once	2.4	3.4	4.1	2.3	2.9	
	Stealing someone else's property	Never	97.4	96.1	95.1	96.6	96.5	0.656 / 0.720
		At least once	2.6	3.9	4.9	3.4	3.5	
	Starting a fight	Never	95.0	94.6	92.2	95.4	94.4	2.143 / 0.343
		At least once	5.0	5.4	7.8	4.6	5.6	

*results are presented only as percentages due to table length limitations

**N=sample size reduced by 18 individuals due to missing responses to the question

Source: Authors' own study.

During the analysis, no correlation was found between the frequency of binge drinking and engaging in risky behaviours while intoxicated with psychoactive substances (Table 5).

Table 6.

Undertaking risky behaviours while intoxicated with psychoactive substances (other than alcohol) and the frequency of psychoactive substance use by respondents in the past 12 months (results in %)*

Risky behaviours undertaken while intoxicated with PAS			Once (N = 77)	2–3 times (N = 101)	4 times or more (N = 98)	Total (N = 276)	Chi ²	p
			%	%	%	%		
Neglect of the obligations arising from social roles	Performing household chores	Never	74.0	75.2	64.3	71.0	3.374	0.185
		At least once	26.0	24.8	35.7	29.0		
	Performing professional duties	Never	88.3	90.1	83.7	87.3	1.950	0.377
		At least once	11.7	9.9	16.3	12.7		
Neglect of care for dependent persons	Caring for children under 13 years of age	Never	97.4	94.1	91.8	94.2	2.452	0.293
		At least once	2.6	5.9	8.2	5.8		
	Caring for people aged 60 or over or people with disabilities	Never	96.1	95.0	93.9	94.9	0.449	0.799
		At least once	3.9	5.0	6.1	5.1		
Promiscuity	Having a “casual” sexual intercourse	Never	90.9	87.1	86.7	88.0	0.840	0.657
		At least once	9.1	12.9	13.3	12.0		
	Establishing a “casual” sexual relationship on the Internet	Never	93.5	89.1	90.8	90.9	1.029	0.598
		At least once	6.5	10.9	9.2	9.1		
Brawling behaviours	Brawling at home	Never	92.2	85.1	89.8	88.8	2.345	0.310
		At least once	7.8	14.9	10.2	11.2		
	Public brawling	Never	92.2	91.1	87.8	90.2	1.106	0.575
		At least once	7.8	8.9	12.2	9.8		

Reckless behaviour	Destroying another person's property	Never	97.4	93.1	93.9	94.6	1.736	0.420
		At least once	2.6	6.9	6.1	5.4		
	"Courageous" behaviour (showing off the courage to take risky behaviour)	Never	92.2	89.1	86.7	89.1	1.333	0.513
		at least once	7.8	10.9	13.3	10.9		
	Disturbing the peace of others/social order	Never	92.2	87.1	88.8	89.1	1.183	0.553
		At least once	7.8	12.9	11.2	10.9		
	Self-harming	Never	98.7	88.1	86.7	90.6	8.367	0.015
		At least once	1.3	11.9	13.3	9.4		
	Driving a vehicle	Never	89.6	89.1	85.7	88.0	0.794	0.672
		At least once	10.4	10.9	14.3	12.0		
Aggression towards the environment	Exposing oneself / being naked in inappropriate circumstances	Never	97.4	94.1	92.9	94.6	1.813	0.404
		At least once	2.6	5.9	7.1	5.4		
	Deliberately hitting another person	Never	98.7	88.1	92.9	92.8	7.282	0.026
		at least once	1.3	11.9	7.1	7.2		
	Patostreaming	Never	96.1	96.0	91.8	94.6	2,201	0.333
		At least once	3.9	4.0	8.2	5.4		
	Forcing another person into sexual activity	Never	97.4	90.1	94.9	93.8	4.326	0.115
		At least once	2.6	9.9	5.1	6.2		
	Stealing someone else's property	Never	98.7	93.1	88.8	93.1	6.628	0.036
		At least once	1.3	6.9	11.2	6.9		
	Starting a fight	Never	97.4	93.1	90.8	93.5	3.112	0.211
		At least once	2.6	6.9	9.2	6.5		

*results are presented only as percentages due to table length limitations

Source: Authors' own study.



The results in Table 6 show that the frequency of using psychoactive substances (other than alcohol) differentiates the engagement in only three of the analyzed risky behaviours. It was found that individuals who used substances at least twice in the past year were ten times more likely (12.6%) than those who used them once (1.3%) to engage in self-harm, seven times more likely to deliberately hit another person while intoxicated (9.5% vs. 1.3%), and more likely to steal while intoxicated (9.1% vs. 1.3%).

DISCUSSION

The use of psychoactive substances by an individual alters their mental state, particularly emotional processing and rational thinking, leading to behaviours that are reckless, unpredictable, and often dangerous for themselves and those around them. The influence of intoxication on behaviour is especially pronounced in young individuals (Australian Government, 2017) or those struggling with mental health disorders and illnesses (Brem et al., 2018; Puhalla et al., 2020).

The study aimed to assess the scale of risky behaviours undertaken by respondents under the influence of PAS over the past 12 months, as well as to identify risk factors associated with engaging in risky behaviours after the use of PAS.

The research revealed that the most frequently reported risky behaviours by respondents under the influence of SPA were: neglecting household duties, engaging in “casual” sexual relations, neglecting professional duties, driving motor vehicles, “courageous” behaviours, causing disturbances in public places, and disturbing public peace and order. These findings can partially be linked to the results of Postek’s (2021) study, which showed that 10.6% of respondents had been drawn into an argument by an intoxicated person, and 7.6% had been insulted or provoked by someone under the influence of substances. Additionally, 5.7% of participants were involved in a traffic accident caused by an intoxicated individual, and 0.9% traveled in a car driven by an impaired driver.

In the present study, it was also found that all 19 analyzed risky behaviours were more frequently undertaken by men than women. The most significant differences between genders were observed in behaviours such as initiating fights, committing theft, exposing themselves in inappropriate circumstances, driving vehicles under the influence, engaging in “courageous” behaviours, causing disturbances, vandalism, violence, casual sexual encounters, and neglecting family and professional duties. These findings seem to confirm earlier meta-analyses, which have demonstrated a relationship between PAS and violence, with male gender, psychotic disorders, and the combined use of alcohol and drugs acting as variables that exacerbate this relationship (Duke et al., 2018).

The analysis also revealed that age differentiates the occurrence of six specific risky behaviours under the influence of PAS, which are indicative of neglecting



social roles (both familial and professional), initiating sexual relationships online, engaging in public disturbances, exhibiting “courageous” behaviours, and disrupting public order. These behaviours were predominantly exhibited by younger adults. These findings correspond with those of Mojica-Perez and colleagues, whose study confirmed that alcohol consumption correlates with the number and severity of risky behaviours, and that the frequency of such behaviours decreases with age, although their risk level increases (Mojica-Perez et al., 2019). The study found that being in a committed relationship differentiates only one risky behaviour under the influence of PAS: the act of physically assaulting someone. This behaviour was statistically more likely to be reported by singles.

The literature on the subject confirms the existence of strong connections between substance use and the engagement in various risky behaviours, such as neglect and other forms of violence toward children (Dubowitz et al., 2011) and intimate partners (Cafferky et al., 2018). The relationship between alcohol abuse and aggression is frequently highlighted (Parrott & Eckhardt, 2018), and there are well-documented correlations between aggression and the use of stimulant drugs. For example, nearly 35% of methamphetamine users reported engaging in verbal and/or physical aggression under its influence over the last 12 months (Leslie et al., 2018). Additionally, the use of drugs, particularly new psychoactive substances (chemical substances mimicking the effects of illegal drugs, such as cocaine, amphetamines, ecstasy, or cannabis), strongly correlates with a propensity for impulsive and risky behaviours (Vreeker et al., 2017). Furthermore, alcohol and drug abuse are closely linked to cyberbullying (Kowalski & Wingate, 2023). Individuals under the influence of substances often create problems for their employers and coworkers due to frequent absenteeism (Frone, 2019; Roche et al., 2016) and reduced productivity (Sorge et al., 2020). This contributes to a high turnover of employees (Hoffmann & Larison, 1999) and a significant number of workplace accidents (Elliott & Shelley, 2006). Those who abuse psychoactive substances are also significantly more likely to engage in risky sexual behaviours. These are often casual, emotionless encounters with multiple partners and without protection, increasing the risk of sexually transmitted infections (Adzrago et al., 2023; Cho & Yang, 2023; Feaster et al., 2016; Harbertson et al., 2019).

It has also been found that alcohol and drug consumption is a major cause of reckless driving behaviours, significantly increasing the risk of road accidents. For instance, a blood alcohol level of 1‰ or the use of amphetamines increases the risk of a road accident fivefold (European Commission, 2023). The findings of the study revealed that high alcohol consumption frequency was associated with a higher frequency of only 9 out of 19 risky behaviours, mainly in the context of neglecting care for dependent individuals (such as children, people with disabilities, and the elderly), reckless behaviour, and aggression towards others. High frequency of binge drinking, however, did not increase the risk of any of the other

analyzed behaviours. In contrast, high frequency of using psychoactive substances (other than alcohol) in the past year was associated with only three risky behaviours: physical assault, self-harm, and theft.

These findings suggest that there are likely other mediating factors that influence the behaviours of individuals under the influence of psychoactive substances. For example, research has shown that aggression in individuals who abuse alcohol is regulated by various factors (Parrott & Eckhardt, 2018), including individual tendencies towards aggressive behaviour (Birkley & Eckhardt, 2015), tension in relationships with hostile individuals (Leonard & Blane, 1992), and provocative signals from the environment (Gallagher et al., 2010).

For social prevention efforts aimed at reducing problem behaviours, it is crucial to identify and target the risk factors associated with engaging in risky behaviours under the influence of psychoactive substances. The study's findings highlight that certain groups of people may be more susceptible to engaging in specific risky behaviours while intoxicated with psychoactive substances. These individuals might benefit from tailored interventions that take into account their specific risk profiles.

In particular, the results underscore the importance of considering not only the frequency of alcohol or drug use but also other factors, such as individual predispositions, social environment, and interpersonal dynamics, when designing preventive measures. This suggests that effective prevention strategies should address multiple layers of risk, including personal, social, and environmental influences.

For social prevention, aimed at preventing problematic behaviours, it is crucial to identify the risk factors associated with engaging in such behaviours. The present study found that certain groups of individuals may be more prone to engaging in specific risky behaviours under the influence of PAS.

The analyses conducted allow us to conclude that the specific risky behaviours engaged in by respondents under the influence of PAS during the past 12 months mainly concern:

- neglect of responsibilities related to family and work roles after using PAS, which primarily affects men and individuals under the age of 36;
- neglect of child care, most commonly reported by individuals who drink alcohol at least several times a month;
- neglect of care for people with disabilities or the elderly, most commonly declared by men and individuals who drink alcohol at least several times a month;
- "casual sexual relations", reported at the highest rates by men;
- engaging in casual sexual encounters, most often reported by men and individuals under the age of 35;
- starting domestic quarrels, most commonly declared by men;

- public disturbances, which were most often reported by men and individuals under the age of 25;
- deliberate physical aggression towards another person, most commonly reported by men, singles, and individuals who have used PAS 2–3 times in the past year;
- vandalism, which primarily affected men and individuals who drink alcohol at least several times a week;
- daring “courageous” behaviours, reported mostly by men and individuals under the age of 35;
- self-harming, most commonly declared by individuals who drink alcohol at least several times a month and those who used other PAS at least 2–3 times in the past year;
- driving under the influence of alcohol, mostly affecting men;
- exposing oneself in public while intoxicated, reported mainly by men and individuals who drink alcohol at least several times a month;
- patostreaming, most commonly reported by men and individuals who drink alcohol at least several times a week;
- forcing someone into sexual activity, most often perpetrated by men;
- theft under the influence of PAS, mostly affecting men, individuals who drink alcohol at least several times a month, and those who used other PAS 4 or more times in the past year;
- starting physical fights, most commonly declared by men.

Based on the findings of our research, it can be concluded that risky behaviours, which occur after the use of PAS, are primarily influenced by sociodemographic factors (mainly male gender and being under the age of 35). It was also established that the increase in the number of most risky behaviours while intoxicated is not proportional to the frequency of PAS abuse. Even a low frequency, i.e. occasional intoxication, can be associated with engaging in such behaviours. In practice, this highlights the need for preventive measures not only for individuals who are addicted or abuse PAS but also for those who experience episodes of intoxication or use PAS in a risky manner (WHO, 2024).

Particularly important are actions aimed at changing the stereotypical social acceptance of occasional, e.g. “weekend” PAS intoxication, especially among men and young adults. Many young people believe that consuming large amounts of alcohol or using other PAS only occasionally is perfectly acceptable and does not carry serious consequences. However, based on the research, it can be assumed that the current trend among young adults to engage in occasional intoxication (e.g. to celebrate success or other important event, or to relieve stress at work or university) is a significant risk factor for engaging in risky behaviours under the influence of PAS.

These findings challenge the previous assumption that risky behaviours while intoxicated are only characteristic of individuals who are addicted or regularly

abusing PAS. At the same time, the results of this study open up new perspectives both in terms of research into risky behaviours and in the design of preventive interventions.

CONCLUSION

Among the 19 risky behaviours undertaken under the influence of PAS in the last 12 months, the most frequently reported were: performing household duties, casual sexual encounters, performing professional duties, driving vehicles, “courageous” behaviours, brawling in public places, and disturbing the peace and public order. The main risk factors for engaging in risky behaviours after using PAS are primarily sociodemographic: being male and under the age of age 35. The frequency of intoxication with PAS in the 12 months prior to the study is associated only with selected risky behaviours. More frequent alcohol consumption (at least several times a month) increases the risk of neglecting care for dependent individuals, reckless behaviour, and aggression towards others. More frequent use of PAS other than alcohol (several times a year) is associated with an increase in assaults, self-harm, and theft.

Preventive interventions should therefore focus on changing the stereotypical social acceptance of occasional, e.g. “weekend” substance intoxication, especially among men and young adults. Prevention should not be focused primarily on groups of individuals addicted to PAS. Priority should be given to those who report episodic, risky substance use.

STUDY LIMITATIONS

The proposed tool, the Inventory of Risky Behaviours Associated with Psychoactive Substance Abuse, is a pilot version and requires further development. The tool relies solely on the respondents’ declarations, thus, limiting the value of the conclusions. Future directions include refining the inventory items and validating the tool through research with a larger, more socio-demographically diverse sample.

REFERENCES

- Abbey, A., Saenz, C., & Buck, P.O. (2005). The cumulative effects of acute alcohol consumption, individual differences and situational perceptions on sexual decision making. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 66(1), 82–90. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsa.2005.66.82>



- Abbey, A., & Wegner, R. (2015). Using experimental paradigms to examine alcohol's role in men's sexual aggression: Opportunities and challenges in proxy development. *Violence Against Women*, 21(8), 975–996. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215589378>
- Abbey, A., Wegner, R., Woerner, J., Pegram, S.E., & Pierce, J. (2014). Review of survey and experimental research that examines the relationship between alcohol consumption and men's sexual aggression perpetration. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 15(4), 265–282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838014521031>
- Adzrago, D., Nyarko, S.H., Ananaba, N., & Markham, C. (2023). Effects of mental health and substance use disorder symptoms on the association between STDs and sexual identity: Evidence from the 2017–2019 National Survey on Drug Use and Health. *Journal of Public Health*, 31(8), 1225–1236. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-021-01683-y>
- Ariely, D., & Loewenstein, G. (2006). The heat of the moment: The effect of sexual arousal on sexual decision making. *Journal of Behavioural Decision Making*, 19(2), 87–98. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.501>
- Athey, A., Shaff, J., Kahn, G., Brodie, K., Ryan, T.C., Sawyer, H., DeVinney, A., Nestadt, P.S., & Wilcox, H.C. (2025). Association of substance use with suicide mortality: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence Reports*, 14, 100310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dadr.2024.100310>
- Australian Government. (2017). *What are drugs?* Department of Health. <https://www.health.gov.au/zdrowie-topy/leki/roki/kresy/krewne-re-narkotykowe>
- Bek, D., & Popiołek, M. (2019). Patostreaming – charakterystyka i prawne konteksty zjawiska. *Zarządzanie Mediami*, 4, 247–262. <https://doi.org/10.4467/23540214ZM.19.016.11342>
- Birkley, E.L., & Eckhardt, C.I. (2015). Anger, hostility, internalizing negative emotions, and intimate partner violence perpetration: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 37, 40–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2015.01.002>
- Branley, D.B., & Covey, J. (2017). Is exposure to online content depicting risky behaviour related to viewers' own risky behaviour offline? *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 75, 283–287. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.05.023>
- Brem, M.J., Florimbio, A.R., Elmquist, J., Shorey, R.C., & Stuart, G.L. (2018). Antisocial traits, distress tolerance, and alcohol problems as predictors of intimate partner violence in men arrested for domestic violence. *Psychology of Violence*, 8(1), 132–139. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000088>
- Bruno, A., Scimeca, G., Marino, A.G., Mento, C., Micò, U., Romeo, V.M., Pandolfo, G., Zoccali, R., & Muscatello, M.R.A. (2012). Drugs and sexual behaviour. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 44(5), 359–364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02791072.2012.736801>
- Cafferky, B.M., Mendez, M., Anderson, J.R., & Stith, S.M. (2018). Substance use and intimate partner violence: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology of Violence*, 8(1), 110–131. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000074>

- Cho, H.-S., & Yang, Y. (2023). Relationship between alcohol consumption and risky sexual behaviours among adolescents and young adults: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Public Health*, 68, 1605669. <https://doi.org/10.3389/ijph.2023.1605669>
- Davis, K.C., Hendershot, C.S., George, W.H., Norris, J., & Heiman, J.R. (2007). Alcohol's effects on sexual decision making: An integration of alcohol myopia and individual differences. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 68(6), 843–851. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2007.68.843>
- Davis, K.C., Parrott, D.J., George, W.H., Tharp, A.T., Hall, G.C.N., & Stappenbeck, C.A. (2014). Studying sexual aggression: A review of the evolution and validity of laboratory paradigms. *Psychology of Violence*, 4(4), 462–476. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037662>
- Dubowitz, H., Kim, J., Black, M.M., Weisbart, C., Semiatin, J., & Magder, L.S. (2011). Identifying children at high risk for a child maltreatment report. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 35(2), 96–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2010.09.003>
- Duke, A.A., Smith, K.M.Z., Oberleitner, L.M.S., Westphal, A., & McKee, S.A. (2018). Alcohol, drugs, and violence: A meta-meta-analysis. *Psychology of Violence*, 8(2), 238–249. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000106>
- Elliott, K., & Shelley, K. (2006). Effects of drugs and alcohol on behaviour, job performance, and workplace safety. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 43(3), 130–134. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1920.2006.tb00012.x>
- European Commission. (2023). *Road safety thematic report – alcohol and drugs*. European Road Safety Observatory. Brussels, European Commission, Directorate General for Transport. https://road-safety.transport.ec.europa.eu/document/download/bd2408b2-64ce-44a8-a4ca-d7820c7c91ba_en?filename=ERSO-TR-alcohol_drugs_2023.pdf
- Feaster, D.J., Parish, C.L., Gooden, L., Matheson, T., Castellon, P.C., Duan, R., Pan, Y., Haynes, L.F., Schackman, B.R., Malotte, C.K., Mandler, R.N., Colfax, G.N., & Metsch, L.R. (2016). Substance use and STI acquisition: Secondary analysis from the AWARE study. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 169, 171–179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2016.10.027>
- Fino, E., Jaspal, R., Lopes, B., Wignall, L., & Bloxson, C. (2021). The Sexual Risk Behaviours Scale (SRBS): Development & validation in a university student sample in the UK. *Evaluation & the Health Professions*, 44(2), 152–160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01632787211003950>
- Frone, M.R. (2019). Employee psychoactive substance involvement: historical context, key findings, and future directions. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour*, 6(1), 273–297. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015231>
- Gallagher, K.E., Hudepohl, A.D., & Parrott, D.J. (2010). Power of being present: The role of mindfulness on the relation between men's alcohol use and sexual aggression toward intimate partners. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 36(6), 405–413. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20351>



- González-Ponce, B.M., Vera, B.D.V., Lozano-Rojas, Ó.M., Vidal-Giné, C., & Fernández-Calderón, F. (2023). Drunkenness and regretted online social risk behaviours: The role of social drinking motives and positive urgency. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 58(8), 1046–1052. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2023.2205495>
- Harbertson, J., Scott, P.T., Lemus, H., Michael, N.L., & Hale, B.R. (2019). Cross-sectional study of sexual behaviour, alcohol use, and mental health conditions associated with sexually transmitted infections among deploying shipboard US military personnel. *Military Medicine*, 184(11–12), e693–e700. <https://doi.org/10.1093/milmed/usz070>
- Hoffmann, J., & Larison, C. (1999). Drug use, workplace accidents and employee turnover. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 29(2), 341–364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002204269902900212>
- Jessor, R. (1991). Risk behaviour in adolescence: A psychosocial framework for understanding and action. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 12(8), 597–605. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1054-139X\(91\)90007-K](https://doi.org/10.1016/1054-139X(91)90007-K)
- Kmieciak-Goławska. (2009). Patostreaming jako narzędzie popularyzacji podkultury przemocy. *Biu- letyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Kryminologicznego im. prof. Stanisława Batawii (PTK)*, 25, 171–183.
- Kowalski, R.M., & Wingate, V.S. (2023). Cyberbullying in children and adolescents. In A.N.M. Leung, K.K.S. Chan, C.S.M. Ng, & J.C.-K. Lee (Eds.), *Cyberbullying and Values Education* (pp. 13–29). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003314509-3>
- Leonard, K.E., & Blane, H.T. (1992). Alcohol and marital aggression in a national sample of young men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7(1), 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626092007001002>
- Leslie, E.M., Smirnov, A., Cherney, A., Wells, H., Legosz, M., Kemp, R., & Najman, J.M. (2018). Predictors of aggressive behaviour while under the influence of illicit drugs among young adult methamphetamine users. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 53(14), 2439–2443. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2018.1473434>
- MacDonald, T.K., Fong, G.T., Zanna, M.P., & Martineau, A.M. (2000). Alcohol myopia and condom use: Can alcohol intoxication be associated with more prudent behaviour? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 605–619. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.605>
- Malczewski, A., Bevez, M., Dalmata, M., Jędruszek, Ł., & Kidawa, M. (2020). *Raport o stanie narkomanii w Polsce 2020*. Krajowe Biuro ds. Przeciwdziałania Narkomanii. <https://www.cinn.gov.pl/porta?id=105923>
- Malczewski, A., & Jabłoński, P. (Eds.). (2023). *Raport 2023. Uzależnienia w Polsce*. Krajowe Centrum Przeciwdziałania Uzależnieniom. <https://kcpu.gov.pl/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Raport-2023-wersja-Internetowa.pdf>
- Michalska-Warias, A., & Wolters Kluwer Polska. (2016). *Zgwałcenie w małżeństwie: Studium prawnokarne i kryminologiczne*. Wolters Kluwer.
- Modrzyński, R. (2022). Zaburzenia wynikające z używania substancji w ICD-11. Zmiany w diagnostyce klinicznej. *Psychiatria i Psychologia Kliniczna*, 22(4), 248–252. <https://doi.org/10.15557/PiPK.2022.0031>

- Mojica-Perez, Y., Callinan, S., & Livingston, M. (2019). Has the relationship between alcohol consumption and alcohol-related risky behaviour changed in Australia? An exploratory study. *Alcohol and Alcoholism*, 54(3), 331–337. <https://doi.org/10.1093/alcac/agz034>
- Moskalewicz, J., & Wciórka, J. (Eds.). (2021). *Kondycja psychiczna mieszkańców Polski: Raport z badań „Kompleksowe badanie stanu zdrowia psychicznego społeczeństwa i jego uwarunkowań – EZOP II”*. Instytut Psychiatrii i Neurologii.
- Mozgawa, M., & Kozłowska-Kalisz, P. (2012). Zgwałcenie w małżeństwie w świetle badań empirycznych. In M. Mozgawa (Ed.), *Przestępstwo zgwałcenia* (pp. 217–241). LEX a Wolteres Kluwer Business.
- Neal, D.J., Corbin, W.R., & Fromme, K. (2006). Measurement of alcohol-related consequences among high school and college students: Application of item response models to the Rutgers Alcohol Problem Index. *Psychological Assessment*, 18(4), 402–414. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.18.4.402>
- O'Hare, T. (2001). Substance abuse and risky sex in young people: The development and validation of the Risky Sex Scale. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 22(2), 89–101. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012653717412>
- Ostaszewski, K. (2014). *Zachowania ryzykowne młodzieży w perspektywie mechanizmów resilience*. Instytut Psychiatrii i Neurologii.
- Palamar, J.J., Le, A., & Acosta, P. (2020). Posting, texting, and related social risk behaviour while high. *Substance Abuse*, 41(3), 382–390. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08897077.2019.1635966>
- Parrott, D.J., & Eckhardt, C.I. (2018). Effects of alcohol on human aggression. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 19, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.03.023>
- Perez, M.A.G., Lerma, M., Torres, J., & Cooper, T.V. (2021). Posting alcohol-related content and texting under the influence among Hispanic college students. *Journal of Technology in Behavioural Science*, 6(4), 589–598. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41347-021-00211-9>
- Policja Statystyka. (2025a). *Nietrzeźwi podejrzani o popełnienie przestępstwa*. <https://statystyka.policja.pl/st/wybrane-statystyki/nietrzezwi-podejrzani-o-popeln/50862,Nietrzezwi-podejrzani-o-popelnienie-przestepstwa.html>
- Policja Statystyka. (2025b). *Prowadzenie pojazdu w stanie nietrzeźwości*. Policja. <https://statystyka.policja.pl/st/przestepstwa-ogolem/przestepstwa-drogowe/prowadzenie-pojazdu-w-s/122332,Prowadzenie-pojazdu-w-stanie-nietrzezwosci.html>
- Policja Statystyka. (2025c). *Przemoc domowa*. Policja. <https://statystyka.policja.pl/st/wybrane-statystyki/przemoc-domowa>
- Policja Statystyka. (2025d). *Zamachy samobójcze zakończone zgonem (2027-2024)*. <https://statystyka.policja.pl/st/wybrane-statystyki/zamachy-samobojcze/63803,-Zamachy-samobojcze-od-2017-roku.html>
- Polska Akademia Nauk. (2020). *Kodeks Etyki Pracownika Naukowego*. <https://instytucja.pan.pl/kodeks-etyki-pracownika-naukowego>

- Polskie Towarzystwo Psychologiczne. (2018). *Kodeks Etyczny Psychologa Polskiego Towarzystwa Psychologicznego*. http://www.ptp.org.pl/teksty/NOWY_KODEKS_PTP.pdf
- Polskie Towarzystwo Socjologiczne. (2012). *Kodeks Etyki Spcjologa*. <https://pts.org.pl/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/kodeks.pdf>
- Postek, S. (2021). Szkody związane z piciem alkoholu przez inne osoby. In M. Rowicka, S. Postek, & M. Zin-Sędek (Eds.), *Wzory konsumpcji alkoholu w Polsce Raport z badań kwestionariuszowych 2020 r.* (pp. 52–59). Państwowa Agencja Rozwiązywania Problemów Alkoholowych.
- Prause, N., Staley, C., & Finn, P. (2011). The effects of acute ethanol consumption on sexual response and sexual risk-taking intent. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 40(2), 373–384. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-010-9718-9>
- Puhalla, A.A., Berman, M.E., Coccaro, E.F., Fahlgren, M.K., & McCloskey, M.S. (2020). History of childhood abuse and alcohol use disorder: Relationship with intermittent explosive disorder and intoxicated aggression frequency. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 125, 38–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2020.02.025>
- Purba, A.K., Thomson, R.M., Henery, P.M., Pearce, A., Henderson, M., & Katikireddi, S.V. (2023). Social media use and health risk behaviours in young people: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*, e073552. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2022-073552>
- Read, J.P., Kahler, C.W., Strong, D.R., & Colder, C.R. (2006). Development and preliminary validation of the young adult alcohol consequences questionnaire. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 67(1), 169–177. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsa.2006.67.169>
- Robinson, T., & Berridge, K.C. (1993). The neural basis of drug craving: An incentive-sensitization theory of addiction. *Brain Research Reviews*, 18(3), 247–291. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-0173\(93\)90013-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-0173(93)90013-P)
- Roche, A., Pidd, K., & Kostadinov, V. (2016). Alcohol- and drug-related absenteeism: A costly problem. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 40(3), 236–238. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1753-6405.12414>
- Room, R., & Collins, G. (1983). *Alcohol and Disinhibition: Nature and Meaning of the Link: Proceedings of a Conference, February 11–13, 1981*. US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.
- Rowicka, M., Postek, S., & Zin-Sądek, M. (2021). *Wzory konsumpcji alkoholu w Polsce Raport z badań kwestionariuszowych 2020 r.* PARPA. http://parpa.pl/images/wzory_konsumpcji__2020_popr.pdf
- Sadeh, N., & Baskin-Sommers, A. (2017). Risky, Impulsive, and Self-Destructive Behaviour Questionnaire (RISQ): A validation study. *Assessment*, 24(8), 1080–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191116640356>
- Serafin, P., Jakubczyk, A., Podgórska, A., Topolewska-Wochowska, A., & Wojnar, M. (2012). Przemoc pomiędzy partnerami i zachowania ryzykowne u osób uzależnionych od alkoholu i innych substancji psychoaktywnych. *Alkoholizm i Narkomania*, 25(3), 289–305.

- Sorge, J.T., Young, M., Maloney-Hall, B., Sherk, A., Kent, P., Zhao, J., Stockwell, T., Perlova, K., Macdonald, S., & Ferguson, B. (2020). Estimation of the impacts of substance use on workplace productivity: A hybrid human capital and prevalence-based approach applied to Canada. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 111(2), 202–211. <https://doi.org/10.17269/s41997-019-00271-8>
- Staples, J.M., George, W.H., Stappenbeck, C.A., Davis, K.C., Norris, J., & Heiman, J.R. (2015). Alcohol myopia and sexual abdication among women: Examining the moderating effect of child sexual abuse. *Addictive Behaviours*, 41, 72–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.09.014>
- Steele, C.M., & Josephs, R.A. (1990). Alcohol myopia: Its prized and dangerous effects. *American Psychologist*, 45(8), 921–933. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.45.8.921>
- Vreeker, A., Van Der Burg, B.G., Van Laar, M., & Brunt, T.M. (2017). Characterizing users of new psychoactive substances using psychometric scales for risk-related behaviour. *Addictive Behaviours*, 70, 72–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2017.02.010>
- WHO. (2024). *Clinical Descriptions and Diagnostic Requirements for ICD-11 Mental, Behavioural and Neurodevelopmental Disorders*. World Health Organization.
- Zwierzynska, E., & Pietrzak, B. (2014). Patogeneza uzależnień – problem wciąż aktualny. *Alcoholism and Drug Addiction*, 27(2), 163–175. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0867-4361\(14\)70011-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0867-4361(14)70011-2)

RYZIKOWNE ZACHOWANIA PO UŻYCIU SUBSTANCJI PSYCHOAKTYWNYCH

Wprowadzenie: Odurzanie się substancjami psychoaktywnymi (SPA) wiąże się z podejmowaniem zachowań ryzykownych godzących w normy prawne, moralne i obyczajowe. Konstruowanie efektywnych oddziaływań profilaktycznych musi się opierać na aktualnej wiedzy o skali, zakresie i determinantach zachowań ryzykownych podejmowanych po użyciu substancji psychoaktywnych.

Cel badań: Celem jest uzyskanie wiedzy o skali ryzykownych zachowań podejmowanych pod wpływem SPA w ciągu 12 miesięcy przed badaniem oraz ich uwarunkowaniach: socjodemograficznych i związanych z częstotliwością odurzania się SPA.

Metoda badań: Metodę stanowił sondaż diagnostyczny – kwestionariusz ankiety online zawierający 33 pytania lub bloki pytań, w tym pilotażową wersję autorskiego narzędzia Inwentarz zachowań ryzykownych związanych z nadużywaniem substancji psychoaktywnych. Przebadało 1265 pełnoletnich osób, w bieżącej analizie uwzględniono dane 1104, które w ostatnim roku używały SPA.

Wyniki: Najczęściej podejmowanymi ryzykownymi zachowaniami pod wpływem SPA w ciągu ostatnich 12 miesięcy były: wykonywanie obowiązków domowych (34%), „przygodne” stosunki seksualne (12%), wykonywanie obowiązków zawodowych (11%), prowadzenie pojazdów mechanicznych (10%), zachowania brawurowe (9%), awanturowanie się w miejscach publicznych (9%), zakłócanie spokoju i porządku publicznego (9%). Kluczowym czynnikiem ryzyka jest płeć męska. Czynniki sprzyjającymi 6–9 analizowanych zachowań są: wiek (do



35 roku życia) oraz picie alkoholu co najmniej kilka razy w miesiącu.

Wnioski: Dominującymi zachowaniami ryzykownymi, podejmowanymi w stanie odurzenia SPA są: wykonywanie obowiązków domowych i zawodowych, „przygodne” stosunki seksualne, prowadzenie pojazdów mechanicznych, zachowania brawurowe, awanturowanie i zakłócanie porządku publicznego. Podejmują je najczęściej mężczyźni, osoby do 35 roku życia, osoby pijące alkohol co najmniej kilka razy w miesiącu.

Słowa kluczowe: ryzykowne zachowania, zespoły zachowań ryzykownych, konsekwencje nadużywania substancji psychoaktywnych