

Socialization as a Mechanism for Preventing Drug Use among Adolescents a Sociological Approach

Dr. KABOUYA Derine *

University of 20 August 1955 Skikda, Algeria, Email: d.kabouya@univ-skikda.dz

Received: 10/01/2026

Accepted: 28/06/2026

Published: 22/07/2026

Abstract:

This theoretical study addresses the problem of adolescent drug use as a phenomenon that cannot be adequately understood apart from the broader process of socialization through which individuals acquire the values, norms, and attitudes that shape their relationship to themselves and to their social environment. The article aims to examine the role played by social institutions and the mechanisms of socialization in preventing drug-related behavior among adolescents, adopting a theoretical and analytical sociological approach based on a critical review of the relevant sociological literature and theoretical frameworks, rather than on empirical or statistical fieldwork. The study first situates the discussion within the main sociological theories explaining drug use, the factors associated with it, and the principal institutions of socialization, before turning to a focused analysis of the specific mechanisms through which socialization operates, namely learning and modeling, social interaction, informal social control, the internalization of values and norms, reinforcement, parental guidance and monitoring, the formation of conscience and self-regulation, role acquisition, and attitude formation. The theoretical analysis shows that adolescent drug use is a complex social phenomenon shaped by the interplay of multiple dimensions, and that socialization constitutes a pivotal protective factor when its institutions and mechanisms operate in a coherent and mutually reinforcing manner; conversely, these same mechanisms may become channels for the acquisition of drug-related behavior when this system is fragmented or conveys inconsistent normative messages. The study concludes with a set of preventive recommendations addressed to the family, the school, and other relevant social actors, alongside proposed directions for future empirical research capable of testing these theoretical propositions.

Keywords: Socialization; Drug Use; Adolescents; Social Prevention; Social Control; Socialization Mechanisms; Sociology.

Introduction:

The phenomenon of drug abuse is considered one of the most prominent social problems facing contemporary societies, due to the effects and repercussions it produces that go beyond the individual to affect the family, educational institutions, and society as a whole. Drug abuse does not merely represent an individual behavior linked to the desire to experiment or seek pleasure, but rather it is a complex phenomenon whose emergence and continuation is intertwined with a group of social, cultural, family, economic, and psychological factors, which makes understanding it and limiting its spread require a multi-dimensional approach, which places the social environment in which the individual lives at the center of the analysis, and the seriousness of this phenomenon increases when it is linked to the group of adolescents. Considering that adolescence represents a fundamental stage in building personality, forming identity, and acquiring values and standards that

guide behavior, in this stage the individual gradually moves from dependence on the family to expanding the circle of his social relationships, and becomes more in contact with the group of friends, school, the media, and the digital space, which makes his behavior and trends vulnerable to the various social and cultural influences surrounding him. Therefore, protecting the adolescent from drug abuse cannot be limited to intervention after the problem appears, but rather calls for attention to the social processes that contribute to shaping his personality and directing his choices from the early stages of his development. In this context, socialization emerges as one of the most important processes through which an individual acquires socially acceptable values, standards, trends, and behavior patterns. Through the family, school, peer group, and other socialization institutions, the adolescent learns how to interact with others, distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable behavior, and acquire self- and social control mechanisms that help him confront the pressures and situations that may push him to adopt dangerous behaviors. Thus, the function of socialization is not limited to achieving social integration, but it can also perform a preventive function by building... A value and behavioral system that enhances the adolescent's ability to resist various forms of deviance. The importance of this role is evident in the nature of the relationships that arise within socialization institutions. The family that provides dialogue, emotional support, follow-up, and balanced social control can constitute an important protective factor for the adolescent, while family disintegration, weak communication, or lack of follow-up may open the way to some external sources of influence. The school also represents a basic space for promoting values, belonging, responsibility, and social integration, while the group of comrades can play a dual role. It may be a source of support and protection, and in some cases it may become a source of learning and normalizing risky behaviours. In addition to this, the media and the digital space have become an essential part of the contemporary social environment, with the educational and preventive potential they carry on the one hand, and the risks associated with some content and behavioral models on the other hand. Therefore, looking at socialization as a mechanism for preventing drug abuse requires going beyond the perception that limits prevention to awareness campaigns or security and therapeutic measures, and also paying attention to building the social environment capable of protecting the adolescent before he falls into the cycle of drug abuse. Social prevention begins with the family and continues within the school and the environment. Social, and is influenced by the group of comrades, the prevailing culture, the media, and the digital space, which makes its success linked to the degree of integration between the various socialization institutions and their ability to provide a coherent system of values, support, and social control. From this standpoint, this article seeks to present a sociological approach to the relationship between socialization and the prevention of drug abuse in adolescents, by analyzing the roles played by socialization institutions, and revealing the most important mechanisms that can make them a tool for prevention and protection, in addition to discussing the social factors that may strengthen or weaken this function. The article also aims to highlight the necessity of moving from dealing with drug abuse as an individual problem to understanding it within the framework of the network of relationships, institutions and social processes that shape adolescent behavior and tendencies. Based on what was previously mentioned, the central problem of the article is determined in the following main question: To what extent can socialization, through its various institutions and mechanisms, constitute an effective sociological mechanism for preventing drug abuse among adolescents?

A number of sub-questions branch out from this main question:

- How does socialization contribute to shaping adolescents' attitudes and behaviors related to drug use?
- What is the role of the family, school, and group of friends in preventing drug abuse among adolescents?
- What are the most important mechanisms through which socialization can enhance the adolescent's ability to resist drug abuse?
- What are the most prominent social factors that can weaken the protective role of socialization and increase the adolescent's susceptibility to engaging in drug abuse?

Based on these questions, the article proceeds to analyze socialization not only as a process of transmitting values and standards, but also as a mechanism for social prevention and building behavioral and moral immunity among adolescents, allowing for a deeper understanding of the role that various societal institutions can play in reducing the spread of drug abuse.

First: The importance and objectives of the scientific study:

1- The importance of scientific study:

This study gains its scientific importance from the fact that it addresses the problem of socialization as a preventive mechanism against drug abuse among adolescents. It is a problem in which the fields of educational sociology and the sociology of deviance and social control intersect, which makes its sociological approach a qualitative addition to understanding a phenomenon that goes beyond narrow psychological or biological explanations to an explanation that links it to social structures and institutions of upbringing.

The importance of the topic also stems from the fact that socialization is not just a general educational process, but rather a preventive approach in the first place, as the values, standards, and patterns of social control instilled by the family, school, and other social control institutions constitute the first line of defense against deviant behaviors, including drug abuse. Studying this mechanism allows revealing the links between the weakness or strength of the socialization processes on the one hand, and the adolescent's susceptibility to slipping into abuse or his resistance to it on the other hand.

The importance of the study also lies in its focus on the family and school as the two most influential institutions in building the adolescent's social identity, and in instilling the values and standards that regulate his behavior and determine his relationship with the group, which makes understanding their nurturing performance necessary to understand paths of prevention or deviance alike.

The importance of the topic is also related to the role of socialization in enhancing the factors of protection and social integration among adolescents, thus reducing the manifestations of marginalization and alienation, which are among the most prominent factors leading to deviant behaviors in general and drug abuse in particular. The more effective the upbringing is in achieving integration, the less vulnerable the adolescent will be to this behavior.

The sociological approach adds special explanatory value to this topic, because it moves the analysis of drug abuse from the level of the isolated individual to the level of the relationship between the individual and the social structure to which he belongs, thus highlighting how upbringing processes turn into an essential explanatory variable in understanding prevention, away from reductionist explanations.

Finally, the study has practical importance for social and educational prevention efforts, as understanding the mechanisms of socialization and their preventive roles provides a theoretical basis on which educational and preventive approaches can be built aimed at strengthening the role of the family and school in protecting adolescents from drug abuse.

2- Objectives of the scientific study:

- The most important objectives of the scientific study that we discussed are as follows:
- Analysis of the role of the family in preventing drug abuse in adolescents through socialization processes.
- Highlighting the role of the school and other socialization institutions in building preventive values and standards.
- Explaining the role of values, social standards, and social control mechanisms in reducing deviant behaviors.
- Analysis of the contribution of socialization in enhancing social integration and protective factors among adolescents.
- Understand how socialization mechanisms contribute to reducing factors leading to drug abuse.
- Extracting preventive trends with a sociological basis that benefit social and educational prevention efforts.

Second: The basic concepts of the study:

The concepts of socialization, adolescence, drug abuse, and its prevention intersect in one field of applied sociological and psychological research. This is because adolescence represents the developmental stage most sensitive to the influences of socialization, and it is also the age period most vulnerable to the risk of initiating drug abuse, which makes preventive interventions based on scientific evidence a necessity for research and application at the same time. This paper reviews the four concepts based on approved institutional and academic scientific references.

1- The concept of socialization:

Socialization is defined as the process through which the individual acquires, from his childhood and during the various stages of his life, the knowledge, values, standards, trends, and patterns of behavior that enable him to integrate into society and interact with its members in a way that is compatible with its culture and social systems. Socialization is not limited to transferring social standards from one generation to another, but rather represents a continuous interactive process that contributes to shaping the individual's personality, forming his social identity, and directing his behavior according to what society considers acceptable or unacceptable.

Anthony Giddens believes that socialization is the process through which children and new members of society learn the ways of life in society. It is a process that allows the individual to develop self-awareness and acquire the skills, values, and standards necessary to participate in social life. From this perspective, the family, school, group of comrades, the media, and other socialization institutions constitute basic spaces for the individual to acquire social standards and patterns of behavior.

Socialization can also be viewed as a continuous process that does not stop at childhood, but rather extends to adolescence, adulthood, and various stages of life, as the individual constantly faces new social situations and roles that require the acquisition of new knowledge and behavioral rules. Therefore, the effectiveness of socialization institutions in adolescence acquires special importance,

given that this stage is characterized by psychological and social transformations and an increasing desire for independence and influence by the peer group.

In the context of studying drug abuse in adolescents, socialization gains preventive importance; Sound family and school upbringing can contribute to consolidating the values of responsibility, discipline, and self-respect, and developing the ability to make decisions and resist peer pressure, which may enhance the adolescent's ability to avoid dangerous behaviors, including drug abuse.¹

Emile Durkheim, one of the founders of classical sociology, believes that socialization (which he expressed in the concept of education) is the influence exercised by adult generations on generations that have not yet matured for social life, with the aim of arousing and developing a set of physical, mental and moral conditions that the political society in its entirety and the special environment in which they are prepared to live in particular; The individual alone, through his pure individual effort, is unable to achieve these states² 'As for Talcott Parsons, the pioneer of the constructivist functional school, he addressed the issue of socialization as the mechanism through which the individual intervenes in the values and standards that make up the social system, ensuring the stability of this system and its reproduction across successive generations, and making the family and school the primary mediators in this process³.

2- The concept of adolescence:

The World Health Organization officially defines adolescents as individuals between the ages of 10 and 19 years, while the term "youth" is used for the age group from 15 to 24 years, and the term "young people" covers the age range from 10 to 24 years.⁴ 'From a developmental psychological perspective, Erik Erikson describes this stage as a pivotal psychosocial crisis entitled "Identity versus Identity Dispersion," during which the adolescent seeks to crystallize a coherent sense of himself and his social status, by testing multiple roles and values before arriving at stable commitments that qualify him to move into adulthood⁵.

3- The concept of drug abuse:

The World Health Organization's dictionary of alcohol and drug terms defines 'abuse' as a pattern of using a substance that results in physical, psychological, or social harm to the individual, while 'dependence' is defined as a group of physiological, behavioral, and cognitive phenomena in which the use of the substance becomes a top priority for the individual, outweighing in importance other behaviors that were previously of higher value to him⁶ 'The fifth edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5), issued by the American Psychiatric Association, specifies precise diagnostic criteria for what is known as "substance use disorder," including poor control over use, deficits in social and occupational functioning, and risky use, as well as physiological criteria such as tolerance and withdrawal symptoms⁷.

4- The concept of prevention:

The International Standards for the Prevention of Drug Abuse, issued jointly by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the World Health Organization, define prevention as a set of policies and interventions based on scientific evidence, aimed at preventing the initiation of drug abuse or limiting the development of drug-related problems⁸ 'International standards for the prevention of drug abuse adopt a three-fold classification of preventive interventions according to the level of risk of the target group. Universal Prevention is directed at the general population regardless of their level of risk, Selective Prevention targets populations with an above-average level of exposure to risk factors, and Indicated Prevention is directed at individuals who are at

highest risk, including individuals who may have already begun trying substances and are therefore more vulnerable to developing substance use disorders⁹ 'Empirical evidence from Life Skills Training shows that an approach based on enhancing adolescents' personal and social competencies is more effective in reducing rates of initiation of tobacco, alcohol and drug use, compared to programs that limit awareness of risks without developing social resistance and decision-making skills¹⁰.

5- The concept of socialization mechanisms:

Socialization mechanisms refer to the psychological and social processes through which the individual integrates the values, standards, and roles transmitted to him by the institutions of upbringing (family, school, peer group, media), and these processes are translated into actual stable behavior in the individual.

In their theory of the social construction of reality, Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann distinguish between two types of upbringing based on the mechanism of internalization: the primary upbringing that the child receives in the family and establishes his first sense of social reality, and the secondary upbringing that occurs later through specialized institutions such as school and work, through which the individual acquires subsidiary roles and knowledge based on the base established by the primary upbringing¹¹.

From a psychosocial perspective, the social learning theory developed by Albert Bandura is one of the most important frameworks explaining the mechanisms of upbringing at the individual level. He believes that social learning takes place through four intermediate processes: attention, retention, behavioral production, and motivation, and that the individual acquires his behavior patterns primarily through observation, imitation, and modeling of the behavior of significant others, and through direct or indirect (alternative) reinforcement of this behavior¹².

At the level of the context surrounding the individual, Uri Bronfenbrenner presented the ecological systems model, which explains the multiple mechanisms of upbringing according to levels ranging from the immediate environment (family, school, group of comrades) to the broader systems (society and culture), and confirms that the growth and upbringing of the individual is shaped by the mutual interaction between these overlapping levels and not through a unidirectional influence from the environment to the individual¹³.

Recent literature in this field, as documented in the comprehensive reference edited by Joan Groske and Paul Hastings, concludes that socialization mechanisms operate in an interactive, non-linear manner, such that the child is an active party in the upbringing process and not merely a passive recipient of the influences of the parents or the institutions surrounding him¹⁴.

Third/For previous studies:

This element reviews four previous studies directly related to this scientific study titled "Socialization as a Mechanism to Prevent Drug Abuse in Adolescents: A Sociological Approach," distributed between two Algerian studies and two foreign studies, with the aim of forming an analytical and critical base upon which the theoretical and synthetic approach to this article will later be built.

1- A study presented by Khaled Zahzah in the year 2025¹⁵:

A study entitled "Institutions of socialization and their role in protecting the school environment from the scourge of drugs," was published in the Journal of Social Sciences issued by Ammar Thlidji University in Laghouat. The study aimed to shed light on the role of various institutions of

socialization (family, school, media, religious and cultural institutions, in addition to health and security agencies) in protecting the school environment from the phenomenon of drug abuse. The researcher adopted the descriptive analytical approach in treating the topic theoretically, without conducting a field study with a specific sample, as it was based on an analysis of the literature on the topic. And official institutional data (such as the National Drug Control Bureau's investigation) to build his perception.

The study concluded that functional integration between different educational institutions represents an essential factor in raising awareness of the dangers of drugs and in creating a safe and supportive school environment that limits the spread of this phenomenon. It stressed that the responsibility for prevention cannot be placed on one institution in isolation from the rest of the educational institutions.

This study serves our current article in its early emphasis on the pluralistic and integrative nature of socialization institutions in the face of drug abuse, which is consistent with the general premise of our topic. However, the study remains limited in that it is a general descriptive-theoretical treatment that was not built on questioning a specific sociological theory (such as the theories of social control or social learning), and did not detail the internal mechanisms through which institutional integration actually works at the individual level of the adolescent, which represents a direct entry into the theoretical approach that our article seeks to develop.

2- Study by Fatiha Zardani in 2023¹⁶:

This study was entitled "The Role of Family Disintegration in Teenage Girls' Tendency to Drug Abuse," at the Ben Ashour Re-Education Center in Blida Province. It was published in the Journal of Studies in the Psychology of Deviance issued by the University of Batna. The study aimed to reveal the impact of family disintegration on teenage girls' tendency toward drug abuse and to identify the reasons for the spread of this phenomenon among this group. The researcher adopted a case study approach combined with a descriptive analytical approach, in addition to adopting a small purposive sample consisting of five cases from the center's inmates, using two direct observation tools. And a standardized interview to collect data.

The study found that a number of family factors explain the trend of teenage girls towards drug abuse, most notably the weak economic level of the family, the presence of a criminal past within it, the continuation of family conflicts, emotional deprivation, exposure to violence of all kinds, and the absence of a parent through death, divorce, or abandonment.

This study helps our article in providing accurate empirical content of what "dysfunctional family upbringing" can mean at the field level, as it translates the concept of family disintegration into specific indicators (economic, relational, emotional). However, the limited size of the sample (five cases) and its intentional nature within a re-education institution make the results descriptive of a sample in which drug abuse has actually stabilized, without the possibility of proving the corresponding preventive effect of cohesive family upbringing. This makes the study closer to explaining preventive failure after it occurs than to building a pre-emptive model, which is the methodological gap that our theoretical article seeks to overcome with an approach concerned with the prevention mechanism itself and not only analyzing cases of stable abuse.

3- The study by J. David Hawkins et al¹⁷ :

Presented by J. David Hawkins, Richard Catalano, and Janet Miller published in 1992 a comprehensive theoretical review entitled "Risk and Protective Factors against Alcohol and Other

Drug Problems in Adolescence and Early Adulthood: Their Implications for the Prevention of Substance Abuse,” published in the journal *Psychological Bulletin*. The study aimed to review and classify dozens of previous experimental studies on the risk and protective factors associated with adolescent alcohol and drug use, across multiple domains (individual, family, school, peer, and societal), and the formulation of the “Social Development Model” that combines the assumptions of social control theory and social learning theory in explaining the path of addictive behavior growth or prevention.

The study concluded that family factors (such as weak parental control and conflicting family attitudes toward substance abuse), school factors (such as poor commitment and early academic failure), and the peer group (such as the connection between substance abuse and drug users) interact through a cumulative developmental path, and that effective prevention programs are those that aim to enhance protective factors (such as strong social ties to family and school) and not merely reduce risk factors in isolation from them.

This study is considered one of the most important theoretical references for our scientific study, as it provides a comprehensive systematic classification of risk and protective factors across the three upbringing institutions that our article focuses on (family, school, and companions), and provides theoretical support for the integration of the theories of social control and social learning, which is the integration that our scientific study seeks to employ sociologically in the context of the phenomenon of drug abuse specifically. However, the study was completed within an American/Western social and cultural context, and its data were not tested in an Arab or Western context. Algerian, which calls for methodological caution when generalizing its results directly to the reality of Algerian adolescents without taking into account the cultural and institutional specificity of this context.

4- Study by Denise Kandel and Kenneth Andrews, 1987¹⁸ :

This study was completed, entitled “Processes of Socialization of the Adolescent by Parents and Companions,” and was published in *The International Journal of the Addictions*. The study aimed to test the basic processes through which the socialization of the adolescent is carried out by parents and companions regarding the use of alcohol and marijuana, through the mechanisms of modeling and social reinforcement, in their direct, indirect, and conditional forms. The study adopted a quantitative approach based on short-term cross-sectional and longitudinal samples from triads including the adolescent, his or her father, and their best school friend.

The study found that basic upbringing processes vary according to the source of influence (parents or peers), the type of substance used (alcohol or marijuana), and the stage of the behavior (initiation or repetition of it). The influence of companions tends to dominate in the stage of initiation of drug use through a direct modeling mechanism, while the influence of parents remains an indirect and continuous role through their general attitudes towards drug use.

This study serves our article in presenting a precise distinction between the mechanisms of modeling and reinforcement as two different paths through which socialization works. It is an important theoretical distinction for building our sociological approach to how the impact of socialization moves from the mere presence of a social bond to the actual formation of behavior toward drugs. However, the study remains, like the study of Hawkins and his colleagues, produced in a Western social context (a sample of American teenagers in the 1980s), and has a limited focus

on only two substances (alcohol and marijuana). The dynamics of their social use differ from other substances that are more present in the Algerian context.

5- Comment on previous studies:

A. Areas of agreement:

The four studies, despite their different contexts and approaches, agree on the centrality of the family as the most frequent and influential factor in explaining the relationship of socialization to drug use in adolescents. Fazahzah places it at the forefront of upbringing institutions concerned with prevention, and Zardani details the experimental mechanisms of its failure, while the studies of Hawkins and his colleagues, Kandel, and Andrews include it among the most powerful influencing family factors (parental control, parental attitudes toward substance abuse). The four studies also agree, albeit with varying degrees of detail, that the school and the peer group in turn represent active factors, whether as a source of protection (as according to Zahzah, Hawkins and his colleagues) or a source of danger (as according to Kandel and Andrews regarding the influence of companions in the initiation stage of drug use).

B. for. Differences:

The four studies differ clearly in terms of method and level of abstraction: the two Algerian studies are closer to descriptive and case-based treatment of limited size (five cases according to Zardani) or general theory not supported by a sample (at Zahzah), while the two foreign studies rely on broader quantitative and analytical tools: a comprehensive analytical review of dozens of studies according to Hawkins and his colleagues, and tripartite (adolescent-parent-friend) cross-sectional and longitudinal samples according to Kandel and Andrews, and the angle of treatment also differs: The two Algerian studies focus on diagnosing the existing institutional and family reality (lack of institutional integration, family disintegration), while the two foreign studies focus on building explanatory models for the psychosocial processes and mechanisms that link upbringing to behavior (modeling, reinforcement, accumulation of risk and protective factors).

C. What Algerian studies focused on compared to foreign studies:

The two Algerian studies focused mainly on the institutional and descriptive dimension of the phenomenon of drug abuse in its local context (the integration between institutions of upbringing in the school environment according to Zahzah, and the reality of family disintegration within a punitive-educational institution according to Zardani), without much concern with building an integrated theoretical explanatory model of the relationship between upbringing and abuse. On the other hand, the two foreign studies focused on the precise theoretical and methodological construction of this relationship, by classifying risk and protective factors and integrating them into a comprehensive developmental model according to Hawkins and his colleagues, or by dismantling the precise mechanisms of influence according to Kandel and Andrews, without stopping to the same extent at the specificity of the institutional or cultural context in which these processes were produced.

D. Aspects addressed by previous studies in the relationship of socialization to drug abuse:

Together, the four studies addressed integrated dimensions of this relationship: the coordinating institutional dimension (Zahzah), the detailed family dimension at the level of the individual case (Zardani), the comprehensive theoretical dimension of risk and protective factors across the three institutions of upbringing (Hawkins and colleagues), and the precise mechanistic dimension of how influence is transmitted from upbringing to behavior through modeling and reinforcement (Kandel

and Andrews). By actually comparing these four dimensions, it becomes clear that not a single study of them has combined these two levels together: that is, between “description.” The institutional/field reality of upbringing in an Arab or Algerian context on the one hand, and the integrated sociological theoretical structure that explains the mechanisms of this relationship (such as the theories of social control and social learning) on the other hand.

What our current article can add:

Based on the previous actual comparison, this scientific study, as a theoretical sociological approach and not a field study, seeks to bridge this precisely defined gap between the two levels: that is, to build a sociological theoretical synthesis that employs the conceptual and classification framework provided by foreign studies (risk and protective factors, modeling and reinforcement mechanisms) in interpreting an institutional and family reality revealed by Algerian studies (incomplete institutional integration, family disintegration), leading to a theoretical conception of how socialization institutions work and operate. As an integrated prevention mechanism against drug abuse among adolescents, and not merely a separate listing of risk factors or cases of family disintegration after the actual occurrence of abuse.

Fourth: Sociological theories explaining socialization and prevention of various deviant behaviors:

The issue of explaining social behavior, whether in its form that complies with standards or deviates from them, has been one of the central concerns of sociology since its inception. Three main complementary approaches to this matter have crystallized through a historical accumulation of theoretical and experimental research: the theory of socialization, which is concerned with the process of instilling values and standards in the individual through societal institutions, as well as the social theory of learning, which attributes the acquisition of behavior - whether normal or deviant - to the mechanisms of learning by observation, interaction, and reinforcement, in addition to the theory of social control, which Compliance with norms is explained by the strength of the ties that connect the individual to the institutions of his society, and this paper reviews the three theories based on their foundational work in the global sociological and criminological literature.

1- Socialization theory:

Emile Durkheim attributes socialization (which he expressed in the concept of education) to the influence exercised by adult generations on generations that have not yet matured for social life with the aim of arousing and developing a set of physical, mental and moral conditions that the political society in its entirety and the special environment in which they are prepared to live in particular; The individual alone, through his pure individual effort, is unable to achieve these states¹⁹ ‘Durkheim treats this process as a form of “social coercion,” as the rules and values that upbringing transmits to the individual precede his existence and impose themselves on him from the outside, regardless of his personal will, and over time they become part of his internal moral structure.²⁰ ‘Talcott Parsons (the pioneer of the constructivist functional school) treats socialization as the mechanism through which the individual integrates the values and standards that make up the social system within his personal structure (Personality System), ensuring compatibility between the needs of the individual and the requirements of the social roles assigned to him, and thus achieving stability and reproduction of the social system across successive generations through intermediary institutions based on the family and the school²¹.

The functional approach to socialization, especially according to Parsons, has been subjected to fundamental criticism, most notably what was formulated by Dennis Rong in his famous article “The Excessive Perception of Human Socialization in Modern Sociology.” He believes that this approach tends to portray the individual as a passive recipient who absorbs values and standards completely and automatically, ignoring his ability to resist, negotiate, and reinterpret, which opened the door to later approaches that grant the individual A more active role in his own upbringing process²².

2- Social theory of learning:

Social learning theory developed by psychologist Albert Bandura is one of the most important psychosocial frameworks explaining the acquisition of human behavior. Bandura believes that behavior results from a mutual and continuous interaction between personal factors (cognitive and emotional), environmental factors, and behavior itself, which he called “reciprocal determinism,” and that learning occurs essentially through observation, imitation, and modeling of the behavior of significant models such as parents, teachers, and the group of comrades, through four intermediate processes: attention, retention, behavioral production, and motivation.²³ ‘Bandura emphasizes that reinforcement in this process is not limited to direct reinforcement that the individual receives personally, but also includes alternative reinforcement (Vicarious Reinforcement) resulting from observing others rewarding or punishing them for a certain behavior, which makes the individual able to learn complex behavioral patterns without the need for direct experience with them²⁴ ‘The influence of this framework extended to the field of forensic sociology through the social theory of learning formulated by Ronald Akers, which reconstructed Edwin Sutherland's differential association theory by combining it with the principles of operant conditioning. Akers believes that deviant behavior, like normal behavior, is learned through four central concepts: differential association (interaction with groups that hold definitions that support or reject deviance), definitions (acquired attitudes and beliefs toward the behavior), differential reinforcement (balancing the rewards and punishments resulting from the behavior), and imitation (imitating observed behavioral models)²⁵ ‘Akers later expanded the scope of this theory to include the overall structural level of society through the “social structure and social learning” model, showing how structural factors such as social class and family disintegration affect the possibilities of exposure to definitions and models that support deviance, and thus the possibilities of adopting or avoiding this behavior²⁶.

The empirical foundations of this framework are based on a series of laboratory studies conducted by Bandura and his colleagues in the early 1960s, known as the “Bobo doll” experiments, which showed that children who observed an adult model assaulting an inflatable doll subsequently accurately imitated this aggressive behavior even in the absence of the model itself and in new contexts. This provided early and strong experimental evidence that behavior, including aggressive or deviant behavior, can be acquired by mere observation without the need for direct reinforcement²⁷.

3- Social control theory:

Unlike theories that seek to explain the motives for delinquency, the theory of social control formulated by Travis Hirschi in his book “Causes of Delinquency” stems from a different assumption, namely that the tendency to deviance is originally inherent in human nature, and that the question that should be explained is not why some individuals deviate, but rather why most of them adhere to social norms despite this. Hirschi answers that compliance results from the strength

of the social bond that connects the individual to traditional society. The weaker this bond, the more likely the individual is to engage in deviant behavior²⁸. Hirschi identifies four components that make up this bond: attachment, which means emotional ties to parents, teachers, and friends that make the individual sensitive to their opinion of him; Commitment, which refers to the rational investment that an individual makes in traditional paths such as education and work, which makes him reluctant to risk it through deviant behavior. Involvement, which means the individual's actual preoccupation with traditional activities in which he exhausts his time and energy in a way that reduces the chances of deviation. Belief, which means the extent to which an individual adopts the prevailing moral and legal values in his society and recognizes their legitimacy²⁹.

Hirschi himself later revised his theoretical path in collaboration with Michael Gottfredson in their book "A General Theory of Crime," where they moved from focusing on external social ties to focusing on an internal psychological variable, which is "self-control," which is formed in early childhood through effective family upbringing, considering that weak self-control is the most stable characteristic of individuals who are most susceptible to deviant behavior throughout the various stages of their lives³⁰.

The three theories offer complementary, not competing, approaches to explaining social behavior; While socialization theory focuses on the value content that society transmits to the individual through its institutions, the social theory of learning is concerned with the psychological and social mechanism by which this content or its opposite is acquired through observation, interaction, and reinforcement, while social control theory explains continued adherence to standards or abandonment of them by the strength or weakness of the ties between the individual and the traditional institutions of his society. The combined explanatory value of these theories becomes clear in particular in the analysis of phenomena such as juvenile delinquency and adolescent drug abuse, where weak upbringing interacts. Family life, exposure to models and definitions that support abuse, and weak ties to traditional institutions, in shaping an individual's path toward deviant behavior or preventing it.

Fifth: Factors leading to drug abuse among adolescents:

Adolescent drug use cannot be understood as an isolated individual behavior, but rather as the result of the interaction of multiple factors organized in his direct and indirect social environment. This component presents four axes of these factors: family, school, cultural, media, digital, and social and economic, with care being taken to determine the nature of the relationship proven by the scientific literature between each factor and the phenomenon, without slipping into decisive causal judgments when the available evidence does not allow that.

1- Family factors

The family occupies a pivotal position in the scientific literature explaining adolescent drug use, not as a direct cause in itself, but rather as an environment that organizes a set of processes (control, emotional support, quality of communication, treatment methods) that vary depending on the possibilities for the adolescent to resort to drug use.

The Barnes and Farrell study, based on a large, representative sample of adolescents and their families, showed that parental support and continuous monitoring of their children's behavior are important predictors of a decreased likelihood of engaging in alcohol consumption, delinquency, and related problem behaviors, even after controlling for the effect of other demographic and family variables such as economic level, family structure, and history of alcohol abuse³¹.

In the Algerian context specifically, a field study conducted by Fatiha Zardani on cases of drug-adolescent teenage girls at a re-education center in Blida revealed that family disintegration, with its multiple manifestations (ongoing family disputes, emotional deprivation, exposure to violence, the absence of a parent through death, divorce, or abandonment), is clearly linked to these teenage girls' tendency toward drug abuse. This provides local empirical context for what a weakened family's protective function can mean in practice³².

The results of the two studies intersect in indicating that the family impact is not one-dimensional. Weak parental control, on the one hand, and the absence of emotional warmth and dialogue, on the other hand, represent two paths that may work independently or in concert to weaken the protective function of the family. From a sociological standpoint, this can be understood as a weakening of the quality of the adolescent's social bond with his family, not merely the physical presence of its members. The same study shows that orientation toward companions remains a significant predictor of substance abuse and delinquency even in the presence of other family variables, suggesting that a weaker family bond may give way to a stronger influence of alternative nurturing sources³³.

Most studies agree on the centrality of the family, although they differ in determining which of its dimensions (control, emotional support, or quality of communication) is the most explanatory; The specificity of this factor in adolescence remains that the adolescent is going through a stage of seeking greater independence from the family, which makes the withdrawal of parental control at this particular stage more sensitive than its withdrawal in previous age stages.

2- School factors:

The school, as the second social space in which the adolescent spends a large part of his daily time, represents an environment that may contribute to protecting him from drug abuse or increasing his susceptibility to it, depending on the quality of his integration into it and his relationship with it.

A large national longitudinal study, which spanned six years and included more than 1,800 American adolescents, showed that academic achievement and positive attitudes toward school are associated with a lower likelihood of using alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana, and that adolescents who have family and peer support for their academic path are less likely to use than their peers in less educationally oriented environments. However, the same study indicates that the relationship between academic achievement and substance abuse is not necessarily unidirectional, as substance abuse may also contribute to a subsequent decline in achievement, making it a reciprocal relationship rather than a causal relationship in only one direction³⁴.

This result indicates that the impact of the school is not limited to the transfer of knowledge, but rather extends to what can be called the informal social control practiced by the educational institution through its monitoring of the student's behavior, achievement, and relationships within it. When a teenager's integration into this framework is weakened, whether through repeated academic failure, a weak relationship with his teachers and classmates, or the absence of effective monitoring of his situation, he loses one of the most important sources of collective control and discipline that may limit his drift toward deviant behavior such as drug abuse. It is important to avoid generalizations here; Academic failure alone does not explain abuse, but rather it interacts with other factors (family, companions, and social) in determining the actual path that the teenager takes.

This relationship acquires additional specificity in the middle and secondary education stage in particular, which is the stage in which the transition from direct family control to a broader school

environment that requires greater self-discipline that has not yet been completed among many adolescents coincides, making the quality of the school setting at this particular stage a sensitive factor in the adolescent's path towards protection or towards danger.

3- Cultural, media and digital factors:

Today's teenager is exposed to an increasing amount of cultural, media and digital content that may carry positive or neutral perceptions about the use of drugs or alcohol, whether through traditional media or social media platforms.

A comprehensive meta-analytic review of a number of studies concluded that there is a moderate-sized association between adolescents and young adults' interaction with alcohol-related content on social media networks (such as posting, liking, or viewing pictures and posts related to drinking) and their levels of actual alcohol consumption and alcohol-related problems. However, the authors of the review themselves stressed that this association does not prove the direction of causation, and called for further research to determine whether exposure to this content is what drives abuse, or whether teens who are already addicted are more likely to produce and watch this type of content³⁵. This result imposes a precise sociological distinction between statistical correlation and direct causal effect. What studies have proven so far is that digital exposure to content related to drugs or alcohol coincides with higher levels of abuse among adolescents, more than proving that this exposure is the direct and only cause of this abuse. This connection can be interpreted sociologically from two complementary angles: On the one hand, these platforms may contribute to normalizing the image of abuse and presenting it in an attractive social context (festive or companionable), which may gradually weaken the standards that reject it among the teenager who is heavily exposed to it; On the other hand, these platforms may act as a mirror that simply reflects the affiliation of the teen who is already using digital peer networks that share the same practice, rather than what generated this use in the first place.

These factors are gaining great specificity at the current stage, due to the widespread spread of social media platforms among teenagers in particular, and due to the frequent, almost daily exposure these platforms provide to content that may not reach them with the same intensity through traditional media without awareness of this, according to what current evidence allows, the existence of an inevitable causal relationship between the mere use of these platforms and drug abuse.

4- Social and economic factors:

The adolescent's path is also affected by the broader social and economic environment in which he lives, with its material conditions and daily social relationships, most importantly his relationship with his group of companions.

On the one hand, economic conditions, a comprehensive systematic review of numerous studies showed that there is strong evidence that levels of substance abuse are unevenly distributed geographically according to the characteristics of neighborhoods and residential areas, but on the other hand, it found limited and conflicting evidence regarding the hypothesis that economic deprivation at the neighborhood or region level is automatically linked to high rates of abuse, as the results varied according to age group, ethnic affiliation, size of the area studied, and the type of socioeconomic status indicator used³⁶.

This result calls for caution against preconceived and simplistic judgments, such as linking poverty or residential marginalization directly to abuse without explanatory media. What scientific evidence

allows is to talk about the fact that economic deprivation, social exclusion, and an unstable residential environment are factors that may, in some contexts, weaken the informal support and control networks available to the adolescent (whether family or neighborhood), and may increase his exposure to abusive social models in his immediate surroundings, without in themselves constituting an inevitable cause of abuse.

In this broader social context, the group of comrades occupies a special position; A comprehensive analytical review of risk and protective factors showed that the presence of drug users is one of the strongest factors associated with adolescent drug use, within an integrated network of risk factors that also includes a weak social bond with traditional institutions (family and school)³⁷.

A careful analytical study of influence processes also showed that the influence of companions works mainly through the mechanism of direct modeling, especially in the stage of initial initiation into abuse, where the adolescent tends to imitate the behavior of his closest companion at school, while the influence of parents remains more influential indirectly through their general tendencies towards abuse rather than through direct modeling of specific behavior³⁸.

These data intersect to show that the influence of the Comrades group, from a sociological angle, should not be isolated from its broader social and economic context. The adolescent's desire to belong and be accepted within his group, and peer pressure to try or imitate drug use, interact with neighborhood conditions and the family's economic situation in determining the type of buddy networks already available to the adolescent and the type of behavioral models to which he is likely to be exposed within them. Thus, the peer group constitutes the most direct link between the general social and economic environment on the one hand, and the adolescent's individual behavior toward drugs on the other hand.

Based on what we have discussed, it is clear from the above that adolescent drug use cannot be reduced to one single factor, whether it is family, school, cultural-media, or socio-economic. Rather, it is a multi-factor phenomenon in which these four axes interact with each other: a weak family bond may weaken the supervisory function of the school itself when the adolescent lacks someone to follow his academic path; Poor school integration may lead him to spend more time in peer networks that are less committed to traditional norms. These same comradely networks are partly formed within a specific social and economic environment, and in turn mediate the cultural, media and digital content that reaches the adolescent or is drawn from it. If this interactive reading of the factors is necessary to understand the phenomenon, it in turn calls for a sociological theoretical approach capable of explaining the mechanisms of this interaction in an organized manner, which is what the next element of this article is devoted to, entitled "Sociological Explanations of Adolescent Drug Abuse."

Sixth: Socialization mechanisms in preventing drug abuse among adolescents:

Socialization does not function as a protective mechanism against drug abuse in adolescents through one homogeneous process, but rather through the interaction of a set of sub-mechanisms shared by the family, school, peer group, and the broader social environment. Primary socialization theory assumes that both normative and deviant behaviors, including drug abuse, are learned behaviors that are acquired primarily through interaction with sources of primary socialization. This makes prevention the result of the accumulation of several simultaneous social processes and not the result of a single facto.³⁹

1- Mechanism for transmitting social values and standards:

Socialization contributes to instilling a system of values and standards according to which socially acceptable behaviors are determined from others, so that the adolescent gradually internalizes the standards of social rejection of drug use as part of his normative identity and not just a rule imposed from the outside. The more the process of transmitting values is consistent between the family, school, and group of friends, the more internal convictions will be established in the adolescent that direct his behavioral choices toward healthy alternatives, thus reducing the possibility of him adopting abuse behavior even in the absence of direct supervision.

2- Mechanism for building social control and social control:

Socialization constitutes an informal control mechanism, as the cohesion of the social bond between the adolescent and the sources of his upbringing is linked to the degree of his behavioral discipline. According to the theory of social control, the individual's inclination to deviant behavior becomes stronger the stronger his attachment to his parents, his commitment to traditional goals, and his engagement in legitimate activities, because the weakness of these ties makes the individual lose the incentive to take into account the opinion of others and expect their disapproval. The scope of this control expands to include the school and the broader community environment⁴⁰ 'So that the upbringing institutions work together as an interconnected control network that limits the opportunities for the adolescent to engage in substance abuse behaviors.⁴¹

3- Learning mechanism and social modeling:

Adolescents learn their behavior patterns largely through observation, imitation, and interaction with those around them, according to social learning theory.⁴² Which attributes the acquisition of behavior to modeling the actions that the individual sees with significant models in his surroundings and the social reinforcement he receives for them. When the adolescent is presented with positive behavioral models within the family and school that reject abuse, the likelihood of him imitating them increases, while his interaction with groups of companions that adopt deviant behaviors makes these groups an alternative source of learning that weakens the effect of positive modeling⁴³.

4- Mechanism of communication, dialogue and social support:

Family communication based on dialogue and trust is a functional element in socialization, as studies that address the processes of family and companionship socialization show⁴⁴ The quality of interaction between the adolescent and his parents is not merely the formal presence of the family, but rather is what mediates the influence of other factors on substance abuse behavior. Open dialogue gives the adolescent a channel to express his pressures without resorting to harmful alternatives, while social support from the family and school provides psychological and social resources that help the adolescent confront situations that may push him toward abuse, especially in moments of peer pressure.

5- The mechanism of forming positive social choices:

Socialization contributes to directing the adolescent towards belonging to comrade groups and positive social, sporting and cultural activities, which is explanatorily linked to the strength of the family bond itself. As Hershey explained⁴⁵ The teenager's high attachment to his parents is associated with his tendency to associate with companions who in turn have a similar family attachment, which limits his chances of being attracted to groups that adopt substance abuse behavior. Thus, upbringing works to narrow the margin of deviant choices by directing the adolescent's own network of relationships, not just by directly preventing him from using.

It is clear from the above that the prevention of drug abuse in adolescents is not achieved through a single mechanism of socialization, but rather through the overlay of mechanisms for transmitting values, social control, learning, communication, and forming social choices, such that their interaction within the family, school, group of comrades, and social environment produces a multi-source protection network whose effectiveness is difficult to determine through a single variable.

Seventh: General conclusions:

Through what we discussed in this scientific study, we reached a set of conclusions and conclusions, the most important of which are as follows:

- It is confirmed through theoretical analysis that drug abuse among adolescents is a complex social phenomenon whose explanation is intertwined with individual, family, school, and cultural factors, which denies the possibility of attributing it to a single cause or isolated variable, and calls for approaching it within a comprehensive perspective that takes into account the intertwining of these dimensions.
- Socialization occupies a pivotal position in shaping the adolescent's personality, values, standards, and attitudes, as it is the process through which he acquires his first behavioral preparations toward himself and his surroundings, including his attitudes toward the subject of drugs before actually confronting opportunities to abuse.
- Nurturing institutions (family, school, peer group, media) differ in the nature of their contribution to building social protection for the adolescent, but their preventive effectiveness depends primarily on the extent of integration and harmony in the value and normative messages they issue, not on their mere formal presence in the adolescent's life.
- Socialization mechanisms - especially learning by modeling, social interaction, informal control, incorporation of values, reinforcement, guidance and monitoring, formation of moral conscience, acquisition of roles and formation of attitudes - work in two opposite directions: they constitute "when they convey contents compatible with social standards, an effective protective support that fortifies the adolescent." While it can "when it conveys content that is tolerant or encourages abuse, it can become a channel for learning and acquiring this behavior".
- It is ensured that informal social control, integrated self-monitoring, and the clarity of the adolescent's social roles together constitute an internal and external line of defense that operates continuously, so that it remains effective even in the absence of direct supervision, which explains the variation among adolescents in the degree of their resistance to the temptation to abuse despite their exposure to relatively similar social conditions.
- The analysis concludes that the preventive effectiveness of socialization is not achieved by a single institution or mechanism alone, but rather by virtue of the integration and harmony between the various components of the socialization process - its institutions, mechanisms, and value contents - such that this integration constitutes a necessary condition for building stable and effective social prevention among adolescents.

Conclusion:

The sociological treatment addressed in this article reveals that drug abuse among adolescents cannot be reduced to a one-dimensional explanation that links it to a deviant individual will or a psychological defect isolated from its social context. Rather, it is a complex social phenomenon in which multiple structural, relational, and symbolic dimensions intersect. The analysis showed that the path of the adolescent's slide towards abuse, or on the contrary, his path towards conformity

with prevailing social standards, is not determined in isolation from the long and continuous process of socialization that he has been going through since childhood, which is shaped through multiple institutions (family, school, peer group, media and digital space), and is actually translated through precise mechanisms (learning and modeling, social interaction, informal control, integration of values, reinforcement, guidance and control, formation of conscience, acquisition of roles, and formation of... directions).

By combining the level of explanatory theories, the level of institutions that embrace upbringing, and the level of mechanisms through which this upbringing operates, the article was able to provide an integrated reading of the position of socialization as a pivotal preventive variable, not as a marginal or secondary factor in explaining the phenomenon of abuse. When upbringing is characterized by cohesion and consistency between its various components, it produces in the adolescent a system of values, standards, and self-control that protects him against the temptations of abuse. While its fragility or contradiction in its messages opens realistic gaps through which upbringing itself can be transformed, through some of its mechanisms, into a channel for learning deviant behavior instead of preventing it, and this is what gives the sociological approach adopted in this article its scientific value, as it goes beyond a unilateral view of the phenomenon towards a dynamic understanding that links the individual to his social structure through the process of upbringing in all its complexities.

Through what we discussed in this scientific study, we decided to present a set of suggestions and recommendations, the most important of which are as follows:

- Activating the role of the family in practicing balanced socialization that combines monitoring and guidance on the one hand, and emotional warmth and dialogue on the other hand, in a way that enhances its ability to monitor the adolescent's behavior and the environment of his relationships without falling into excessive domineering or leniency.
- Supporting the school in performing its upbringing function in addition to its educational function, through educational programs concerned with building value standards and enhancing self-control among students, not limited to news awareness of the dangers of drugs.
- Paying attention to the role of the peer group as an alternative space for acquiring roles and social recognition, by encouraging directed group activities (sports, cultural, volunteer) that provide the adolescent with legitimate alternatives to satisfy his need for belonging and appreciation.
- Working to achieve harmony between the value messages issued by various upbringing institutions (family, school, media), considering that the conflict of these messages weakens the integration of preventive standards among adolescents and confuses the formation of his attitudes.
- Design community prevention programs specifically aimed at strengthening positive upbringing mechanisms - such as strengthening family ties, training parents and educators on effective monitoring methods, and enhancing self-control skills among adolescents - instead of being limited to general awareness campaigns.
- Involving actors concerned with combating drugs (associations, health and educational bodies, social workers) in developing integrated preventive concepts that take into account

the sociological approach to socialization, and not being limited to injunctive or therapeutic approaches subsequent to the occurrence of abuse.

We decided to present a set of suggestions that we believe will have a positive impact from various future scientific research that could address the same topic:

- Conducting field studies that test the relationship between patterns of family upbringing and its various mechanisms (monitoring, reinforcement, integration of values) and the level of adolescents' exposure to drug abuse, allowing the theoretical assumptions presented by this article to be evaluated in specific social and cultural contexts.
- Studying the effect of the contradiction between the messages of different upbringing institutions (conflicting family discourse with peer group practices or digital media content) on the stability of adolescents' prior attitudes toward drugs.
- Evaluating the effectiveness of preventive programs that are actually based on strengthening positive upbringing mechanisms (such as parent training programs on effective monitoring), to measure the extent to which theoretical frameworks are translated into tangible preventive results on the ground.

List of Sources and References:

- Albert Bandura, *Social Learning Theory*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, USA, 1977.
- Khaled Zahzah, "Institutions of socialization and their role in protecting the school environment from the scourge of drugs," *Journal of Social Sciences*, Ammar Thilighi University of Laghouat, Laghouat, Algeria, Volume 19, Issue 2, 2025.
- Fatiha Zardani, "The role of family disintegration in adolescent girls' tendency toward drug abuse : a field study at the Ben Achour Re-Education Center - Blida," *Journal of Studies in the Psychology of Deviance*, University of Blida 2 Lounici Ali, Blida, Algeria, Volume 8, Issue 1, 2023.
- Albert Bandura, *Social Learning Theory*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs NJ, USA, 1977, pp22–29.
- Alison L. Bryant et al., "How Academic Achievement, Attitudes, and Behaviors Relate to the Course of Substance Use During Adolescence: A 6-Year, Multiwave National Longitudinal Study," *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, Society for Research on Adolescence, Oxford, United Kingdom, vol. 13, no. 3, 2003, pp. 361–397.
- American Psychiatric Association, *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 5th ed, American Psychiatric Publishing, Washington DC, 2013.
- Curtis, Brenda L., Samantha J. Lookatch, Danielle E. Ramo, James R. McKay, Richard S. Feinn, and Henry R. Kranzler. "Meta-Analysis of the Association of Alcohol-Related Social Media Use with Alcohol Consumption and Alcohol-Related Problems in Adolescents and Young Adults." *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 42, no. 6 (2018): 978–986. Wiley, Hoboken, New Jersey, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.13642>.
- Denise B. Kandel and Kenneth Andrews, *Processes of Adolescent Socialization by Parents and Peers*, *The International Journal of the Addictions*, Marcel Dekker, New York, United States, vol 22, no 4, 1987.

- Dennis H. Wrong, *The Oversocialized Conception of Man in Modern Sociology*, American Sociological Review, American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C, USA, Volume 26, Issue No 2, 1961.
- Émile Durkheim, *Education and Sociology*, trans "Sherwood D. Fox", the Free Press, Glencoe IL, USA, 1956.
- Erik H Erikson, *Identity: Youth and Crisis*, W. W. Norton & Company, New York, USA, 1968.
- Eugene R. Oetting and Fred Beauvais, *Peer Cluster Theory, Socialization Characteristics, and Adolescent Drug Use: A Path Analysis*, *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, United States, vol 34, 1987.
- Eugene R. Oetting and Joseph F. Donnermeyer, *Primary Socialization Theory: The Etiology of Drug Use and Deviance. I*, *Substance Use & Misuse*, Marcel Dekker, New York, United States, vol. 33, no. 4, 1998, pp. 995–1026.
- Eugene R. Oetting, Joseph F. Donnermeyer, and Jerry L. Deffenbacher, “Primary Socialization Theory: The Influence of the Community on Drug Use and Deviance. III,” *Substance Use & Misuse*, Marcel Dekker, New York, United States, vol 33, no 8, 1998.
- Giddens, Anthony, and Philip W. Sutton. *Sociology*. 6th ed. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009.
- Gilbert J. Botvin and Kenneth W. Griffin, "Life Skills Training: Empirical Findings and Future Directions," *Journal of Primary Prevention*, Springer Science+Business Media, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, Volume 25, Issue No 2, 2004.
- Grace M. Barnes and Michael P. Farrell, “Parental Support and Control as Predictors of Adolescent Drinking, Delinquency, and Related Problem Behaviors,” *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, National Council on Family Relations, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States, vol. 54, no. 4, 1992.
- Hawkins, J. David, Richard F. Catalano, and Janet Y. Miller. “Risk and Protective Factors for Alcohol and Other Drug Problems in Adolescence and Early Adulthood: Implications for Substance Abuse Prevention.” *Psychological Bulletin* 112, no. 1 (1992): 64–105. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, United States. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.64>.
- Joan E Grusec and Paul D Hastings, *Handbook of Socialization: Theory and Research*, The Guilford Press, New York, USA, 2007.
- Karriker-Jaffe, Katherine J. “Areas of Disadvantage: A Systematic Review of Effects of Area-Level Socioeconomic Status on Substance Use Outcomes.” *Drug and Alcohol Review* 30, no. 1 (2011): 84–95. Wiley, Hoboken, New Jersey, United States. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-3362.2010.00191.x>.
- Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Anchor Books, New York, USA, 1966.
- Ronald L. Akers, *Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach*, Wadsworth, Belmont, California, United States, 1977.
- Talcott Parsons, *The Social System*, the Free Press, Glencoe IL, USA, 1951, chap 6.
- Travis Hirschi, *Causes of Delinquency*, University of California Press, Berkeley, California, United States, 1969.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and World Health Organization, *International Standards on Drug Use Prevention*, 2nd updated ed, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

and World Health Organization, Vienna, USA, 2018, p 13, accessed August 27, 2026, https://www.unodc.org/documents/prevention/UNODC-WHO_2018_prevention_standards_E.pdf.

- Urie Bronfenbrenner, *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.MA, USA, 1979.
- World Health Organization, *Lexicon of Alcohol and Drug Terms*, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 1994.
- World Health Organization, Regional Office for South-East Asia, "Adolescent Health," accessed August 2026, <https://www.who.int/southeastasia/health-topics/adolescent-health>.
- Albert Bandura, Dorothea Ross, and Sheila A. Ross, "Transmission of Aggression through Imitation of Aggressive Models," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 63, no. 3 (1961): 575–582.
- Michael R. Gottfredson and Travis Hirschi, *A General Theory of Crime*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, United States, 1990, pp. 85–120.
- Ronald L. Akers, *Social Learning and Social Structure: A General Theory of Crime and Deviance*, Northeastern University Press, Boston, United States, 1998, pp 50–68.
- Travis Hirschi, *Causes of Delinquency*, University of California Press, Berkeley, California, United States, 1969, p178.

Bibliography

¹ Giddens, Anthony, and Philip W. Sutton. *Sociology*. 6th ed. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009, p. 284.

² Émile Durkheim, *Education and Sociology*, trans "Sherwood D. Fox", the Free Press, Glencoe IL, USA, 1956, p71.

³ Talcott Parsons, *the Social System*, the Free Press, Glencoe IL, USA, 1951, chap 6.

⁴ World Health Organization, Regional Office for South-East Asia, "Adolescent Health," accessed August 2026, <https://www.who.int/southeastasia/health-topics/adolescent-health>.

⁵ Erik H Erikson, *Identity: Youth and Crisis*, W. W. Norton & Company, New York, USA, 1968, pp128–135.

⁶ World Health Organization, *Lexicon of Alcohol and Drug Terms*, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 1994, pp 6-15.

⁷ American Psychiatric Association, *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 5th ed, American Psychiatric Publishing, Washington DC, 2013, p483.

⁸ United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and World Health Organization, *International Standards on Drug Use Prevention*, 2nd updated ed, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and World Health Organization, Vienna, USA, 2018, p 13, accessed August 27, 2026, https://www.unodc.org/documents/prevention/UNODC-WHO_2018_prevention_standards_E.pdf.

⁹ *Ibid*, pp20–22

¹⁰ Gilbert J. Botvin and Kenneth W. Griffin, "Life Skills Training: Empirical Findings and Future Directions," *Journal of Primary Prevention*, Springer Science+Business Media, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, Volume 25, Issue No 2, 2004, pp211–232.

¹¹ Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Anchor Books, New York, USA, 1966, pp129–147.

¹² Albert Bandura, *Social Learning Theory*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs NJ, USA, 1977, pp22–29.

-
- ¹³ Urie Bronfenbrenner, *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 1979, pp3–15.
- ¹⁴ Joan E Grusec and Paul D Hastings, *Handbook of Socialization: Theory and Research*, The Guilford Press, New York, USA, 2007, pp1–12.
- ¹⁵ Khaled Zahzah, “Institutions of socialization and their role in protecting the school environment from the scourge of drugs,” *Journal of Social Sciences*, Ammar Thilliji University of Laghouat, Laghouat, Algeria, Volume 19, Issue 2, 2025, p. 82–97.
- ¹⁶ Fatiha Zardani, “The role of family disintegration in adolescent girls’ tendency toward drug abuse: A field study at the Ben Achour Re-Education Center - Blida,” *Journal of Studies in the Psychology of Deviance*, University of Blida 2 Lounissi Ali, Blida, Algeria, Volume 8, Issue 1, 2023, p. 215–226.
- ¹⁷ J. David Hawkins, Richard F. Catalano, and Janet Y. Miller, “Risk and Protective Factors for Alcohol and Other Drug Problems in Adolescence and Early Adulthood: Implications for Substance Abuse Prevention,” *Psychological Bulletin*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, United States, vol. 112, no. 1, 1992, pp. 64–105.
- ¹⁸ Denise B. Kandel and Kenneth Andrews, “Processes of Adolescent Socialization by Parents and Peers,” *The International Journal of the Addictions*, Marcel Dekker, New York, United States, vol. 22, no. 4, 1987, pp. 319–342.
- ¹⁹ Émile Durkheim, *op.cit*, p71.
- ²⁰ *Ibid*, pp 89–92.
- ²¹ Talcott Parsons, , *op.cit*, 205.
- ²² Dennis H. Wrong, "The Oversocialized Conception of Man in Modern Sociology," *American Sociological Review*, American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C, USA, Volume 26, Issue No 2, 1961, p 183.
- ²³ Albert Bandura, *Social Learning Theory*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, USA, 1977, p. 12.
- ²⁴ Bandura, *op.cit* 116–120.
- ²⁵ Ronald L. Akers, *Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach*, Wadsworth, Belmont, California, United States, 1977, pp. 39–68.
- ²⁶ Ronald L. Akers, *Social Learning and Social Structure: A General Theory of Crime and Deviance*, Northeastern University Press, Boston, United States, 1998, pp 50–68.
- ²⁷ Albert Bandura, Dorothea Ross, and Sheila A. Ross, “Transmission of Aggression through Imitation of Aggressive Models,” *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 63, no. 3 (1961): 575–582.
- ²⁸ Travis Hirschi, *Causes of Delinquency*, University of California Press, Berkeley, California, United States, 1969, p. 16.
- ²⁹ Hirschi, *op.cit*, p 16.
- ³⁰ Michael R. Gottfredson and Travis Hirschi, *A General Theory of Crime*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, United States, 1990, pp. 85–120.
- ³¹ Grace M. Barnes and Michael P. Farrell, “Parental Support and Control as Predictors of Adolescent Drinking, Delinquency, and Related Problem Behaviors,” *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, National Council on Family Relations, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States, vol. 54, no. 4, 1992, pp. 763–776.
- ³² Fatiha Zardani, previous reference, p. 215.
- ³³ Grace M. Barnes and Michael P. Farrell, “Parental Support and Control as Predictors of Adolescent Drinking, Delinquency, and Related Problem Behaviors,” *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, National Council on Family Relations, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States, vol. 54, no. 4, 1992, pp. 763–776.

-
- ³⁴ Alison L. Bryant et al., "How Academic Achievement, Attitudes, and Behaviors Relate to the Course of Substance Use During Adolescence: A 6-Year, Multiwave National Longitudinal Study," *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, Society for Research on Adolescence, Oxford, United Kingdom, vol. 13, no. 3, 2003, pp. 361–397.
- ³⁵ Brenda L. Curtis et al., "Meta-Analysis of the Association of Alcohol-Related Social Media Use with Alcohol Consumption and Alcohol-Related Problems in Adolescents and Young Adults," *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 42, no. 6 (2018): 978–986, <https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.13642>
- ³⁶ Katherine J. Karriker-Jaffe, "Areas of Disadvantage: A Systematic Review of Effects of Area-Level Socioeconomic Status on Substance Use Outcomes," *Drug and Alcohol Review* 30, no. 1 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-3362.2010.00191.x>, 95–84 :(2011)
- ³⁷ J. David Hawkins, Richard F. Catalano, and Janet Y. Miller, "Risk and Protective Factors for Alcohol and Other Drug Problems in Adolescence and Early Adulthood: Implications for Substance Abuse Prevention," *Psychological Bulletin*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, United States, vol. 112, no. 1, 1992, pp. 64–105.
- ³⁸ Denise B. Kandel and Kenneth Andrews, "Processes of Adolescent Socialization by Parents and Peers," *The International Journal of the Addictions*, Marcel Dekker, New York, United States, vol. 22, no. 4, 1987, pp. 319–342.
- ³⁹ Eugene R. Oetting and Joseph F. Donnermeyer, "Primary Socialization Theory: The Etiology of Drug Use and Deviance. I," *Substance Use & Misuse*, Marcel Dekker, New York, United States, vol. 33, no. 4, 1998, pp. 995–1026.
- ⁴⁰ Travis Hirschi, *Causes of Delinquency*, University of California Press, Berkeley, California, United States, 1969.
- ⁴¹ Eugene R. Oetting, Joseph F. Donnermeyer, and Jerry L. Deffenbacher, "Primary Socialization Theory: The Influence of the Community on Drug Use and Deviance. III," *Substance Use & Misuse*, Marcel Dekker, New York, United States, vol. 33, no. 8, 1998, pp. 1629–1665.
- ⁴² Albert Bandura, *Op. cit.*, p. 12.
- ⁴³ Eugene R. Oetting and Fred Beauvais, "Peer Cluster Theory, Socialization Characteristics, and Adolescent Drug Use: A Path Analysis," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, United States, vol. 34, 1987, pp. 205–213.
- ⁴⁴ Denise B. Kandel and Kenneth Andrews, "Processes of Adolescent Socialization by Parents and Peers," *The International Journal of the Addictions*, Marcel Dekker, New York, United States, vol. 22, 1987, pp 319–342.
- ⁴⁵ Travis Hirschi, *Causes of Delinquency*, University of California Press, Berkeley, California, United States, 1969, p178.