

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

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

* 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.

Abstract

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

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

1. Background

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Methods

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

2.1 Participants

Students were recruited via e-mail invitations⁴ and social media (LJMU/UNIFESP Facebook online groups and Twitter). The online invitation detailed the research aims and methods and provided a link to the online participant information sheet and questionnaire. In Brazil, 10,261 students accessed the link. Of 1,491 that completed the questionnaire, 340 were screened out (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.

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

2.2 Instrument and variable

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

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

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

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

2.3 Data analysis

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

3. Results

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

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

(Insert Table 1)

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

(Insert Table 2)

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

(Insert Table 3)

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

(Insert Table 4)

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

(Insert Table 5)

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

(Insert Table 6)

4. Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

4.1 Limitations

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

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

4.2 Conclusions

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

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

References

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cha, E. S., Kim, K. H., & Erlen, J. A. (2007). Translation of scales in cross-cultural research: 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), 1 460–1480.

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

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

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., Dankulincová, 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/alcac/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

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

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

The Licensing Act 2003 (c 17), 262 (2003).

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/17/contents>

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

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

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

Wells, S., Graham, K., & Purcell, J. (2009). Policy implications of the widespread practice of “pre-drinking” or “pre-gaming” before going to public drinking establishments: are current prevention strategies backfiring? *Addiction*, 104(1), 4–9. <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								
N	%	N	%	<i>p</i> value	N	%	N	%	<i>p</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value	
Age				0.093					0.211							
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				Reduce		Increase/No change								
	N	%	N	%	<i>p</i> value	N	%	N	%	<i>p</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value	
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			Reduce		Increase/No change								
N	%	N	%	<i>p</i> value	N	%	N	%	<i>p</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value	
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.