



LJMU Research Online

Santos, MGR, Sanchez, ZM, Hughes, K, Gee, I and Quigg, Z

The perceived impact that alcohol policy could have on Brazilian and British students' pre-drinking behaviour.

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/18807/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Santos, MGR, Sanchez, ZM, Hughes, K, Gee, I and Quigg, Z (2023) The perceived impact that alcohol policy could have on Brazilian and British students' pre-drinking behaviour. Addictive behaviors, 140. ISSN 0306-4603

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

1 **The perceived impact that alcohol policy could have on Brazilian and British students' pre-**
2 **drinking behaviour**

3

4

5

6

7 Mariana G. R. Santos^{*1,2}, Zila M. Sanchez², Karen Hughes³, Ivan Gee¹, and Zara Quigg¹

8

9

10

11

12

* Corresponding author:

Department of Preventive Medicine, Universidade Federal de São Paulo, R. Botucatu, 740, 4th Floor, São Paulo, Brazil, 04023-900. E-mail address: mgrsantos@unifesp.br (Mariana G. R. Santos)

¹ Public Health Institute, Liverpool John Moores University, 3rd Floor Exchange Station, Tithebarn St., Liverpool, UK, L2 2QP.

² Department of Preventive Medicine, Universidade Federal de São Paulo, R. Botucatu, 740, 4th Floor, São Paulo, Brazil, 04023-900.

³ School of Human Sciences, Bangor University, Wrexham Campus, Wrexham Technology Park, Croesnewydd Road, Wrexham, UK, LL13 7YP.

13 Abstract

14 Background: Evidence on how pre-drinking (i.e., drinking in private or in unlicensed
15 settings before going out) varies across cultures and its implications for defining policies and
16 prevention strategies is needed. We explored the perceived impact that various alcohol policies
17 could have on pre-drinking practices amongst Brazilian and British students that pre-drink.
18 Methods: A cross-sectional, online survey amongst student drinkers aged 18-29 in England
19 (N=387) and Brazil (N=1,048) explored sociodemographic, pre-drinking habits, and attitudes
20 towards alcohol policies (increasing prices, regulating availability, and restricting promotions).
21 Results: A greater proportion of British students were aged between 18-21 years old (67.2%) than
22 Brazilian students (45.2%; $p<0.001$). More British (ENG 85.8%) than Brazilian (BRA 44.8%,
23 $p<0.001$) students reported pre-drinking. Pre-drinkers' main motivation was to save money (BRA
24 66.5%, ENG 46.2%, $p<0.001$). In multivariate analyses, in Brazil, male (Odds Ratio [OR]: 1.53,
25 CI: 1.04–2.24) and white (OR: 1.60, CI: 1.03–2.49) pre-drinkers were more likely to believe that
26 increasing prices policies could reduce their pre-drinking habits. In Brazil, white pre-drinkers (OR:
27 1.86, CI: 1.10–3.15) were more likely to believe that restricting alcohol promotions policies could
28 reduce their pre-drinking habits. Regarding the perceived impact that the combined alcohol
29 policies could have on students' pre-drinking practice, only in Brazil there were significant
30 statistical results. Conclusions: Whilst in Brazil none of the investigated alcohol policies are
31 currently implemented, more Brazilian pre-drinkers believed that such legislation could reduce
32 their pre-drinking practices (when compared with British pre-drinkers). These data may help
33 legislators and stakeholders to better understand the characteristics of a more acceptable alcohol
34 policy amongst university students.

35 *Keywords:* Pre-drinking; Perceptions; Alcohol policy; Brazil; England.

36 **1. Background**

37 Alcohol is a leading risk factor for disease burden with harmful drinking responsible for
38 about 3 million deaths (5.3% of all deaths) in 2016 (World Health Organization, 2018). In Brazil,
39 evidence shows high levels of alcohol consumption amongst university students (Machado et al.,
40 2015; Pinheiro et al., 2017). Likewise, data suggests that young adults attending university in the
41 United Kingdom drink more alcohol than their non-student peers (Davoren et al., 2016; de Visser
42 et al., 2013). Amongst students, alcohol can affect academic performance, such as missing class,
43 falling behind, and having lower grades (Atwell et al., 2011; Santos et al., 2013; Wechsler et al.,
44 2002), and also increases exposure to other risky behaviours, such as drink driving, violence, road
45 traffic accidents (Cardoso et al., 2015), and use of other drugs (Castaldelli-Maia et al., 2014).

46 Pre-drinking is part of students' nightlife culture (Foster & Ferguson, 2014; Santos et al.,
47 2015). It refers to drinking in private or in unlicensed settings before going out to parties, bars, and
48 nightclubs (LaBrie & Pedersen, 2008; Pedersen & Labrie, 2007), and can be socially and
49 financially motivated (Read et al., 2010; Wells et al., 2009). Pre-drinking can significantly add to
50 alcohol consumption during a night out (Østergaard & Skov, 2014; Santos et al., 2015), resulting
51 in higher blood alcohol concentration (Barry et al., 2013), and thus contributing to further harm
52 (Caudwell & Hagger, 2014; Merrill et al., 2013).

53 In England, pre-drinking is widespread (Hughes et al., 2011; McClatchley et al., 2014). In
54 Brazil, however, this practice is still not well studied (Carlini et al., 2014; Santos et al., 2015).
55 Understanding university students' nightlife drinking patterns and the practices they engage in
56 (Griffin et al., 2009; Hughes et al., 2009; Hunt et al., 2014) is as important as understanding the
57 implications that alcohol can cause at individual and societal levels (Craigs et al., 2012; de Visser

58 et al., 2013). Gaining knowledge in students' drinking attitudes and beliefs could help creating
59 opportunities to change perceptions.

60 Preventing alcohol harms within nightlife settings is a growing global concern. England
61 has implemented interventions to protect the safety of nightlife patrons and to stop violence and
62 disorder, such as increasing awareness of legislation that prevent sales of alcohol to drunken people
63 and promoting responsible drinking (Quigg et al., 2014, 2018). Measures to deal with alcohol
64 content and information has also been introduced by implementing warning labels on alcohol
65 beverages related to alcohol units and the dangers of drinking during pregnancy (Blackwell et al.,
66 2018; Shemilt et al., 2017; Vasiljevic et al., 2018). Conversely, in Brazil there are no restrictions
67 on alcohol-selling venues (Carlini et al., 2014) and no laws to control the sale of alcohol to
68 inebriated people (Sanchez, 2017). This highlights the need for data on alcohol consumption and
69 policy-relevant behaviours particularly in Brazil where there is no well-established prevention
70 activity in place. Furthermore, international comparisons between countries and policies can help
71 determine how variations in social and cultural environment can influence drinking behaviours
72 (Kuntsche et al., 2014; Kuntsche & Labhart, 2012).

73 Alcohol policy actions can influence drinking patterns (Brand et al., 2007; Graham et al.,
74 2013; Middleton et al., 2010). The most effective ways to reduce alcohol harm are to increase the
75 price of alcohol, to restrict the physical availability of alcohol, and to make alcohol less attractive
76 (World Health Organization, 2010). These are considered as the "best buys" interventions for
77 preventing alcohol harm (Chisholm et al., 2018; World Health Organization, 2017). Understanding
78 the perceived impact of these policies on students' pre-drinking practice is important to preventing
79 this harmful drinking behaviour.

80 The cultural position of alcohol has been challenging policymakers as alcohol has become
81 more available (Room et al., 2005). In England and Brazil, the legal age for buying and drinking
82 alcohol is 18 years, and alcohol is easily available to purchase from off-licensed premises (e.g.,
83 supermarkets) at lower prices and from on-licensed premises (e.g., nightclubs, bars, and pubs)
84 (Carlini et al., 2014; Laranjeira, 2007; Wells et al., 2009). However, Brazil’s efforts to introduce
85 effective public policies on alcohol control have not been successful; and the few existing
86 evidence-based policies and laws focus on reducing drinking and driving issues, leaving a gap for
87 alcohol sales regulation policies, such as price and availability (de Oliveira et al., 2021). In
88 contrast, the UK alcohol policy is broader, focusing on the regulation of alcohol sales and
89 consumption (*The Licensing Act 2003 (c 17)*, 2003).

90 Though trends in alcohol consumption show decreasing drinking levels in the UK (Office
91 for National Statistics, 2018), drinking and drunkenness have been considered a normalised feature
92 of British students’ social nightlife (Gant & Terry, 2017; Hughes et al., 2019) often facilitated by
93 an environment that encourages alcohol consumption through the promotion of alcoholic drinks
94 (Ross-Houle & Quigg, 2019). In England, it is argued that changes that have occurred within
95 nightlife settings, such as deregulation, the dominance of alcohol promotions, and increased
96 density of drinking venues encouraged even more consumption amongst students, which has
97 contributed to a determined “culture of intoxication” when going out (Measham, 2006). Likewise,
98 in Brazil, despite alcohol advertising being regulated by law (*Bill N° 9.294 (15/07/1996) Regarding*
99 *Restrictions on the Use and Advertising of Tobacco Products, Alcohol, Medicines and Agricultural*
100 *Pesticides*, 1996), it is not effectively restricted (Babor et al., 2018; Noel et al., 2017; Sanchez,
101 2017). This lack of control can allow a more permissive environment for excessive drinking (Ally
102 et al., 2014; Purshouse et al., 2017) reinforcing the need for a better understanding of students’

103 drinking culture and its context-specific drinking for the development of effective, targeted
104 prevention and policy measures (e.g., banning alcohol discounts prices and combo promotional
105 nights so that students would not have access to cheap alcohol).

106 To develop effective alcohol policy strategies within different social norms context, we
107 must first understand the factors associated with students' drinking culture, such as their
108 motivations and expectancies, particularly in low-middle income countries like Brazil, where there
109 is a lack of epidemiological and sociological studies on alcohol policy. Thus, this study aims to
110 explore the factors associated with students' support for alcohol policies and the perceived impact
111 that alcohol policies could have on students' pre-drinking practice in Brazil and England.

112 **2. Methods**

113 A cross-sectional, online survey was conducted amongst university students who have
114 consumed alcohol, were 18+ years of age and enrolled at Liverpool John Moores University
115 (LJMU), in England, and at Federal University of São Paulo (UNIFESP), in Brazil, between March
116 and July 2017. Ethical approval was granted by both institutions' ethics committees (LJMU
117 16/CPH/005 and UNIFESP 1.845.314 CAAE: 61290216.3.0000.5505).

118 *2.1 Participants*

119 Students were recruited via e-mail invitations⁴ and social media (LJMU/UNIFESP
120 Facebook online groups and Twitter). The online invitation detailed the research aims and methods
121 and provided a link to the online participant information sheet and questionnaire. In Brazil, 10,261
122 students accessed the link. Of 1,491 that completed the questionnaire, 340 were screened out
123 (22.8%), which generated a final sample of 1,151 students (response rate of 14.5%). In the UK,

⁴ An estimated 12,896 e-mails were sent to Brazilian students and 860 to British students.

124 13,466 students accessed the survey. Of 493 that completed it, 69 were screened out (i.e., declared
125 they were abstainers) (14.0%), which generated a final sample of 424 students (response rate of
126 3.7%). More details on study design and sampling are described in Santos et al. (2022). For this
127 paper we restricted the analysis to participants aged 18-29 (N=1,435). Students aged 30+ were
128 excluded (N=140).

129 *2.2 Instrument and variable*

130 The research tool used in the survey was a questionnaire developed after an extensive
131 review of the literature and through a combination of existing measures. The questionnaire was
132 based on previous questionnaires used to study nightlife patrons in the UK (Hughes, Quigg, Bellis,
133 et al., 2011; Hughes, Quigg, Eckley, et al., 2011) and in Brazil (Santos, Paes, Sanudo, & Sanchez,
134 2015; Santos, Paes, Sanudo, Andreoni, et al., 2015). It was developed with assistance from the
135 supervisory team who had extensive experience in conducting survey research within nightlife
136 settings. It was produced in both English and Portuguese languages and, although the validity and
137 reliability of the measures from the current study were not tested, the items included in the survey
138 were thoroughly discussed with the supervisory team and tested in the pilot study with 10 students
139 who were invited to give qualitative feedback and to comment on the questionnaire to establish
140 face validity and improve reliability. Back-translation was used to ensure reliability and validity
141 in the translation process (Cha et al., 2007).

142 Questions explored participants' sociodemographic variables (e.g., age, gender, marital
143 status, ethnicity, and academic year), and pre-drinking characteristics. Pre-drinking was measured
144 by the response to "*Would you normally pre-drink before going out?*" with options of "*Yes*" and
145 "*No*." To facilitate interpretation of results regarding the main motivation for pre-drinking,
146 categories with low frequencies were grouped. More details about study motivation categories for

147 pre-drinking have been previously published (Santos et al., 2022). Social/conviviality motives
148 include “*part of going out,*” “*to socialize,*” and “*to feel like part of a group*”; fun/intoxication
149 motives include “*to not go out sober,*” “*to lose control,*” “*to deliberately get drunk,*” and “*to have*
150 *a good time*”; and interpersonal enhancement motives include “*to increase confidence,*” “*to*
151 *increase mood,*” “*to relax,*” and “*to reduce anxiety.*”

152 Aiming to measure students’ perceptions of the impact that alcohol policy would have on
153 their pre-drinking practice, participants were presented with a list of policy scenarios and asked to
154 respond to the statement “*My pre-drinking practice would,*” with the options of:
155 “*Reduce/Increase/No change.*” The following alcohol policy scenarios were investigated:
156 increasing prices policies (“*If alcohol price in on-licensed premises increased,*” “*If alcohol price*
157 *in off-licensed premises increased,*” “*If nightclubs, bars/pubs were prohibited to offer alcohol*
158 *discounts,*” and “*If nightclubs, bars/pubs offer cheaper soft drinks options*”); regulating alcohol
159 availability (“*If alcohol sales in off-licensed premises are restricted to designated time*”; “*If*
160 *alcohol sales in off-licensed premises are restricted to designated areas,*” “*If nightclubs, bars/pubs*
161 *closed by 2am,*” “*If nightclubs, bars/pubs did not serve alcohol for drunken people,*” and “*Active*
162 *enforcement of the ban on sales to drunken people in on and off-licensed premises*”); and
163 restricting alcohol promotions (“*If all alcohol promotions and advertising were prohibited*”). If
164 the answer was “*Reduce*” to each italicised question within an alcohol policy group, then it was
165 also “*Reduce*” for the overall alcohol policy variable (i.e., increasing prices, regulating availability,
166 and restricting promotions). The categories “*Increase*” and “*No change*” were grouped since our
167 interest is to understand the opinion about reduction.

168 2.3 Data analysis

169 Data were analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics 24. Frequency tables and descriptive
170 statistics were computed using Chi-Square tests to investigate the characteristics of pre-drinking
171 and students' perceived impact of alcohol policies on their pre-drinking practice for each country.
172 Multivariable logistic regressions (enter method) were built and stratified by country to explore
173 the differences regarding the factors associated with students' perceptions of reducing their pre-
174 drinking practice according to alcohol policy. All models were adjusted for demographic
175 covariates. Each alcohol policy was used as the dependent variable and the following independent
176 variables were analysed: age, gender, marital status, ethnicity, academic year, and pre-drinking
177 practice. The multinomial logistic regression allowed to investigate the associations between age,
178 gender, marital status, ethnicity, academic year, pre-drinking status, and a higher perception of
179 alcohol policies in reducing students' pre-drinking practice, in each country. The dependent
180 variable was the score for the perceived impact of alcohol policies by each participant. The answers
181 could vary from 0 to 3 (score), in which 0 represents those who believed that none of the
182 investigated alcohol policies could reduce their pre-drinking practice, and 1 to 3 the sum of the
183 investigated policies that students believed that could reduce their pre-drinking (1 those who
184 believed that only one of the three policies could reduce pre-drinking practice; 2 represents any
185 two policies; and 3 represents all three policies). The results are presented as odds ratios (OR) and
186 95% confidence intervals (95%CI).

187 3. Results

188 A greater proportion of British students (ENG) reported pre-drinking (85.8%) than
189 Brazilian students (BRA) (44.8.0%; $p < 0.001$). Further analyses were limited to these pre-drinking
190 participants (BRA N=469; ENG N=332). A greater proportion of British students were aged
191 between 18-21 years old (67.2%) than Brazilian students (45.2%; $p < 0.001$). Most participants were

192 women (BRA 54.8%, ENG 65.2%; $p=0.003$), self-categorised as being of white ethnicity (BRA
193 72.7%, ENG 90.7%; $p<0.001$), and undergraduate students (BRA 92.1%, ENG 81.6%; $p<0.001$).
194 Most Brazilian pre-drinkers were single (69.5%, compared with 47.3% in England, $p<0.001$). Pre-
195 drinkers' main motivation for pre-drinking was to save money (BRA 66.5%, ENG 46.2%;
196 $p<0.001$). More Brazilian pre-drinkers believed that increasing the price of alcohol (61.4%,
197 compared with 42.5% in England, $p<0.001$), regulating its availability (BRA 62.5%, compared
198 with 38.0% in England, $p<0.001$), and restricting its promotions (BRA 15.8%, compared with
199 10.5% in England, $p=0.033$) could reduce their pre-drinking practices. Considering all three
200 alcohol policies together, 21.7% of Brazilian pre-drinkers believed that none of the investigated
201 policies could reduce their pre-drinking practices (ENG 41.6%, $p<0.001$).

202 *(Insert Table 1)*

203 In Brazil, male (OR: 1.53, CI:1.04–2.24) and white pre-drinkers (OR: 1.60, CI:1.03–2.49)
204 were more likely to believe that increasing prices policies could reduce their pre-drinking
205 practices. In England, no statistically significant difference was observed.

206 *(Insert Table 2)*

207 Regarding students' perceived impact that restricting alcohol availability policies could
208 have on their pre-drinking practices, in both countries no statistically significant difference was
209 observed.

210 *(Insert Table 3)*

211 In Brazil, white pre-drinkers (OR: 1.86, CI:1.10–3.15) were more likely to believe that
212 restricting alcohol promotions policies could reduce their pre-drinking practices. In England no
213 statistically significant difference was observed.

214 *(Insert Table 4)*

215 Compared to Brazilian students who believed that none of the alcohol policies could reduce
216 their pre-drinking practice, in Brazil, white pre-drinkers (OR: 0.34, CI:0.16-0.71) were less likely
217 to believe that all three alcohol policies could reduce their pre-drinking practice. Also, Brazilian
218 male pre-drinkers (OR: 0.54, CI:0.31-0.91) were less likely to believe that at least one alcohol
219 policy could reduce pre-drinking.

220 *(Insert Table 5)*

221 No statistically significant difference was observed regarding British students' perceived
222 impact that all three alcohol policies could have on their pre-drinking practices.

223 *(Insert Table 6)*

224

225 **4. Discussion**

226 This study explores university students' perceptions of the impact that alcohol policy could
227 have on their pre-drinking behaviour in Brazil and England. To our knowledge, this is the first
228 study of its kind to research students' perspectives on pre-drinking and its association with alcohol
229 policy in countries that have different policies and regulations. One country has limited
230 implementation and scientific evidence on alcohol policy and nightlife, including pre-drinking
231 practices (Brazil), and the other has more research and relevant implementation of alcohol policy
232 (England). Although the samples cannot be considered representative, amongst drinkers our results
233 suggest higher prevalence of pre-drinking in England when compared with Brazil and that
234 individuals are often motivated by the higher cost of alcohol. Our study illustrates that in both
235 countries, many factors can influence students' pre-drinking behaviour. Furthermore, the results
236 suggests that Brazilian and British pre-drinkers have different opinions on the perceived impact
237 that the three alcohol policies could have in reducing their pre-drinking practices.

238 Previous studies suggest that Brazilian and British students' nightlife patrons can be at
239 increased risk of harmful drinking when pre-drinking (Hughes et al., 2008; Santos et al., 2015).
240 Although drinking patterns can be influenced by the culture of alcohol use (Gilligan et al., 2012;
241 Kuntsche et al., 2014), alcohol policy can also contribute to an individuals' drinking behaviour
242 (Brand et al., 2007; Paschall et al., 2012). Increasing the price of alcoholic beverages, restricting
243 the physical availability of alcoholic beverages, and restricting alcohol advertising are the three
244 "best buy" policies for preventing alcohol harm (World Health Organization, 2017), which could
245 be beneficial for the society as a whole by decreasing levels of alcohol burden, such as road traffic
246 injuries, violence, and crime (Chisholm et al., 2018).

247 In England, evidence suggests that alcohol is easily available for students in on- and off-
248 licensed premises and this can have a negative impact on their drinking behaviours (Quigg et al.,
249 2013). The Licensing Act 2003 (*The Licensing Act 2003 (c 17)*, 2003) makes licensed premises
250 responsible for refusing alcohol sales to drunk people to control violent behaviour and drunkenness
251 amongst nightlife patrons (Boyd et al., 2018; Farrimond et al., 2018). Whereas, in Brazil, selling
252 alcohol to drunk people seems to be rooted within the country's culture and there is no regulation
253 on this matter (Sanchez, 2017), highlighting the fact that effective responsible drinking initiatives
254 developed to change drinking behaviours in Brazil are still scant and need to be investigated.
255 Interestingly, the current results show that more Brazilian pre-drinkers (when compared with
256 British pre-drinkers) perceived that regulating alcohol availability could reduce their pre-drinking
257 levels. This gives supports for the Brazilian scenario to formally regulate alcohol sales and restrict
258 its availability in Brazil. However, the effectiveness of implementing such interventions would
259 depend on successful awareness campaigns to stimulate and raise public opinion, political

260 mobilisation, and commitment alongside bar owners and even media representatives training to
261 regulate the availability to alcohol.

262 Alcohol consumption can be reduced by making it less affordable (Cook et al., 2014; Hahn
263 et al., 2012). Current results corroborate previous studies in which pre-drinking is associated with
264 the consumption of cheaper alcohol (Østergaard & Andrade, 2013; Østergaard & Skov, 2014;
265 Wells et al., 2009). Nonetheless, the reasons to pre-drink go beyond finance (Barton & Husk, 2014;
266 Davies & Paltoglou, 2019). Our findings highlight the importance of economic influence and
267 developing stricter alcohol policy target at this population (Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009;
268 Lonsdale et al., 2012). Our results showed that, in Brazil, male and white pre-drinkers were more
269 likely to believe that implementing policies to increase prices could reduce their pre-drinking
270 practices, compared with England, where no associations were found with demographics. Notably,
271 the Brazilian alcohol market is not regulated and none of the “best buys” policies are implemented
272 in the country (Laranjeira, 2007). In the UK, the Scottish and Welsh governments have introduced
273 a minimum price per unit of alcohol, yet no such legislation has yet been introduced in England
274 (Anderson et al., 2021; O’Donnell et al., 2019). This is an interesting finding because policy
275 acceptance can be influenced by the cultural context and previous experience of a country with
276 alcohol legislation, i.e., England has more experience with implementing increasing prices
277 policies, regulating alcohol availability, and restricting alcohol promotions, yet British students
278 seem less likely to believe that implementing such policies could reduce their pre-drinking
279 practices (as opposed to the Brazilian scenario).

280 The context of alcohol use in British young adults’ social life seems to be market driven
281 through the spread of new alcoholic drinks and constant alcohol advertising associating drinking
282 with pleasure (Measham & Brain, 2005; Szmigin et al., 2008) which has been identified as a

283 influencing factor in students' drinking, including pre-drinking (Atkinson et al., 2017). The system
284 of self-regulation of alcohol marketing in Brazil and in England seems to be not effectively
285 restricted (Ross-Houle & Quigg, 2019; Sanchez, 2017). Our results on students' perceptions of
286 restricting alcohol promotions with reduced pre-drinking levels highlight the importance of
287 understanding the wider context of drinking (e.g., alcohol market) on students' pre-drinking, since
288 it plays an important role in supporting the normalised excessive drinking culture amongst students
289 (Griffin et al., 2009).

290 England has already introduced a mix of alcohol control-based policies aimed at better
291 managing nightlife drinking environments (including during pre-drinking practice) as well as
292 encouraging behaviour change (Quigg et al., 2022). Whilst in Brazil none of the "best-buys"
293 alcohol policies are currently implemented; more Brazilian pre-drinkers still believed that such
294 legislation could reduce their pre-drinking practices than when compared with British pre-drinkers.
295 More Brazilian qualitative studies on the populations' perceptions of alcohol policies options are
296 needed to provide key information for policy makers and local authorities to develop proper and
297 adapted interventions aimed at reducing harmful drinking and drunkenness during pre-drinking
298 practice (and consequently throughout the night), according to national priorities and contexts
299 (World Health Organization, 2010). Finally, it is important to acknowledge that understanding the
300 individuals' perceptions of alcohol policy and its effectiveness do not necessarily mean that
301 policies are effective.

302 **4.1 Limitations**

303 Limitations of this study include the low response rates. Online surveys are much less likely
304 to achieve responses rates as high as in-person or paper administrative surveys (Nulty, 2008).
305 Despite the lower rates, this study managed to achieve a large Brazilian sample, which was very

306 interesting because, unlike England, in Brazil it is not as common for students to receive invitations
307 for online research. The questionnaire was designed and adapted for both countries. Yet, since
308 Brazil and the UK have different nightlife structures (e.g., distinction between on- and off-licensed
309 premises), type of drinks, alcohol strengths, and serving sizes, findings regarding the perceived
310 impact that alcohol policy could have on Brazilian and British students' pre-drinking behaviour
311 may not be comparable and generalizable since there might have been some difficulties with
312 Brazilian students' interpretation of the survey. Furthermore, asking about people's alcohol
313 consumption can be a problem, especially when reporting socially or culturally "unacceptable"
314 behaviours (e.g., pre-drinking), because people tend to over- or under-estimate their alcohol
315 consumption (van de Mortel, 2008). To avoid that, the pilot study tested not only whether
316 interviewees understood the questions but also if they felt able to answer it. Moreover, the wording
317 and translation process were carefully thought to avoid judgmental questions. This study aimed to
318 gain understanding of university students' perceived impact that alcohol policy could have on their
319 pre-drinking practice. Thus, the current results add to the literature regarding students' alcohol use
320 and the possible influences in pre-drinking behaviour and its implication for policy and prevention.

321 **4.2 Conclusions**

322 Alcohol use amongst university students within nightlife settings (e.g., during pre-drinking
323 practice) is a multifaceted behaviour influenced by many factors. Also, alcohol policies and
324 interventions within nightlife contexts are important areas for practice and future research. Overall,
325 Brazilian pre-drinkers were more likely to believe that implementing the "best-buys" alcohol
326 policies could reduce their pre-drinking practices, when compared to British pre-drinkers.
327 Brazilian research aimed at understanding alcohol use within the nightlife context, including
328 during pre-drinking practice and its related harms (to develop effective policies and interventions)

329 is still scant. There is a lack of political (including financial support) and populational commitment
330 at both local and national level to develop and accelerate the application and control of existing
331 policies in Brazil. Therefore, to establish what lessons can be learned across different cultures for
332 addressing harmful drinking and drunkenness amongst students, particularly during pre-drinking
333 practice, further qualitative research aimed at exploring students' ways of drinking alongside
334 attitudes, beliefs, and (mis)perceptions is required to better understand how factors influencing
335 students' pre-drinking behaviour may vary across cultures.

336 **References**

- 337 Ally, A. K., Meng, Y., Chakraborty, R., Dobson, P. W., Seaton, J. S., Holmes, J., Angus, C.,
338 Guo, Y., Hill-McManus, D., Brennan, A., & Meier, P. S. (2014). Alcohol tax pass-through
339 across the product and price range: do retailers treat cheap alcohol differently? *Addiction*,
340 *109*(12), 1994–2002. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.12590>
- 341 Anderson, P., O'Donnell, A., Kaner, E., Llopis, E. J., Manthey, J., & Rehm, J. (2021). Impact of
342 minimum unit pricing on alcohol purchases in Scotland and Wales: controlled interrupted
343 time series analyses. *The Lancet Public Health*, *6*(8), e557–e565.
344 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(21\)00052-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00052-9)
- 345 Atkinson, A. M., Ross-Houle, K. M., Begley, E., & Sumnall, H. R. (2017). An exploration of
346 alcohol advertising on Social Networking Sites: An analysis of content, interactions and
347 young people's perspectives. *Addiction, Research and Theory*, *25*(2), 91–102.
348 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/16066359.2016.1202241>
- 349 Atwell, K., Abraham, C., & Duka, T. (2011). A parsimonious, integrative model of key
350 psychological correlates of UK university students' alcohol consumption. *Alcohol Alcohol*,

351 46(3), 253–260. <https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agr016>

352 Babor, T. F., Robaina, K., Brown, K., Noel, J., Cremonte, M., Pantani, D., Peltzer, R. I., &
353 Pinsky, I. (2018). Is the alcohol industry doing well by “doing good”? Findings from a
354 content analysis of the alcohol industry’s actions to reduce harmful drinking. *BMJ Open*,
355 8(10), e024325. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-024325>

356 Barry, A. E., Stellefson, M. L., Piazza-Gardner, A. K., Chaney, B. H., & Dodd, V. (2013). The
357 impact of pre-gaming on subsequent blood alcohol concentrations: an event-level analysis.
358 *Addict Behav*, 38(8), 2374–2377. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2013.03.014>

359 Barton, A., & Husk, K. (2014). “I don’t really like the pub [...]”: Reflections on young people
360 and pre-loading alcohol. *Drugs and Alcohol Today*, 14(2), 58–66.
361 <https://doi.org/10.1108/DAT-12-2013-0055>

362 *Bill N° 9.294 (15/07/1996) regarding restrictions on the use and advertising of tobacco products,*
363 *alcohol, medicines and agricultural pesticides, (1996).*
364 http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/LEIS/L9294.htm

365 Blackwell, A. K. M., Drax, K., Attwood, A. S., Munafò, M. R., & Maynard, O. M. (2018).
366 Informing drinkers: Can current UK alcohol labels be improved? *Drug Alcohol Depend*,
367 192, 163–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdp.2018.07.032>

368 Boyd, K. A., Farrimond, H. R., & Ralph, N. (2018). The impact of breathalysers on violence and
369 attitudes in the night-time economy. *European Journal of Criminology*, 1–23.

370 Brand, D. A., Saisana, M., Rynn, L. A., Pennoni, F., & Lowenfels, A. B. (2007). Comparative
371 analysis of alcohol control policies in 30 countries. *PLoS Med*, 4(4), e151.

372 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0040151>

373 Cardoso, F. M., Barbosa, H. A., Costa, F. M., Vieira, M. A., & Caldeira, A. P. (2015). Factors
374 associated with binge drinking practice amongst students from health department. *Rev*
375 *CEFAC*, *17*(2), 475–484.

376 Carlini, C., Andreoni, S., Martins, S. S., Benjamin, M., Sanudo, A., & Sanchez, Z. M. (2014).
377 Environmental characteristics associated with alcohol intoxication among patrons in
378 Brazilian nightclubs. *Drug Alcohol Rev*, *33*(4), 358–366. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dar.12155>

379 Carlini, C. M., & Sanchez, Z. M. (2018). Typology of Nightclubs in São Paulo, Brazil: Alcohol
380 and Illegal Drug Consumption, Sexual Behavior and Violence in the Venues. *Subst Use*
381 *Misuse*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2018.1435067>

382 Casswell, S., & Thamarangsi, T. (2009). Reducing harm from alcohol: call to action. *Lancet*,
383 *373*(9682), 2247–2257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(09\)60745-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60745-5)

384 Castaldelli-Maia, J. M., Martins, S. S., de Oliveira, L. G., van Laar, M., de Andrade, A. G., &
385 Nicastri, S. (2014). Use transition between illegal drugs among Brazilian university
386 students. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*, *49*(3), 385–394.
387 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-013-0748-1>

388 Caudwell, K. M., & Hagger, M. S. (2014). Pre-drinking and alcohol-related harm in
389 undergraduates: the influence of explicit motives and implicit alcohol identity. *J Behav*
390 *Med*, *37*(6), 1252–1262. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-014-9573-6>

391 Cha, E. S., Kim, K. H., & Erlen, J. A. (2007). Translation of scales in cross-cultural research:
392 issues and techniques. *J Adv Nurs*, *58*(4), 386–395. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365->

393 2648.2007.04242.x

- 394 Chisholm, D., Moro, D., Bertram, M., Pretorius, C., Gmel, G., Shield, K., & Rehm, J. (2018).
395 Are the “Best Buys” for Alcohol Control Still Valid? An Update on the Comparative Cost-
396 Effectiveness of Alcohol Control Strategies at the Global Level. *Journal of Studies on*
397 *Alcohol and Drugs*, 79(4), 514–522. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30079865/>
- 398 Cook, W. K., Bond, J., & Greenfield, T. K. (2014). Are alcohol policies associated with alcohol
399 consumption in low- and middle-income countries? *Addiction*, 109(7), 1081–1090.
400 <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.12571>
- 401 Craigs, C., Bewick, B., Gill, J., O’May, F., & Radley, D. (2012). UK student alcohol
402 consumption: a cluster analysis of drinking behaviour typologies. *Health Education*
403 *Journal*, 71(4), 516–526.
- 404 Davies, E. L., & Paltoglou, A. E. (2019). Public self-consciousness, pre-loading and drinking
405 harms among university students. *Subst Use Misuse*, 54(5), 747–757.
406 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2018.1536720>
- 407 Davoren, M. P., Demant, J., Shiely, F., & Perry, I. J. (2016). Alcohol consumption among
408 university students in Ireland and the United Kingdom from 2002 to 2014: a systematic
409 review. *BMC Public Health*, 16, 173. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-2843-1>
- 410 de Oliveira, C. W. L., Mendes, C. V., Kiepper, A., Monteiro, M. G., Wagner, G. A., & Sanchez,
411 Z. M. (2021). Analysis of gaps in alcohol policies in Brazil using the Pan American Health
412 Organization’s Alcohol Policy Scoring. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 97, 103322.
413 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2021.103322>

- 414 de Visser, R., Wheeler, Z., Abraham, C., & Smith, J. (2013). Drinking is our modern way of
415 bonding: young people's beliefs about interventions to encourage moderate drinking.
416 *Psychology & Health*, 28(12), 1460–1480.
- 417 Farrimond, H., Boyd, K., & Fleischer, D. (2018). Reconfiguring the violent encounter?
418 Preloading, security staff and breathalyser use in the night-time economy. *Int J Drug Policy*,
419 56, 108–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2018.03.008>
- 420 Foster, J. H., & Ferguson, C. (2014). Alcohol “Pre-loading”: A Review of the Literature. *Alcohol*
421 *Alcohol*, 49(2), 213–226. <https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agt135>
- 422 Gant, R., & Terry, P. (2017). Narrative of the night out: Student engagement in the night-time
423 economy of Kingston Upon Thames. *Local Economy*, 32(5), 467–481.
- 424 Gilligan, C., Kuntsche, E., & Gmel, G. (2012). Adolescent drinking patterns across countries:
425 associations with alcohol policies. *Alcohol Alcohol*, 47(6), 732–737.
426 <https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/ags083>
- 427 Graham, K., Miller, P., Chikritzhs, T., Bellis, M. A., Clapp, J. D., Hughes, K., Toomey, T. L., &
428 Wells, S. (2013). Reducing intoxication among bar patrons: some lessons from prevention
429 of drinking and driving. *Addiction*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.12247>
- 430 Griffin, C., Bengry-Howell, A., Hackley, C., Mistral, W., & Szmigin, I. (2009). Every Time I Do
431 It I Absolutely Annihilate Myself: Loss of (Self-)consciousness and Loss of Memory in
432 Young People's Drinking Narratives. *Sociology*, 43(3), 457–476.
433 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0038038509103201>
- 434 Hahn, R. A., Middleton, J. C., Elder, R., Brewer, R., Fielding, J., Naimi, T. S., Toomey, T. L.,

435 Chattopadhyay, S., Lawrence, B., & Campbell, C. A. (2012). Effects of alcohol retail
436 privatization on excessive alcohol consumption and related harms: a community guide
437 systematic review. *Am J Prev Med*, *42*(4), 418–427.
438 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2012.01.002>

439 Hughes, K., Anderson, Z., Bellis, M. A., Morleo, M., Jarman, I., & Lisboa, P. (2009). *Blood*
440 *Alcohol Levels and Drunkenness amongst People Visiting Nightlife in the North West*.
441 Centre for Public Health.

442 Hughes, K., Anderson, Z., Morleo, M., & Bellis, M. A. (2008). Alcohol, nightlife and violence:
443 The relative contributions of drinking before and during nights out to negative health and
444 criminal justice outcomes. *Addiction*, *103*(1), 60–65. <https://doi.org/ADD2030> [pii]
445 [10.1111/j.1360-0443.2007.02030.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2007.02030.x)

446 Hughes, K., Quigg, Z., Bellis, M. A., van Hasselt, N., Calafat, A., Kosir, M., Juan, M., Duch, M.,
447 & Voorham, L. (2011). Drinking behaviours and blood alcohol concentration in four
448 European drinking environments: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health*, *11*, 918.
449 <https://doi.org/1471-2458-11-918> [pii] [10.1186/1471-2458-11-918](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-11-918)

450 Hughes, K., Quigg, Z., Eckley, L., Bellis, M., Jones, L., Calafat, A., Kosir, M., & van Hasselt, N.
451 (2011). Environmental factors in drinking venues and alcohol-related harm: the evidence
452 base for European intervention. *Addiction*, *106 Suppl*, 37–46.
453 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2010.03316.x>

454 Hughes, K., Quigg, Z., Ford, K., & Bellis, M. A. (2019). Ideal, expected and perceived
455 descriptive norm drunkenness in UK nightlife environments: a cross-sectional study. *BMC*
456 *Public Health*, *19*(1), 442. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6802-5>

457 Hunt, G., Moloney, M., & Fazio, A. (2014). "A cool little buzz": alcohol intoxication in the
458 dance club scene. *Subst Use Misuse*, 49(8), 968–981.
459 <https://doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2013.852582>

460 Kuntsche, E., Gabhainn, S. N., Roberts, C., Windlin, B., Vieno, A., Bendtsen, P., Hublet, A.,
461 Tynjälä, J., Välimaa, R., Dankulinová, Z., Aasvee, K., Demetrovics, Z., Farkas, J., van der
462 Sluijs, W., de Matos, M. G., Mazur, J., & Wicki, M. (2014). Drinking motives and links to
463 alcohol use in 13 European countries. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs*, 75(3), 428–437.
464 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24766755>

465 Kuntsche, E., & Labhart, F. (2012). Investigating the drinking patterns of young people over the
466 course of the evening at weekends. *Drug Alcohol Depend*, 124(3), 319–324.
467 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2012.02.001>

468 LaBrie, J. W., & Pedersen, E. R. (2008). Prepartying promotes heightened risk in the college
469 environment: an event-level report. *Addict Behav*, 33(7), 955–959.
470 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2008.02.011>

471 Laranjeira, R. R. (2007). Brazil's market is unregulated. *BMJ*, 335(7623), 735.
472 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39360.432940.BE>

473 Lonsdale, A. J., Hardcastle, S. J., & Hagger, M. S. (2012). A minimum price per unit of alcohol:
474 a focus group study to investigate public opinion concerning UK government proposals to
475 introduce new price controls to curb alcohol consumption. *BMC Public Health*, 12, 1023.
476 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-12-1023>

477 Machado, J. N. S., Finelli, L. A. C., Jones, K. M., & Soares, W. D. (2015). Alcohol consumption
478 amongst Medical students. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa Em Ciências Da Saúde*

479 (RBP_eCS), 2(2), 46–51.

480 McClatchley, K., Shorter, G. W., & Chalmers, J. (2014). Deconstructing alcohol use on a night
481 out in England: promotions, preloading and consumption. *Drug Alcohol Rev*, 33(4), 367–
482 375. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dar.12150>

483 Measham, F. (2006). The new policy mix: alcohol, harm minimisation, and determined
484 drunkenness in contemporary society. *Int J Drug Policy*, 17, 258–268.

485 Measham, F., & Brain, K. (2005). 'Binge' drinking, British alcohol policy and the new culture of
486 intoxication. *Crimemedia Cult*, 1(3), 262–83.

487 Merrill, J. E., Vermont, L. N., Bachrach, R. L., & Read, J. P. (2013). Is the pregame to blame?
488 Event-level associations between pregaming and alcohol-related consequences. *J Stud*
489 *Alcohol Drugs*, 74(5), 757–764. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23948535>

490 Middleton, J. C., Hahn, R. A., Kuzara, J. L., Elder, R., Brewer, R., Chattopadhyay, S., Fielding,
491 J., Naimi, T. S., Toomey, T., & Lawrence, B. (2010). Effectiveness of policies maintaining
492 or restricting days of alcohol sales on excessive alcohol consumption and related harms. *Am*
493 *J Prev Med*, 39(6), 575–589. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2010.09.015>

494 Noel, J. K., Babor, T. F., & Robaina, K. (2017). Industry self-regulation of alcohol marketing: a
495 systematic review of content and exposure research. *Addiction*, 112(1), 28–50.

496 Nulty, D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be done?
497 *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(3), 301–314.

498 O'Donnell, A., Anderson, P., Jané-Llopis, E., Manthey, J., Kaner, E., & Rehm, J. (2019).
499 Immediate impact of minimum unit pricing on alcohol purchases in Scotland: controlled

500 interrupted time series analysis for 2015-18. *BMJ*, 366(15274).
501 <https://www.bmj.com/content/366/bmj.15274>

502 Office for National Statistics. (2018). *Adult drinking habits in Great Britain: 2017*. Home Office.

503 Østergaard, J., & Andrade, S. B. (2013). Who pre-drinks before a night out and why?
504 Socioeconomic status and motives behind young people's pre-drinking in the United
505 Kingdom. *Journal of Substance Use, Early Online*, 1–10.
506 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.3109/14659891.2013.784368>

507 Østergaard, J., & Skov, P. R. (2014). Do pre-drinkers consume more alcohol than non-pre-
508 drinkers on an event-specific night out? A cross-national panel mobile survey of young
509 people's drinking in England and Denmark. *Drug Alcohol Rev*, 33(4), 376–384.
510 <https://doi.org/10.1111/dar.12161>

511 Paschall, M. J., Grube, J. W., Thomas, S., Cannon, C., & Treffers, R. (2012). Relationships
512 between local enforcement, alcohol availability, drinking norms, and adolescent alcohol use
513 in 50 California cities. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs*, 73(4), 657–665.
514 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22630804>

515 Pedersen, E. R., & Labrie, J. (2007). Partying before the party: examining prepartying behavior
516 among college students. *J Am Coll Health*, 56(3), 237–245.
517 <https://doi.org/A20823601U510P18> [pii] 10.3200/JACH.56.3.237-246

518 Pinheiro, M. A., Torres, L. F., Bezerra, M. S., Cavalcante, R. C., Alencar, R. D., Donato, A. C.,
519 Campêlo, C. P. B., Gomes, I. P., Alencar, C. H., & Cavalcanti, L. P. G. (2017). Prevalence
520 and factors associated with alcohol and tobacco use amongst medical students in the
521 northeastern of Brazil. *Rev Bras Educ Med*, 41(2), 231–249.

522 Purshouse, R. C., Brennan, A., Moyo, D., Nicholls, J., & Norman, P. (2017). Typology and
523 Dynamics of Heavier Drinking Styles in Great Britain: 1978-2010. *Alcohol Alcohol*, 52(3),
524 372–381. <https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agw105>

525 Quigg, Z., Butler, N., Hughes, K., & Bellis, M. A. (2022). Effects of multi-component
526 programmes in preventing sales of alcohol to intoxicated patrons in nightlife settings in the
527 United Kingdom. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 15, 100422.
528 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.abrep.2022.100422>

529 Quigg, Z., Hughes, K., & Bellis, M. A. (2013). Student drinking patterns and blood alcohol
530 concentration on commercially organised pub crawls in the UK. *Addict Behav*, 38(12),
531 2924–2929. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2013.08.029>

532 Quigg, Z., Hughes, K., Bellis, M., van Hasselt, N., Calafat, A., Košir, M., Duch, M., Juan, M.,
533 Voorham, L., & Goossens, F. X. (2014). Incidents of harm in European drinking
534 environments and relationships with venue and customer characteristics. *The International
535 Journal Of Alcohol And Drug Research*, 3(4), 269–275.
536 <https://ijadr.org/index.php/ijadr/article/view/180>

537 Quigg, Z., Hughes, K., Butler, N., Ford, K., Canning, I., & Bellis, M. A. (2018). Drink Less
538 Enjoy More: effects of a multi-component intervention on improving adherence to, and
539 knowledge of, alcohol legislation in a UK nightlife setting. *Addiction*.
540 <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.14223>

541 Read, J. P., Merrill, J. E., & Bytschkow, K. (2010). Before the party starts: risk factors and
542 reasons for “pregaming” in college students. *J Am Coll Health*, 58(5), 461–472.
543 <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448480903540523>

544 Room, R., Babor, T., & Rehm, J. (2005). Alcohol and public health. *Lancet*, 365(9458), 519–
545 530. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(05\)17870-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)17870-2)

546 Ross-Houle, K., & Quigg, Z. (2019). Content, perceptions and impact of alcoholic drink
547 promotions in nightlife venues that are targeted towards students. *Addictive Behaviors*
548 *Reports*, 9, 100163. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352853218301743>

549 Sanchez, Z. M. (2017). Binge drinking among young Brazilians and the promotion of alcoholic
550 beverages: a Public Health concern. *Epidemiol Serv Saude*, 26(1), 195–198.
551 <https://doi.org/10.5123/S1679-49742017000100020>

552 Santos, M. G. R., Paes, A. T., Sanudo, A., Andreoni, S., & Sanchez, Z. M. (2015). Gender
553 Differences in Predrinking Behavior Among Nightclubs' Patrons. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*,
554 39(7), 1243–1252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.12756>

555 Santos, M. G. R., Paes, A. T., Sanudo, A., & Sanchez, Z. M. (2015). Factors Associated with
556 Pre-drinking Among Nightclub Patrons in the City of São Paulo. *Alcohol Alcohol*, 0, 1–8.
557 <https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agu055>

558 Santos, M. G. R., Sanchez, Z. M., Hughes, K., Gee, I., & Quigg, Z. (2022). Pre-drinking, alcohol
559 consumption and related harms amongst Brazilian and British university students. *PLOS*
560 *ONE*, 17(3), e0264842. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0264842>

561 Santos, M. V. F., Pereira, D. S., & Siqueira, M. M. (2013). Use of alcohol and tobacco amongst
562 students of psychology at the Federal University of Espírito Santo. *J Bras Psiquiatr*, 62(1),
563 22–30.

564 Shemilt, I., Hendry, V., & Marteau, T. M. (2017). What do we know about the effects of

565 exposure to “Low alcohol” and equivalent product labelling on the amounts of alcohol, food
566 and tobacco people select and consume? A systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 17(1),
567 29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3956-2>

568 Szmigin, I., Griffin, C., Mistral, W., Bengry-Howell, A., Weale, L., & Hackley, C. (2008). Re-
569 framing “binge drinking” as calculated hedonism: empirical evidence from the UK. *Int J*
570 *Drug Policy*, 19(5), 359–366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2007.08.009>

571 *The Licensing Act 2003 (c 17)*, 262 (2003).
572 <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/17/contents>

573 van de Mortel, T. F. (2008). Faking it: social desirability response bias in self-report research.
574 *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25(4), 40–48.

575 Vasiljevic, M., Couturier, D. L., & Marteau, T. M. (2018). Impact of low alcohol verbal
576 descriptors on perceived strength: An experimental study. *Br J Health Psychol*, 23(1), 38–
577 67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjhp.12273>

578 Wechsler, H., Lee, J. E., Kuo, M., Seibring, M., Nelson, T. F., & Lee, H. (2002). Trends in
579 college binge drinking during a period of increased prevention efforts. Findings from 4
580 Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study surveys: 1993-2001. *J Am Coll*
581 *Health*, 50(5), 203–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448480209595713>

582 Wells, S., Graham, K., & Purcell, J. (2009). Policy implications of the widespread practice of
583 “pre-drinking” or “pre-gaming” before going to public drinking establishments: are current
584 prevention strategies backfiring? *Addiction*, 104(1), 4–9. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2008.02393.x)
585 [0443.2008.02393.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2008.02393.x)

586 World Health Organization. (2010). *Global strategy to reduce the harmful use of alcohol*. World
587 Health Organization (WHO).

588 World Health Organization. (2017). *'Best Buys' and Other Recommended Interventions for the*
589 *Prevention and Control of Noncommunicable Diseases: Updated (2017) Appendix 3 of the*
590 *Global Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Noncommunicable Diseases 2013–*
591 *2020*.

592 World Health Organization. (2018). *Global status report on alcohol and health*. World Health
593 Organization (WHO).

594

Table 1.

Distribution of Brazilian (N=469) and British pre-drinkers' (N=332) sociodemographic characteristics and perceptions of the impact that alcohol policies could have on their pre-drinking practice.

	Settings				<i>p</i> value
	BRAZIL N=469		ENGLAND N=332		
	N	%	N	%	
Age (years)					<0.001
18-21	212	45.2	223	67.2	
22-29	257	54.8	109	32.8	
Gender					0.003
Male	211	45.2	113	34.8	
Female	256	54.8	212	65.2	
Marital status					<0.001
Single	326	69.5	157	47.3	
In a relationship	143	30.5	175	52.7	
Ethnic group					<0.001
White	341	72.7	301	90.7	
Other	128	27.3	31	9.3	
Academic year					<0.001
Undergraduate	432	92.1	271	81.6	
Post-graduate	37	7.9	61	18.4	
Pre-drinking main reason					<0.001
Social/conviviality	70	14.9	85	25.8	
Financial	312	66.5	152	46.2	
Fun/intoxication	67	14.3	67	20.4	
Interpersonal enhancement	20	4.3	25	7.6	
Students' perceptions of the impact that increasing pricing policies could have on their pre-drinking practice					<0.001
Reduce	288	61.4	141	42.5	
Increase/no change	181	38.6	191	57.5	
Students' perceptions of the impact that regulating alcohol availability could have on their pre-drinking practice					<0.001
Reduce	293	62.5	126	38.0	
Increase/no change	176	37.5	206	62.0	

Students' perceptions of the impact that restricting alcohol promotions could have on their pre-drinking practice					0.033
Reduce	74	15.8	35	10.5	
Increase/no change	395	84.2	297	89.5	
Students' perceptions of the impact that the combined* alcohol policies could have on their pre-drinking practice					<0.001
Believed that all three alcohol policies could reduce their pre-drinking practice	55	11.7	20	6.0	
Believed that two out of three policies could reduce their pre-drinking practice	178	38.0	68	20.5	
Believed that one of the policies could reduce their pre-drinking practice	134	28.6	106	31.9	
Believed that none of the policies could reduce their pre-drinking practice	102	21.7	138	41.6	

Note: *The policies were increasing prices, regulating alcohol availability, and restricting alcohol promotions

Table 2.

Factors associated with the different perceptions of the impact that *increasing prices policies* could have on Brazilian (N=469) and British students' (N=332) pre-drinking practices.

Settings																
Increasing prices policies																
Descriptive statistics										Logistic regression*						
BRAZIL N=469					ENGLAND N=332					BRAZIL N=469			ENGLAND N=332			
Reduce		Increase/No change			Reduce		Increase/No change			OR	95% CI	p value	OR	95% CI	p value	
N	%	N	%	p value	N	%	N	%	p value							
Age																
					0.093					0.211			0.212			
18-21	139	65.6	73	34.4			100	44.8	123	55.2	0.77	0.52 – 1.15	0.210	0.68	0.37 – 1.24	0.212
22-29 (ref)	149	58.0	108	42.0			41	37.6	68	62.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender					0.033					0.116						
Male	119	56.4	92	43.6			42	37.2	71	62.8	1.53	1.04 – 2.24	0.028	1.37	0.84 – 2.23	0.202
Female (ref)	169	66.0	87	34.0			98	46.2	114	53.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marital status					0.562					0.413						
Single	203	62.3	123	37.7			63	40.1	94	59.9	0.91	0.60 – 1.38	0.679	1.14	0.71 – 1.84	0.565
On a relationship (ref)	85	59.4	58	40.6			78	44.6	97	55.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethnic group					0.074					0.950						
White	201	58.9	140	41.1			128	42.5	173	57.5	1.60	1.03 – 2.49	0.035	1.05	0.48 – 2.29	0.889
Other (ref)	87	68.0	41	32.0			13	41.9	18	58.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Academic year					0.097					0.795						
Undergraduate	270	62.5	162	37.5			116	42.8	155	57.2	0.63	0.31 – 1.30	0.218	1.17	0.57 – 2.39	0.658
Post-graduate (ref)	18	48.6	19	51.4			25	41.0	36	59.0	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: reference for categories for each sociodemographic variable used in the regressions are identified with (ref). *Multiple logistic regression - reference is increase/no change.

Table 3.

Factors associated with the different perceptions of the impact that *regulating alcohol availability* could have on Brazilian (N=469) and British students' (N=332) pre-drinking practices.

	Settings															
	Regulating alcohol availability															
	Descriptive statistics										Logistic regression*					
	BRAZIL N=469					ENGLAND N=332					BRAZIL N=469			ENGLAND N=332		
	Reduce		Increase/No change		<i>p</i> value	Reduce		Increase/No change		<i>p</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%							
Age					0.509					0.076						
18-21	129	60.8	83	39.2		92	41.3	131	58.7		1.13	0.76 – 1.69	0.518	0.68	0.36 – 1.26	0.223
22-29 (ref)	164	63.8	93	36.2		34	31.2	75	68.8		-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender					0.691					0.592						
Male	134	63.5	77	36.5		45	39.8	68	60.2		0.95	0.65 – 1.39	0.798	0.90	0.55 – 1.48	0.696
Female (ref)	158	61.7	98	38.3		78	36.8	134	63.2		-	-	-	-	-	-
Marital status					0.189					0.146						
Single	210	64.4	116	35.6		66	42.0	91	58.0		0.76	0.50 – 1.15	0.201	0.78	0.48 – 1.27	0.331
On a relationship (ref)	83	58.0	60	42.0		60	34.3	115	35.7		-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethnic group					0.132					0.927						
White	206	60.4	135	39.6		114	37.9	187	62.1		1.40	0.91 – 2.17	0.124	1.00	0.45 – 2.20	0.994
Other (ref)	87	68.0	41	32.0		12	38.7	19	61.3		-	-	-	-	-	-
Academic year					0.968					0.358						
Undergraduate	270	62.5	162	37.5		106	39.1	165	60.9		1.03	0.49 – 2.15	0.937	1.06	0.50 – 2.23	0.868
Post-graduate (ref)	23	62.2	14	37.8		20	32.8	41	67.2		-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: reference for categories for each sociodemographic variable used in the regressions are identified with (ref). *Multiple logistic regression - reference is increase/no change.

Table 4.

Factors associated with the different perceptions of the impact that *restricting alcohol promotions* could have on Brazilian (N=469) and British students' (N=332) pre-drinking practices.

	Settings																			
	Restricting alcohol promotions																			
	Descriptive statistics					Logistic regression*														
	BRAZIL N=469					ENGLAND N=332					BRAZIL N=469			ENGLAND N=332						
Reduce		Increase/No change			<i>p</i> value	Reduce		Increase/No change			<i>p</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value			
N	%	N	%	N		%	N	%	N	%										
Age					0.366						0.566									
18-21	37	17.5	175	82.5		22	9.9	201	90.1		0.83	0.49 – 1.40	0.490	1.48	0.60 – 3.67	0.392				
22-29 (ref)	37	14.4	220	85.6		13	11.9	96	88.1		-	-	-	-	-	-				
Gender					0.715						0.415									
Male	32	15.2	179	84.8		10	8.8	103	91.2		1.14	0.68 – 1.90	0.599	1.57	0.70 – 3.51	0.264				
Female (ref)	42	16.4	214	83.6		25	11.8	187	88.2		-	-	-	-	-	-				
Marital status					0.126						0.381									
Single	57	17.5	269	82.5		19	12.1	138	87.9		0.64	0.35 – 1.16	0.148	0.60	0.28 – 1.27	0.186				
On a relationship (ref)	17	11.9	126	88.1		16	9.1	159	90.9		-	-	-	-	-	-				
Ethnic group					0.026						0.869									
White	46	13.5	295	86.5		32	10.6	269	89.4		1.86	1.10 – 3.15	0.020	0.79	0.22 – 2.84	0.722				
Other (ref)	28	21.9	100	78.1		3	9.7	28	90.3		-	-	-	-	-	-				
Academic year					0.694						0.793									
Undergraduate	69	16.0	363	84.0		28	10.3	243	89.7		0.95	0.34 – 2.66	0.925	0.91	0.31 – 2.69	0.876				
Post-graduate (ref)	5	13.5	32	86.5		7	11.5	54	88.5		-	-	-	-	-	-				

Note: reference for categories for each sociodemographic variable used in the regressions are identified with (ref). *Multiple logistic regression - reference is increase/no change.

Table 5.

Distribution and estimates from multinomial logistic regression for Brazilian pre-drinker's (N=469) sociodemographic characteristics and perceptions of reducing their pre-drinking practices according to combined alcohol policies*

	Perceived (combined) alcohol policies* that could reduce pre-drinking behaviour																	
	Descriptive statistics									Multinomial logistic regression*								
	BRAZIL N=469									BRAZIL N=469								
	None of the policies		One of the policies		Two of the three policies		All three policies		p value	One of the policies			Two of the three policies			All three policies		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	OR		95% CI	p value	OR	95% CI	p value	OR	95% CI	p value	
Age										0.772								
18-21	44	20.8	57	26.9	85	40.1	26	12.3		0.96	0.55 – 1.67	0.889	1.12	0.67 – 1.88	0.652	1.12	0.55 – 2.28	0.743
22-29 (ref)	58	22.6	77	30.0	93	36.2	29	11.3		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender										0.103								
Male	54	25.6	51	24.2	84	39.8	22	10.4		0.54	0.31 – 0.91	0.022	0.76	0.46 – 1.25	0.285	0.53	0.27 – 1.05	0.071
Female (ref)	47	18.4	82	32.0	94	36.7	33	12.9		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marital status										0.262								
Single	69	21.2	88	27.0	125	38.3	44	13.5		0.91	0.52 – 1.61	0.762	1.07	0.62 – 1.83	0.807	1.99	0.89 – 4.47	0.094
On a relationship (ref)	33	23.1	46	32.2	53	37.1	11	7.7		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethnic group										0.025								
White	79	23.2	102	29.9	129	37.8	31	9.1		0.90	0.48 – 1.69	0.756	0.71	0.40 – 1.27	0.256	0.34	0.16 – 0.71	0.004
Other (ref)	23	18.0	32	25.0	49	38.3	24	18.8		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Academic year										0.463								
Undergraduate	91	21.1	123	28.5	168	38.9	50	11.6		1.33	0.51 – 3.43	0.550	1.79	0.69 – 4.66	0.227	1.03	0.30 – 3.44	0.962
Post-graduate (ref)	11	29.7	11	29.7	10	27.0	5	13.5		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: The policies were increasing prices, regulating alcohol availability, and restricting alcohol promotions. Reference for categories for each sociodemographic variable used in the regressions are identified with (ref). For the multinomial logistic regression, the reference category is NONE of the policies could reduce pre-drinking.

Table 6.

Distribution and estimates from multinomial logistic regression for British pre-drinker's (N=332) sociodemographic characteristics and perceptions of reducing their pre-drinking practices according to combined alcohol policies*

	Perceived (combined) alcohol policies* that could reduce pre-drinking behaviour																	
	Descriptive statistics									Multinomial logistic regression*								
	ENGLAND N=332									ENGLAND N=332								
	None of the policies		One of the policies		Two of the three policies		All three policies		p value	One of the policies			Two of the three policies			All three policies		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	OR		95% CI	p value	OR	95% CI	p value	OR	95% CI	p value	
Age										0.120								
18-21	84	37.7	76	34.1	51	22.9	12	5.4		1.49	0.75 – 2.96	0.244	2.06	0.88 – 4.84	0.095	0.88	0.27 – 2.85	0.832
22-29 (ref)	54	49.5	30	27.5	17	15.6	8	7.3		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender										0.777								
Male	50	44.2	36	31.9	20	17.7	7	6.2		0.94	0.54 – 1.65	0.845	0.68	0.35 – 1.33	0.268	0.89	0.32 – 2.48	0.829
Female (ref)	84	39.6	68	32.1	47	22.2	13	6.1		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marital status										0.775								
Single	63	40.1	49	31.2	36	22.9	9	5.7		0.97	0.56 – 1.69	0.937	1.36	0.72 – 2.55	0.339	1.03	0.37 – 2.82	0.954
On a relationship (ref)	75	42.9	57	32.6	32	18.3	11	6.3		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethnic group										0.465								
White	123	40.9	100	33.2	60	19.9	18	6.0		1.91	0.70 – 5.25	0.206	0.90	0.35 – 2.34	0.843	1.11	0.22 – 5.53	0.895
Other (ref)	15	48.4	6	19.4	8	25.8	2	6.5		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Academic year										0.691								
Undergraduate	109	40.2	90	33.2	56	20.7	16	5.9		1.03	0.45 – 2.38	0.934	0.71	0.26 – 1.88	0.492	1.13	0.27 – 4.69	0.860
Post-graduate (ref)	29	47.5	16	26.2	12	19.7	4	6.6		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: The policies were increasing prices, regulating alcohol availability, and restricting alcohol promotions. Reference for categories for each sociodemographic variable used in the regressions are identified with (ref). For the multinomial logistic regression, the reference category is NONE of the policies could reduce pre-drinking.