

Age of First Use, Age of Habitual Use, and Problematic Alcohol Use: A Cross-Cultural
Examination among Young Adults in Seven Countries

Victoria O. Chentsova ¹

Adrian J. Bravo ^{1*}

Angelina Pilatti ²

Ricardo Pautassi ²

Laura Mezquita ³

Lee Hogarth ⁴

Cross-Cultural Addictions Study Team ⁵

* Corresponding Author:

Dr. Adrian J. Bravo

Business Address: 540 Landrum Drive, Williamsburg Virginia, 23185

Work Phone: +1 (757) 221-3881

Email: ajbravo@wm.edu

¹ Department of Psychological Sciences, William & Mary, Williamsburg, USA

² Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Facultad de Psicología, Instituto de Investigaciones Psicológicas, IIPsi, CONICET. Córdoba, Argentina

³ Department of Basic and Clinical Psychology and Psychobiology, Universitat Jaume I, Castelló de la Plana, Castellón, Spain

⁴ School of Psychology, University of Exeter, Exeter, United Kingdom.

⁵ This project was completed by the Cross-cultural Addictions Study Team (CAST), which includes the following investigators (in alphabetical order): Adrian J. Bravo, William & Mary (Coordinating PI); Christopher C. Conway, Fordham University; James M. Henson, Old Dominion University; Lee Hogarth, University of Exeter; Manuel I. Ibáñez, Universitat Jaume I de Castelló; Debra Kaminer, University of Cape Town; Matthew Keough, York University; Laura Mezquita, Universitat Jaume I de Castelló; Generós Ortet, Universitat Jaume I de Castelló; Matthew R. Pearson, University of New Mexico; Angelina Pilatti, National University of Córdoba; Mark A. Prince, Colorado State University; Jennifer P. Read, University of Buffalo; Hendrik G. Roozen, University of New Mexico; Paul Ruiz, Universidad de la República.

Role of Funding Sources:

Dr. Bravo was supported by a training grant (T32-AA018108) from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) in the United States during the duration of data

collection for this project. Data collection was supported, in part, by grant T32-AA018108. NIAAA had no role in the study design, collection, analysis or interpretation of the data, writing the manuscript, or the decision to submit the paper for publication. Data collection in Spain was also supported by grants UJI-A2019-08 from the Universitat Jaume I and RTI2018-099800-B-I00 from the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities (MCIU). Data collection in Argentina was also supported by grants from the National Secretary of Science and Technology (FONCYT, grant number PICT 2015-849) and by grants from the Secretary of Science and Technology- National University of Córdoba (SECyT-UNC).

Disclosures

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement:

Data and analytic outputs are available at <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/UG6D5>

Age of First Use, Age of Habitual Use, and Problematic Alcohol Use: A Cross-Cultural
Examination among Young Adults in Seven Countries

Abstract

Earlier age of alcohol use initiation has been consistently associated with later problematic alcohol use. However, it is unclear what aspect of early initiation is key for risk assessment and whether there are cultural differences. The present study examined relationships between Age of First Use (AFU) and Age of Habitual Use (AHU) on alcohol use behaviors across seven countries (USA, England, Argentina, Uruguay, Spain, Canada, South Africa). Participants were 5,336 college students reporting past month alcohol consumption. Participants provided information, via online survey, on AFU, AHU, and current drinking behaviors. Results demonstrated significant direct associations between Age variables and all outcomes, except for AHU to drinking frequency. Further, AFU demonstrated stronger associations with drinking frequency, while AHU was more strongly associated with AUDIT scores and negative consequences. A moderation effect of country was additionally discovered among several regression paths. These findings suggest AHU should receive greater focus in alcohol research.

Keywords: age of first use; age of first habitual use; alcohol; cross-cultural; young adults

Introduction

An early age of alcohol drinking onset has been associated with long-term problematic alcohol use, including development of an alcohol use disorder (AUD; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2021). This finding has driven public policy, such as enforcing restrictions on the purchase or consumption of alcohol, with the aim of delaying initiation of drinking. Despite these efforts, many individuals take their first sip of alcohol well before the legal age, with 39.7% of American individuals having their first drink between the ages of 12 – 20 (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2021). In another epidemiological study, 21.7% of 8th graders (12-14 years old), 34.7% of 10th graders (15-16 years old), and 54.1% of 12th graders (17-18 years old) reported ever having tried alcohol (Johnston et al., 2022); however, recent research bring into question using Age of First Use as a standard for predicting problematic alcohol use or AUD later in life (Morean et al., 2012; Maimaris & McCambridge, 2014, Sartor et al., 2016; del Valle Vera et al., 2020). Further complicating matters is the cultural context, as early initiation to drinking is defined differently across different cultures. The purpose of the present research is to address this question of early risk factors for problematic alcohol use by analyzing, across samples of college student drinkers from seven countries, the role of a potential alternative for predicting alcohol-related problems: *Age of Habitual Use* of alcohol.

Age of First Alcohol Use and Problematic Alcohol Use

There is a cultural notion backed by an abundance of literature establishing some relationship between age of first exposure to alcohol and alcohol use later in life (Pautassi et al., 2020, Buchmann et al., 2009; DeWit et al., 2000;). It is therefore no surprise that asking individuals to report their age of first exposure to alcohol has become standard in medical and research

contexts (Levy & Kokotailo, 2011). The measure, however, comes with several caveats that have problematized its use as a primary age-based risk factor of future problematic use (Kuntsche et al., 2016). For example, Age of First Use might describe an isolated event in the drinking trajectory of an individual. That is, someone who may have had their first exposure to alcohol at a young age may refrain from using the substance again for many years. Additionally, some literature has reported a weak association between Age of First Use and subsequent problematic alcohol use (Labouvie et al., 1997; Maimaris & McCambridge, 2014), introducing concerns over the number of other factors that may influence these associations (Sarvet & Hasin, 2016). For example, some research has found minimal association between Age of First Use and future drinking outcomes once you control for other relevant constructs (e.g., conduct problems, Rossow & Kuntsche, 2012).

Age of Habitual Use and Problematic Alcohol Use

Habitual substance use is not formally defined in the literature but has been examined and functionally contextualized in existing research (Hogarth, 2020; Newlin & Strubler, 2007). In the present research we will consider habitual use interchangeable with other terms (e.g., regular use) expressing reoccurring use to some degree (Puddey et al., 1987; Spoth et al., 2005; Voskoboinik et al., 2016). Though not as plentiful as research on age of first use, a relationship between early habitual use and various negative outcomes has been reported, including longitudinal associations with problematic substance use behaviors (Berchtold et al., 2011). Particularly in the context of problematic drinking, regular drinking has been theorized to contribute to an environment conducive to eventual AUD (Davis et al., 2020; Barker & Taylor, 2014). The research exploring the relationship between age of onset of habitual use and problematic substance use, let alone alcohol use, is however limited.

Cross-Cultural Perspectives

There is a wide variety of cut-offs for legally accepted drinking age across countries. For example, legal access to alcohol purchasing begins at 18 years old in Argentina and Spain, making habitual use beginning at 17 years old seem less dramatic than if such behavior is found in the USA, held to a 21 year old legal standard (See *Supplemental Table 1* for a description of the various alcohol policies among all the countries assessed in the present study). Even greater is the variability, both within and between countries, for what can be considered a “socially accepted” drinking age. In the USA it is culturally accepted for individuals to engage in regular drinking at college (Merrill & Carey, 2016), but not that much during adolescence. On the other hand, in environments outside of North America, while there might not be the same emphasis on introduction to alcohol in a college-campus context, there may be more acceptance of early drinking in other contexts, such as family settings (Bravo et al., 2017; Kuntsche et al., 2006). Greater acceptance of early drinking in family settings could be related to the belief, held by some parents, that supplying small amounts of alcohol to their children in a controlled and supervised setting helps them achieve responsible drinking and reduces the risk of them exhibiting hazardous drinking patterns later in life (Gilligan & Kypri, 2012, Jackson et al., 2012). Additionally, the internal dynamics of cultural politics in different countries have proven to drive cross-cultural and cross-generational shifts between the dichotomy of dry cultures, where attitudes and norms concerning drinking are more conservative, and wet cultures, where attitudes and norms concerning drinking are less conservative, which could reasonably contribute to variability in drinking outcomes (Room, 2010). These cultural variations provide an interesting context for understanding what it means to engage in “early” first use and “early” habitual use, and further complicates the question if these cultural differences impact the average ages at

which people engage in first use or habitual use and if these cultural differences impact the relationship between Age of First Use or Age of Habitual Use on problematic alcohol use later in life.

Purpose of the Present Study

The present study examined the relationship between Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use on alcohol use behaviors (specifically problematic alcohol use) among college student drinkers from seven countries (USA, England, Argentina, Uruguay, Spain, Canada, and South Africa). We also examined possible differences in drinking behaviors (e.g., use frequency and quantity) across countries. Our first hypothesis was that alcohol related experiences (i.e., Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use) and alcohol behaviors (including drinking frequency, binge drinking frequency, and drinking quantity) would differ significantly cross-culturally, particularly due to different alcohol related laws (i.e., lower age requirement would probably lead to lower Age of First and Habitual Use). The second hypothesis was that earlier Age of First Use and earlier Age of Habitual use would both be significantly associated with alcohol use and problems in young adulthood across all cultures. More specifically, our expectation was greater predictive value of Age of Habitual Use over Age of First Use, given the findings of prior twin studies demonstrating more significant associations of AUD with Age of Habitual Use rather than Age of First Use (Davis et al., 2020). Furthermore, early exposure to alcohol is not a culturally specific phenomenon (Sudhinaraset et al., 2016; Strunin et al., 2007; Room, 2004) and limited research exists comparing the relationship between Age of First Use or Age of Habitual Use on problematic drinking across different cultures. Therefore, we explored whether associations within our models were culturally universal or culturally specific (i.e., test of moderation).

Method

Participants and Procedures

Participants were college students ($n=9,171$) recruited from 12 universities across seven countries (USA, Canada, Spain, England, Argentina, Uruguay, and South Africa) to complete an online survey exploring risk and protective factors of substance use and addictive behaviors between February 2019 and March 2020. The analytic sample for this study was limited to students who completed questions about Age of First Use, Age of Habitual Use, and reported consuming alcohol at least once in the past 30 days (total sample $n=5,336$, 72.5% female; USA $n=2,168$, 68.9% female; Canada $n=972$, 69.4% female; South Africa $n=353$, 82.1% female; Spain, $n=566$, 72.4% female; Uruguay $n=129$, 86.0% female; Argentina, $n=780$, 75.8% female; England, $n=368$, 81.3% female). Study procedures (see [blinded for review], for more information) were approved by the institutional review boards (or the international equivalent) for each participating university.

Measures

All appropriate measures exhibit at least metric invariance across the countries, a necessary requirement when examining associations between constructs across different groups (Cieciuch et al., 2019). For all constructs, items were averaged or summed such that higher scores indicate higher endorsement of that construct.

Introduction to Alcohol Use. This construct was broken down into two main measures: self-reported Age of First Use and self-reported Age of onset of habitual drinking. The former was assessed with the question “How old were you the first time you drank alcohol?”, whereas the latter was assessed with the question “At what age did you begin to consume alcohol as a habit?”. These questions were translated into Spanish for students in Argentina, Spain, and

Uruguay.

Alcohol Use. Single items were used to measure past 30-day alcohol use frequency and past 30-day binge drinking frequency (i.e., drinking 4+/5+ standard drinks in 2h hours or less, for women/men [in Spain it is 7+ for men, 5.5+ for women]). To measure typical quantity of alcohol use per week, participants were presented with a visual guide about typical drinks (specific to each country), to help them ascertain the concept of Standard Drink Units (SDUs). Using a grid such that each day of the week was broken down into six 4-hour blocks of time (12a-4a, 4a-8a, 8a-12p, etc.), participants were asked to report at which times they consumed alcohol during a “typical week” in the past 30 days, as well as the number of drinks typically consumed during that time block. The measure was translated into Spanish for students in Argentina, Spain, and Uruguay. We calculated typical quantity of alcohol use by summing the total number of standard drinks consumed across time blocks during the typical week. To make accurate comparisons across countries, the total number SDUs consumed were transformed into grams of alcohol considering country specific SDU rates based on grams of alcohol (quantity estimates >3SDs above the mean were Winsorized).

AUD symptoms. To assess AUD symptoms, we employed a modified version of the 10-item Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (i.e., Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test – US [AUDIT-US]; Higgins-Biddle & Babor, 2018), originally created by Saunders et al. (1993). In this version, the response options for Items 1–3 are adjusted and the wording for Item 3 reflects the USA gender-specific definition of heavy episodic drinking (i.e., frequency of drinking 4+/5+ standard drinks [14 grams of alcohol] in for women/men in a drinking period). This measure was translated into Spanish based off the original Spanish version of the AUDIT created by Rubio Valladolid et al. (1998). However, in Spain we used an open-ended response

option (as opposed to Likert scale) and item 3 was adapted to reflect binge drinking definition in Spain (i.e., 7+ for men, 5.5+ for women in a 2 hour period). A total score was calculated by summing the scores across all items (Total sample Cronbach's $\alpha = .77$, Cronbach's α by country ranged from $\alpha=.72$ to $\alpha=.81$).

Alcohol Use Consequences. Negative alcohol-related problems were assessed using the Brief-Young Adult Alcohol Consequences Questionnaire (B-YAACQ; Kahler et al., 2005) or its Spanish version for students in Argentina, Spain, and Uruguay (Pilatti et al., 2014). The B-YAACQ is a 24-item questionnaire that measures alcohol-related negative experiences within the past 30 days. A composite score reflective of the total number of distinct alcohol problems experienced in the past 30 days was created by summing all endorsed experiences (Total Cronbach's $\alpha = .86$, Cronbach's α by country range from $\alpha=.81$ to $\alpha=.88$).

Data Analyses Plan

We first conducted one-way ANOVAs, followed by post-hoc Bonferroni tests, to examine country-level differences in prevalence rates of alcohol use patterns. To investigate independent associations between the variables, correlations were examined across the total sample and within each country. We then examined the direct associations between the age variables (i.e., Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use) and each of the five alcohol outcomes (i.e., 30 Day Drinking Frequency, 30 Day Binge Drinking Frequency, Typical Quantity, AUDIT scores, and B-YAACQ scores) using separate multiple regression models (one for each outcome). Wald's test of parameter constraints was used to analyze which predictor was stronger, by determining if effect sizes were statistically significantly different (at $p < .05$) from each other. Parameters were estimated using maximum likelihood estimation, and missing data (<1% in all models) were handled using full information maximum likelihood. Statistical

significance was determined by 99% bias-corrected bootstrapped confidence intervals (based on 10,000 bootstrapped samples) that did not contain zero. To test for invariance of the models across gender and countries, we conducted sets of χ^2 difference tests ($p < .01$) comparing unconstrained models, in which regression effects were free to vary across country/gender groups, to a constrained model, in which corresponding regression effects were forced to be equivalent across countries/gender groups. All correlation, regression, and chi-square models were run in *Mplus* version 8.6 (Muthen & Muthen, 2019), whereas ANOVAs were run in SPSS 27.0.

Results

Prevalence rates of distinct alcohol use patterns in the total sample and analysis of variance results across countries are presented in Table 1. Within the total sample, on average, individuals had their first drink at around 15-years old ($M = 15.16$) and began drinking habitually at about 17-and-a-half years old ($M = 17.47$). The ANOVA revealed significant differences between countries on both age variables, Age of First Use, $F(6, 5329) = 58.34, p < .001$ and Age of Habitual Use, $F(6, 5329) = 70.31, p < .001$, as well as each of the outcome variables (see Table 1). Of note are the differences that appeared along lines of legal consumption age such that we saw significantly lower average Ages of First Use and Habitual use among countries with younger legal drinking ages (e.g., England, Argentina, Uruguay) compared to countries with older legal drinking ages (e.g., USA and Canada). Bivariate correlations between each of the study variables in the total sample are presented in Table 2. Both age variables (Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use) were significantly negatively correlated with each of the outcome variables, such that older ages for First Use and Habitual Use were both generally associated with less alcohol use or alcohol related problems. Further, the two Age variables were strongly

positively correlated with each other ($r = .50$) although less in strength (i.e., $r < .80$; Young, 2017) than would indicate issues of multicollinearity (i.e., suggesting these are distinct constructs; Berry & Feldman, 1985). Bivariate correlations and descriptive statistics of all study variables in each country's sample are presented in Supplemental Tables 2 – 8.

Model Results: Associations with Alcohol Use Behaviors and Outcomes

Regression results from the total sample are summarized in Table 3. Within our multivariate regression model, we found statistically significant direct associations between the Age variables and all the outcome variables, apart for Age of Habitual Use predicting Drinking Frequency. Specifically, we found that earlier Age of First Use and earlier Habitual Use were weakly associated (while controlling for the other predictor) with higher scores on Drinking Frequency, Binge Drinking Frequency, Typical Drink Quantity, AUDIT scores, and BYAACQ scores in young adulthood.

The Wald's test indicated that, for last 30-Day Drinking Frequency, Age of First Use was a significantly stronger predictor than Age of Habitual Use, Wald $\chi^2 = 24.04$, $p < .001$. On the other hand, Age of Habitual Use was a statistically significant stronger predictor for AUDIT scores (Wald $\chi^2 = 5.728$, $p = .02$) and a significant stronger predictor of BYAACQ scores (Wald $\chi^2 = 4.817$, $p = .03$). No significant differences between Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use were found in predictive potential for the Binge Frequency (Wald $\chi^2 = 2.802$, $p = .09$) and Quantity (Wald $\chi^2 = .105$, $p = .75$) outcome variables.

Multi-Group Models

In examining structural invariance across gender, chi-square analyses on our constrained multigroup models compared to the unconstrained model indicated model invariance across genders for the paths between both Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use and the five

outcome variables and revealed no significant differences by gender (see Supplemental Table 9). In examining structural invariance across countries, our constrained multigroup models compared to the unconstrained model did not support model invariance across countries for three of the model paths (see Supplemental Table 10). Specifically, a moderation effect of country exists with respect to the regression paths in the Age of First Use \rightarrow AUDIT ($\chi^2(1, 5336) = 17.32, p < .01$), Age of Habitual Use \rightarrow AUDIT ($\chi^2(1, 5336) = 25.80, p < .001$) and Age of Habitual Use \rightarrow 30 Days Binge Drinking ($\chi^2(1, 5336) = 32.33, p < .001$) paths. To identify where the lack of invariance in model arose, we then freed each path comparing two specific country results at a time. See Table 4 for estimates by country and significant differences.

Overall, we found that in the Age of Habitual Use \rightarrow 30 Days Binge Drinking model, model variance was driven by a variety of country differences including differences between the USA vs. Uruguay/Argentina, where the direct effect was stronger in the USA. Additional differences included Canada vs. Uruguay (stronger for Canada), as well as England vs Spain/Argentina/Uruguay (stronger effect for England). In the Age of First Use \rightarrow AUDIT, invariance was driven by differences between England vs. USA/South Africa/Spain, where the effect was weaker (and positive) for the English sample than for the other three countries (associations were stronger and negative). Finally, in the Age of Habitual Use \rightarrow AUDIT model, significant differences arose between England vs. all other countries, where the effect was stronger for the English sample than for the other six countries (all associations were negative in directionality). Additionally, significant model differences were found between Spain vs. USA/Canada (associations were stronger for both the USA and Canada samples).

It is important to note that while examining associations across countries, the model estimates varied as did the differences in the patterns of statistical significance, which were

likely due to sample size differences between countries. For example, the model estimates for the English sample were more extreme than the total analytic sample for a number of indicators but were not statistically significant due to the small number of participants from the English sample.

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to examine alcohol use behaviors and the relationship between Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use on alcohol use behaviors (including problematic alcohol use) among college students from seven countries. In line with previous research, we found significant cross-cultural differences in drinking practices and outcomes (Smart & Ogborne, 2000). Specifically, among college students that reported drinking in the past 30 days, students in countries with older legal drinking cut off (such as the USA) had their first experiences with alcohol later in life (i.e., older first age of use) when compared to countries with younger or no legal drinking cut offs, such as England or Argentina. Similarly, students in countries with older legal alcohol purchase ages, such as the USA and Canada, reported later start of habitual drinking than countries with younger purchase ages such as Argentina and Uruguay. Further, our findings demonstrated that indicators of alcohol misuse (i.e., AUDIT scores) and alcohol consequences scores are higher in countries with relatively early legal drinking cut off age. Such findings highlight the importance of culture and policy when studying development milestones associated with problematic alcohol use. These findings also suggest the potential importance of distinguishing between legal drinking age and legal alcohol purchase age such that younger legal drinking age may introduce early opportunities to try alcohol, perhaps under supervision, while younger legal purchase age opens space for unsupervised drinking from a young age.

The regressions results provided additional support for associations between Age of First

Use and Age of Habitual Use with alcohol practices later in life (Jackson, 2012; Sudhinaraset et al., 2016), such that earlier Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use were associated with higher reports of drinking frequency, binge drinking frequency, alcohol typical quantity consumed, and higher AUDIT and BYAACQ scores during young adulthood. A new and unique contribution of the present study is that our findings demonstrate that Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use do not associate with later drinking outcomes with the same intensity. Specifically, Age of First Use had stronger associations with drinking frequency, while Age of Habitual Use was more strongly associated with AUDIT scores and negative consequences, in line with the limited existing research (Davis et al., 2020).

Several mechanisms may underlie the differential associations found. One possibility takes into account the impact of early alcohol exposure on the developing brain (Dawson et al., 2008). Pre-clinical studies have revealed detrimental effects of early (e.g., adolescent) alcohol exposure, yet most of these studies have employed heavy and protracted alcohol exposure. For instance, Marszalek-Grabska et al. (2018) reported memory recognition deficits after binge-like (2.0–4.0 g/kg) and prolonged alcohol exposure in rats, akin to what we refer to here as Habitual Use. Age of First Use, as self-reported in clinical studies, might represent a first exposure to alcohol that likely involves low frequency or dose and hence with little impact on the developing brain. Further, significant associations between Age of First Use and later problematic drinking may be, in fact, indicative of some genetic liability (Davis et al., 2020). On the contrary, Age of Habitual Use might entail engagement with alcohol in frequency and amount substantial enough to impact brain development, particularly in areas of the frontal lobe associated with cognitive performance and evaluation of rewards and losses (Bourque et al., 2016; Silveri, 2012). Future studies should further dissect both milestones, by registering the

typical dose achieved in the first contacts with alcohol and the average alcohol consumed during Habitual Use.

Another possibility is that Age of Habitual Use represents a mediator in a chain of events that ultimately lead to AUDs, so that it relates to AUDIT and BYAACQ scores more closely than Age of first use. Under this perspective, the latter milestone would be a distal predictor, exerting a broader effect. Some studies have established that there is a large lag period, sometimes ranging from two to four years (the present sample average was about two years) between the first use of alcohol and problematic use of the drug (Behrendt et al., 2009). This lag provides a large space for other factors to develop and come into play, such as time for habitual use to develop. Studies focusing on tobacco (Conner et al., 2021) or other substances (Casanueva et al., 2013) have demonstrated a pattern of early first use associated with earlier onset of habitual use. Additional longitudinal research has shown a direct relationships between early Age of First Use, transition to habitual use, and eventually transition to misuse (Wittchen et al., 2008). Further research has expanded upon these findings, demonstrating strong relationships between first use, first intoxication, regular drinking, and problematic use, and more specifically alcohol use disorder (Sartor et al., 2016). An alternative explanation of the limited association between Age of First Use and later drinking outcomes, along similar lines, is the marker hypothesis that suggests that early alcohol use and the later development of symptoms of problematic drinking are not causally related but instead are both manifestations of a third variable unidentified in this study (Guttmanova et al., 2012). Such variables could include genetic vulnerability or early exposure to stress.

We found several significant cross-cultural differences in the associations between age variables and outcome variables. These differences, which were driven largely by significant

differences between USA and other countries or England and other countries, may be the consequence of cultural differences in perception of acceptable drinking behavior. For example, the association between Age of First Use and AUDIT scores was, among the countries tested in the present study, generally weaker in the sample from England. This could relate to Age of First Use in England being relatively culturally irrelevant, or at least not as significant as Age of Habitual Use (England had the strongest effect for Age of Habitual Use → AUDIT scores). If an early first drink, as permitted by law in England, is normalized then it would make sense that later drinking behaviors will not associate as closely with Age of First Use as something like early Habitual Drinking, which is more limited by stricter purchasing laws (Smith & Foxcroft, 2009).

Limitations and Future Directions

Some limitations of this study warrant further investigation into this area of research. First, the cross-sectional design of this study does not allow us to make temporal inferences based on this data. Since drinking law and diversion programming relies on delaying age of early use, it is important to conduct longitudinal studies beginning before drinking behaviors start to provide more foundation for understanding the causation piece of both Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use across these countries. Additionally, participants in the present study differed in age, which may have introduced recall bias, where respondents report events closer to the time of interview than is true or the tendency to underestimate the elapsed time since an event occurred, skewing the reporting of Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use (Johnson & Schultz, 2005). Further, the samples from each respective country may not be entirely representative of the broader college-student population with regards to gender distribution. In the present study, samples were skewed towards being predominantly (between 68.9% and 86.0%) female-

identifying. Previous research is mixed on the role of gender in models associating alcohol initiation and later use behaviors (Hawkins et al., 1997; Donovan, 2004; Chatterjee et al., 2018).

We did not measure the impact of drinking on cognitive and other brain function, which limits speculation on potential neurobiological mechanisms underlying the Age effects. Future studies may expand on these findings to explore brain development in the context of Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use. This should provide a better understanding of how each milestone relate to other factors down the line (e.g., drinking norms and problematic use). Another limitation is in the strict focus on alcohol use. Some existing literature suggests that in contexts of lifetime polysubstance use, early initiation in one substance may relate to problems in another substance (Behrendt et al., 2011). Polysubstance use is becoming more prevalent in college populations (Barrett et al., 2006; Bravo et al., 2021; Conway et al., 2013; Looby et al., 2021; Willis et al., 2019;), thus future studies could enrich this area of research by studying the relationship between first use and habitual use of various substances and the corresponding outcomes.

Perhaps the most critical limitation of this research, and of this area of research more broadly, is the lack of fixed definitions and criterion for age variables, including but not limited to Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use. The significant differences in the average Age of First Use and Age of First Habitual Use, and further the significant differences between Associations of Age of First Use and Age of First Habitual Use with various alcohol related outcomes suggests that people do not equate their Age of First Use experience to be the same as their Age of First Habitual use exposure. The way individuals interpreted the question of Age of Habitual Use could have influenced their response such that Age of Habitual Use may hold negative connotation or understood to mean age at which an individual notices dependency on

alcohol which inherently would relate to problematic alcohol use more. Others may have simply understood Habitual Use to mean when regular use began; although what “regular” use means in this case could be interpreted differently as well. These terms have yet to be explicitly and consistently defined in the literature, but are constantly being used, sometimes interchangeably, with other terms like Regular Use or Age of Onset to examine age-related alcohol consumption milestones and how they relate to problematic alcohol use down the line. In the present study, Age of First Use was determined with the question, “How old were you the first time you drank alcohol?” while Habitual Use was determined with the question “At what age did you begin to consume alcohol as a habit?”. In other studies, however, Age of First Use has been addressed with different questions which can vary the answers. For instance, one study explicitly restricted Age of First Use to not include small taste or sips (Livingston et al., 2016). Future studies may investigate how individuals understand the differences between the various age milestones, and should aim to functionally define these terms such that they hold distinct psychometric properties in the context of predicting alcohol use outcomes.

Conclusions

Though drinking cultures, practices, and outcomes differ across the globe, the existence of legislation around legal drinking or alcohol purchasing in nearly every country highlights the importance of legal drinking age as a cross-cultural milestone. With that, the onus of intervening in problematic alcohol use is put on different aspects of early drinking laws cross-culturally, with some countries focusing on delaying drinking all together, while others focus on delaying regular access to alcohol. Similarly, research on age variables and how they relate to problematic alcohol use outcomes down the line have favored Age of First Use in predicting alcohol use trends later in life (DeWit et al., 2000; Maimaris et al., 2014), but have also demonstrated that early alcohol

use defined differently, such as by Age of Habitual Use, also predicts later alcohol use and more specifically problematic alcohol use (Guttmanova et al., 2011; Ohannessian et al., 2015).

The present research provides a necessary examination and comparison of the different age variables explored in the existing alcohol literature with the understanding that diverse drinking culture may be associated with different outcomes. The implications of our findings specifically provide grounds to dig deeper into alcohol use trajectories from various early drinking age milestones, including but not limited to Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use. Moreover, this research demonstrates a need for further investigating age variables and how we define these age variables for practical application. Specifically, understanding how alcohol use practices as they relate to age at certain drinking milestones differ depending on how we define those milestones. Problematic alcohol use is a global phenomenon, but the role of varying alcohol related laws and drinking culture cannot be undermined. To reduce problematic alcohol use and derail alcohol use disorder before it begins, it is critical that research focuses not only to understand how early experiences can relate to later outcomes, but to understand how this may vary with culture and leverage that knowledge to interrupt negative cycles of use.

References

- Adler, I., & Kandel, D. B. (1981). Cross-cultural perspectives on developmental stages in adolescent drug use. *Journal of studies on alcohol*, *42*(9), 701-715.
<https://doi.org/10.15288/jsa.1981.42.701>
- Arteaga, I., Chen, C.-C., & Reynolds, A. J. (2010). Childhood predictors of adult substance abuse. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *32*(8), 1108–1120.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2010.04.025>
- Barker, J. M., & Taylor, J. R. (2014). Habitual alcohol seeking: Modeling the transition from casual drinking to addiction. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *47*, 281–294.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2014.08.012>
- Barrett, S. P., Darredeau, C., & Pihl, R. O. (2006). Patterns of simultaneous polysubstance use in drug using university students. *Human Psychopharmacology: Clinical and Experimental*, *21*(4), 255–263. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hup.766>
- Bravo, A. J., Pearson, M. R., Pilatti, A., Read, J. P., Mezquita, L., Ibáñez, M. I., & Ortet, G. (2017). Cross-cultural examination of college drinking culture in Spain, Argentina, and USA: Measurement invariance testing of the College Life Alcohol Salience Scale. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *180*, 349–355.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2017.08.016>
- Behrendt, S., Wittchen, H.-U., Höfler, M., Lieb, R., & Beesdo, K. (2009). Transitions from first substance use to substance use disorders in adolescence: Is early onset associated with a rapid escalation? *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *99*(1–3), 68–78.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2008.06.014>
- Behrendt, S., Beesdo-Baum, K., Höfler, M., Perkonig, A., Bühringer, G., Lieb, R., & Wittchen,

- H.-U. (2012). The relevance of age at first alcohol and nicotine use for initiation of cannabis use and progression to cannabis use disorders. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *123*(1–3), 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2011.10.013>
- Berchtold, A., Akre, C., Jeannin, A., Michaud, P.-A., & Suris, J.-C. (2011). First consumption ever of multiple substances: Applying an expert-based taxonomy to a Swiss national sample of adolescents. *Addictive Behaviors*, *36*(1–2), 68–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2010.08.023>
- Berry, W. D., & Feldman, S. (1985). *Multiple regression in practice*. SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412985208>
- Bourque, J., Baker, T. E., Dagher, A., Evans, A. C., Garavan, H., Leyton, M., Séguin, J. R., Pihl, R., & Conrod, P. J. (2016). Effects of delaying binge drinking on adolescent brain development: A longitudinal neuroimaging study. *BMC Psychiatry*, *16*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-016-1148-3>
- Buchmann, A. F., Schmid, B., Blomeyer, D., Becker, K., Treutlein, J., Zimmermann, U. S., Jennen-Steinmetz, C., Schmidt, M. H., Esser, G., Banaschewski, T., Rietschel, M., Schumann, G., & Laucht, M. (2009). Impact of age at first drink on vulnerability to alcohol-related problems: Testing the marker hypothesis in a prospective study of young adults. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *43*(15), 1205–1212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2009.02.006>
- Casanueva, C., Stambaugh, L., Urato, M., Fraser, J. G., & Williams, J. (2014). Illicit drug use from adolescence to young adulthood among child welfare-involved youths. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse*, *23*(1), 29–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1067828X.2012.735514>

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021, October 6). *Underage drinking*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved April 4, 2022, from <https://www.cdc.gov/alcohol/fact-sheets/underage-drinking.htm>
- Chartier, K. G., Hesselbrock, M. N., & Hesselbrock, V. M. (2009). Ethnicity and adolescent pathways to alcohol use. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 70(3), 337–345. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2009.70.337>
- Chartier, K. G., Hesselbrock, M. N., & Hesselbrock, V. M. (2010). Development and vulnerability factors in adolescent alcohol use. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 19(3), 493–504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chc.2010.03.004>
- Chatterjee, D., McMorris, B., Gower, A. L., Forster, M., Borowsky, I. W., & Eisenberg, M. E. (2018). Adverse Childhood Experiences and Early Initiation of Marijuana and Alcohol Use: The Potential Moderating Effects of Internal Assets. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 53(10), 1624–1632. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2017.1421224>
- Conner, M., Grogan, S., Simms, E. R., Cowap, L., Armitage, C. J., West, R., Marshall, A., & Siddiqi, K. (2021). Association between age at first reported e- cigarette use and subsequent regular e- cigarette, ever cigarette and regular cigarette use. *Addiction*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.15386>
- Davis, C. N., Slutske, W. S., Piasecki, T. M., Martin, N. G., & Lynskey, M. T. (2020). Comparing the potential causal influence of two indicators of early alcohol use on later alcohol use disorder symptoms. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, 129(3), 256–265. <https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000474>
- Dawson, D. A., Goldstein, R. B., Chou, S. P., Ruan, W. J., & Grant, B. F. (2008). Age at first drink and the first incidence of adult-onset DSM-IV alcohol use disorders. *Alcoholism:*

- Clinical and Experimental Research*, 32(12), 2149–2160. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.2008.00806.x>
- DeWit, D. J., Adlaf, E. M., Offord, D. R., & Ogborne, A. C. (2000). Age at first alcohol use: A risk factor for the development of alcohol disorders. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 157(5), 745–750. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.157.5.745>
- Donovan, J. E. (2004). Adolescent alcohol initiation: A review of psychosocial risk factors. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 35(6), 529.e7–529.e18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2004.02.003>
- Felson, R. B., Savolainen, J., Thoroddur Bjarnason, T., Anderson, A. L., & Zohra, I. T. (2011). The cultural context of adolescent drinking and violence in 30 European countries. *Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 49(3), 699–728. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2011.00239.x>
- Grant, J. D., Scherrer, J. F., Lynskey, M. T., Lyons, M. J., Eisen, S. A., Tsuang, M. T., True, W. R., & Bucholz, K. K. (2006). Adolescent alcohol use is a risk factor for adult alcohol and drug dependence: Evidence from a twin design. *Psychological Medicine*, 36(1), 109–118. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291705006045>
- Gilligan, C., & Kypri, K. (2012). Parent attitudes, family dynamics and adolescent drinking: qualitative study of the Australian Parenting Guidelines for Adolescent Alcohol Use. *BMC Public Health*, 12, 491. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-12-491>
- Guttmanova, K., Bailey, J. A., Hill, K. G., Lee, J. O., Hawkins, J. D., Woods, M. L., & Catalano, R. F. (2011). Sensitive periods for adolescent alcohol use initiation: predicting the lifetime occurrence and chronicity of alcohol problems in adulthood. *Journal of studies on alcohol and drugs*, 72(2), 221–231. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2011.72.221>

- Henry, K. L., McDonald, J. N., Oetting, E. R., Silk Walker, P., Walker, R. D., & Beauvais, F. (2011). Age of onset of first alcohol intoxication and subsequent alcohol use among urban American Indian adolescents. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 25*(1), 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021710>
- Hogarth, L. (2020). Addiction is driven by excessive goal-directed drug choice under negative affect: Translational critique of habit and compulsion theory. *Neuropsychopharmacology, 45*(5), 720–735. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-020-0600-8>
- Hu, H., Eaton, W. W., Anthony, J. C., Wu, L.-T., & Cottler, L. B. (2017). Age of first drunkenness and risks for all-cause mortality: A 27-year follow-up from the epidemiologic catchment area study. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 176*, 148–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2017.03.015>
- Jackson, K. M. (2010). Progression through early drinking milestones in an adolescent treatment sample. *Addiction, 105*(3), 438–449. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02800.x>
- Jackson, C., Ennett, S. T., Dickinson, D. M., & Bowling, J. M. (2012). Letting children sip: understanding why parents allow alcohol use by elementary school-aged children. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 166*(11), 1053–1057. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpediatrics.2012.1198>
- Johnson, E. O., & Schultz, L. (2005). Forward telescoping bias in reported age of onset: An example from cigarette smoking. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research, 14*(3), 119–129. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.2>
- Johnston, L. D., Miech, R. A., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., Schulenberg, J. E., & Patrick, M. E. (2022). *Monitoring the Future national survey results on drug use, 1975-2021:*

- Overview, key findings on adolescent drug use.* Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 154 pp.
- Kahler, C. W., Strong, D. R., & Read, J. P. (2005). Toward Efficient and Comprehensive Measurement of the Alcohol Problems Continuum in College Students: The Brief Young Adult Alcohol Consequences Questionnaire. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 29*(7), 1180–1189. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ALC.0000171940.95813.A5>
- Kuendig, H., Plant, M. A., Plant, M. L., Miller, P., Kuntsche, S., & Gmel, G. (2008). Alcohol-related adverse consequences: Cross-cultural variations in attribution process among young adults. *European Journal of Public Health, 18*(4), 386–391. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckn007>
- Kuntsche, E., Knibbe, R., Gmel, G., & Engels, R. (2006). Who drinks and why? A review of socio-demographic, personality, and contextual issues behind the drinking motives in young people. *Addictive Behaviors, 31*(10), 1844–1857. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2005.12.028>
- Kuntsche, E., Rossow, I., Engels, R., & Kuntsche, S. (2016). Is “age at first drink” a useful concept in alcohol research and prevention? We doubt that. *Addiction, 111*(6), 957–965. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.12980>
- Hawkins, J. D., Graham, J. W., Maguin, E., Abbott, R., Hill, K. G., & Catalano, R. F. (1997). Exploring the effects of age of alcohol use initiation and psychosocial risk factors on subsequent alcohol misuse. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 58*(3), 280–290. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsa.1997.58.280>
- Higgins-Biddle, J. C., & Babor, T. F. (2018). A review of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT), AUDIT-C, and USAUDIT for screening in the United

- States: Past issues and future directions. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 44(6), 578–586. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00952990.2018.1456545>
- Labouvie, E., Bates, M. E., & Pandina, R. J. (1997). Age of first use: Its reliability and predictive utility. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 58(6), 638–643.
<https://doi.org/10.15288/jsa.1997.58.638>
- Lanza, S. T., & Vasilenko, S. A. (2015). New methods shed light on age of onset as a risk factor for nicotine dependence. *Addictive Behaviors*, 50, 161–164.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2015.06.024>
- Levy, S. J. L., & Kokotailo, P. K. (2011). Substance use screening, brief intervention, and referral to treatment for pediatricians. *Pediatrics*, 128(5), e1330–e1340.
<https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2011-1754>
- Livingston, M. D., Xu, X., & Komro, K. A. (2016). Predictors of recall error in self-report of age at alcohol use onset. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 77(5), 811–818.
<https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2016.77.811>
- Lorant, V., Nicaise, P., Soto, V. E., & d’Hoore, W. (2013). Alcohol drinking among college students: college responsibility for personal troubles. *BMC public health*, 13(1), 1-9.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-13-615>
- Looby, A., Prince, M. A., Villarosa-Hurlocker, M. C., Conner, B. T., Schepis, T. S., & Bravo, A. J. (2021). Young adult use, dual use, and simultaneous use of alcohol and marijuana: An examination of differences across use status on marijuana use context, rates, and consequences. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 35(6), 682–690.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000742>
- Marszalek-Grabska, M., Gibula-Bruzda, E., Bodzon-Kulakowska, A., Suder, P., Gawel, K.,

- Filarowska, J., ... & Kotlinska, J. H. (2018). Effects of the positive allosteric modulator of metabotropic glutamate receptor 5, VU-29, on impairment of novel object recognition induced by acute ethanol and ethanol withdrawal in rats. *Neurotoxicity research*, 33(3), 607-620. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12640-017-9857-z>
- Merrill, J. E., & Carey, K. B. (2016). Drinking over the lifespan: Focus on college ages. *Alcohol Research: Current Reviews*, 38(1), 103–114.
- Morean, M. E., Corbin, W. R., & Fromme, K. (2012). Age of first use and delay to first intoxication in relation to trajectories of heavy drinking and alcohol-related problems during emerging adulthood. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 36(11), 1991–1999. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.2012.01812.x>
- Newlin, D. B., & Strubler, K. A. (2007). The habitual brain: An “adapted habit” theory of substance use disorders. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 42(2–3), 503–526. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826080601144606>
- Ohannessian, C. M., Finan, L. J., Schulz, J., & Hesselbrock, V. (2015). A long-term longitudinal examination of the effect of early onset of alcohol and drug use on later alcohol abuse. *Substance Abuse*, 36(4), 440–444. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08897077.2014.989353>
- Pautassi, R. M., Bravo, A. J., Acquas, E., & Pilatti, A. (2020). Editorial: Is Early Onset of Alcohol Use Associated With Later Alcohol Use?. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 14, 133. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2020.00133>
- Pilatti, A., Caneto, F., Garimaldi, J. A., del Valle Vera, B., & Pautassi, R. M. (2014). Contribution of time of drinking onset and family history of alcohol problems in alcohol and drug use behaviors in Argentinean college students. *Alcohol and Alcoholism*, 49(2), 128–137. <https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agt176>

- Pilatti, A., Read, J. P., Vera, B. del V., Caneto, F., Garimaldi, J. A., & Kahler, C. W. (2014). The Spanish version of the Brief Young Adult Alcohol Consequences Questionnaire (B-YAACQ): A Rasch Model analysis. *Addictive Behaviors, 39*(5), 842–847.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.01.026>
- Room, R. (2004). "Drinking and Coming of Age in a Cross-Cultural Perspective." Reducing underage drinking: a collective responsibility, Edited by R. J. Bonnie and M. E. O'Connell. Washington D.C.: National Academies Press [Committee on Developing a Strategy to Reduce and Prevent Underage Drinking, Board on Children, Youth, and Families, National Research Council, Institute of Medicine of the National Academies].
- Room, R. (2010). Dry and wet cultures in the age of globalization. *Dry and Wet Cultures in the Age of Globalization, 1000-1009*.
- Room, R. (2010) Dry and wet cultures in the age of globalization, *Salute e Società* 10(3, Suppl.): 229-237.
- Rossow, I., & Kuntsche, E. (2013). Early onset of drinking and risk of heavy drinking in young adulthood—A 13- year prospective study. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 37*, E297-E304. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.2012.01924.x>
- Rubio Valladolid, G., Bermejo Vicedo, J., Caballero Sánchez-Serrano, M. C., & Santo-Domingo Carrasco, J. (1998). Validation of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) in primary care. *Revista Clinica Espanola, 198*, 11–14.
- Sartor, C. E., Jackson, K. M., McCutcheon, V. V., Duncan, A. E., Grant, J. D., Werner, K. B., & Bucholz, K. K. (2016). Progression from first drink, first intoxication, and regular drinking to alcohol use disorder: A comparison of African American and European American youth. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 40*(7), 1515–1523.

- <https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.13113>
- Sarvet, A. L., & Hasin, D. (2016). The natural history of substance use disorders. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 29(4), 250–257. <https://doi.org/10.1097/YCO.0000000000000257>
- Shih, R. A., Miles, J. N. V., Tucker, J. S., Zhou, A. J., & D'Amico, E. J. (2012). Racial/ethnic differences in the influence of cultural values, alcohol resistance self-efficacy, and alcohol expectancies on risk for alcohol initiation. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 26(3), 460–470. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029254>
- Silveri, M. M. (2012). Adolescent brain development and underage drinking in the United States: Identifying risks of alcohol use in college populations. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, 20(4), 189–200. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10673229.2012.714642>
- Smart, R. G., & Ogborne, A. (2000). Drinking and heavy drinking by students in 18 countries. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 60(3), 315–318. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-8716\(00\)00117-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-8716(00)00117-4)
- Smith, L., & Foxcroft, D. (2009). Drinking in the UK. *An exploration of trends*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Spoth, R., Randall, G. K., Shin, C., & Redmond, C. (2005). Randomized Study of Combined Universal Family and School Preventive Interventions: Patterns of Long-Term Effects on Initiation, Regular Use, and Weekly Drunkenness. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 19(4), 372–381. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-164X.19.4.372>
- Strunin, L., Edwards, E. M., Godette, D. C., & Heeren, T. (2007). Country of origin, age of drinking onset, and drinking patterns among Mexican American young adults. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 91(2–3), 134–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2007.05.013>

- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2021). *Key substance use and mental health indicators in the United States: Results from the 2020 National Survey on Drug Use and Health* (HHS Publication No. PEP21-07-01-003, NSDUH Series H-56). Rockville, MD: Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Retrieved from <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/>
- Sudhinaraset, M., Wigglesworth, C., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2016). Social and cultural contexts of alcohol use: Influences in a social-ecological framework. *Alcohol Research: Current Reviews*, 38, 35–45.
- Swift, W., Coffey, C., Carlin, J. B., Degenhardt, L., & Patton, G. C. (2008). Adolescent cannabis users at 24 years: Trajectories to regular weekly use and dependence in young adulthood. *Addiction*, 103(8), 1361–1370. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2008.02246.x>
- Taylor, M., Collin, S. M., Munafò, M. R., MacLeod, J., Hickman, M., & Heron, J. (2017). Patterns of cannabis use during adolescence and their association with harmful substance use behaviour: Findings from a UK birth cohort. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 71(8), 764–770. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2016-208503>
- The Interagency Coordinating Committee on the prevention of underage drinking (ICCPUD). SAMHSA. (n.d.). Retrieved April 8, 2022, from <https://www.samhsa.gov/iccpud>
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2022, March). *Alcohol Facts and Statistics*. National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. Retrieved April 4, 2022, from <https://www.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/brochures-and-fact-sheets/alcohol-facts-and-statistics>

- Velleman, R. D. B., Templeton, L. J., & Copello, A. G. (2005). The role of the family in preventing and intervening with substance use and misuse: A comprehensive review of family interventions, with a focus on young people. *Drug and Alcohol Review, 24*(2), 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09595230500167478>
- del Valle Vera, B., Pilatti, A., & Pautassi, R. M. (2020). ELSA cohort 2014: Association of age of first drink and progression from first drink to drunkenness on alcohol outcomes in Argentinean college freshmen. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 46*(1), 58–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00952990.2019.1608223>
- Voskoboinik, A., Prabhu, S., Ling, L. H., Kalman, J. M., & Kistler, P. M. (2016). Alcohol and Atrial Fibrillation: A Sobering Review. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 68*(23), 2567–2576. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2016.08.074>
- Ward, B., Snow, P., & Aroni, R. (2010). Children's alcohol initiation: An analytic overview. *Drugs: Education, Prevention & Policy, 17*(3), 270–277. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09687630802590526>
- Warner, L. A., & White, H. R. (2003). Longitudinal effects of age at onset and first drinking situations on problem drinking. *Substance Use & Misuse, 38*(14), 1983–2016. <https://doi.org/10.1081/JA-120025123>
- Wittchen, H.-U., Behrendt, S., Höfler, M., Perkonigg, A., Lieb, R., Bühringer, G., & Beesdo, K. (2008). What are the high risk periods for incident substance use and transitions to abuse and dependence? Implications for early intervention and prevention. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research, 17*(Suppl1), S16–S29. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.254>
- Young, D.S. (2017). *Handbook of Regression Methods* (1st ed.). Chapman and Hall/CRC.

<https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315154701>

Table 1
General Demographics and ANOVA Results

Variable Mean (SD)	Total	USA	Canada	South Africa	Spain	Argentina	Uruguay	England	Significant Differences
Total Sample Size	n = 5336	n = 2168	n = 972	n = 353	n = 566	n = 780	n = 129	n = 368	N/A
Age*	20.45 (3.92)	19.77 (3.19)	19.97 (4.23)	20.49 (2.32)	21.01 (3.09)	22.22 (4.92)	26.36 (6.44)	18.86 (2.29)	<i>USA > England</i> <i>Canada > England</i> <i>South Africa > England</i> <i>Spain > USA, Canada, England</i> <i>Argentina > USA, Canada, South Africa, Spain, England</i> <i>Uruguay > USA, Canada, South Africa, Spain, Argentina, England</i>
Age of First Use*	15.16 (2.07)	15.67 (2.11)	15.31 (2.06)	15.07 (2.13)	14.58 (1.64)	14.43 (1.65)	14.86 (2.26)	14.41 (2.23)	<i>US > Canada, South Africa, Spain, Argentina, England</i> <i>Canada > Spain, Argentina, England</i> <i>South Africa > Spain, Argentina, England</i>
Habitual Use *	17.47 (1.95)	17.94 (1.88)	17.68 (1.89)	17.41 (1.72)	16.64 (1.77)	16.64 (2.02)	17.46 (2.69)	17.18 (1.41)	<i>US > Canada, South Africa, Spain, Argentina, England</i> <i>Canada > Spain, Argentina, England</i> <i>South Africa > Spain, Argentina</i> <i>Uruguay > Spain, Argentina</i> <i>England > Spain, Argentina</i>
30 Day Drinking Frequency *	6.00 (5.00)	6.12 (5.10)	5.21 (4.81)	7.30 (5.20)	4.95 (4.11)	5.46 (4.56)	4.65 (4.48)	9.38 (5.28)	<i>South Africa > USA, Canada, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay</i> <i>England > USA, Canada, South Africa, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay</i>
30 Day Binge Drinking Frequency *	2.47 (3.37)	2.87 (3.54)	2.18 (3.16)	2.92 (3.62)	1.45 (2.31)	1.45 (2.41)	0.85 (1.46)	4.72 (4.46)	<i>USA > Canada, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay</i> <i>Canada > Spain, Argentina, Uruguay</i> <i>South Africa > Canada, Spain,</i>

	<i>Argentina, Uruguay</i> England > USA, Canada, South Africa, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay USA > Canada, South Africa, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay							
Typical Quantity *	133.06 (118.81)	153.70 (131.19)	135.99 (118.54)	105.54 (91.72)	105.47 (94.91)	115.22 (110.41)	65.20 (64.94)	138.98 (106.22)
	Canada > South Africa, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay Spain > Uruguay England > South Africa, Spain, Uruguay							
	USA > Canada, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay Canada > Uruguay South Africa > Canada, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay Spain > Uruguay England > USA, Canada, South Africa, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay USA > Canada, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay							
AUDIT *	9.95 (5.69)	10.22 (5.74)	9.47 (5.43)	11.13 (5.97)	9.04 (4.94)	8.68 (4.95)	6.95 (4.21)	13.63 (6.61)
	Canada > Uruguay South Africa > USA, Canada, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay Spain > Uruguay England > USA, Canada, South Africa, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay USA > Canada, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay							
BYAACQ *	5.12 (4.45)	5.43 (4.76)	4.53 (4.18)	6.40 (4.63)	4.37 (3.84)	4.45 (3.78)	3.06 (3.29)	6.93 (4.48)
	Canada > Uruguay South Africa > USA, Canada, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay England > USA, Canada, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay							

Note. USA = United States of America. *ANOVA $p \leq .001$. Significant differences in alcohol use behavior and outcome prevalence rates across countries were determined by a Bonferroni corrected post-hoc comparisons. Typical quantity of alcohol use was calculated by summing the total number of standard drinks (defined to the participant) consumed across time blocks during the typical week. To make accurate comparisons across countries, the total number SDUs consumed were transformed into grams of alcohol considering country specific SDU rates based on grams of alcohol (quantity estimates >3SDs above the mean were Winsorized).

Table 2*Bivariate correlations among study variables in total sample (n = 5,336)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Age of First Use	---							15.16	2.07
2. Age of Habitual Use	.49	---						17.47	1.95
3. Drinking Last 30 Days	-.13	-.07	---					6.00	5.00
4. Binge Drinking Last 30 Days	-.10	-.12	.58	---				2.47	3.37
5. Typical Quantity	-.11	-.12	.49	.61	---			131.55	119.07
6. BYAACQ	-.12	-.15	.31	.42	.42	---		5.12	4.44
7. AUDIT	-.16	-.19	.41	.57	.56	.66	---	9.95	5.68

Note. Significant correlations are bolded for emphasis and were determined by a 99% bias-corrected standardized bootstrapped confidence interval (based on 10,000 bootstrapped samples) that does not contain zero.

Table 3*Estimates for Age of First Use and Age of Habitual Use Predicting Alcohol-Use Outcomes*

Drinking Frequency as Outcome	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	99% <i>CI</i>
Age of First Use → Drinking Frequency	-0.33	-0.14	0.02	-0.18, -0.09
Age of Habitual Use → Drinking Frequency	0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.05, 0.06
Binge Frequency as Outcome	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	99% <i>CI</i>
Age of First Use → Binge Frequency	-0.08	-0.05	0.02	-0.09, -0.01
Age of Habitual Use → Binge Frequency	-0.16	-0.09	0.01	-0.13, -0.06
Typical Quantity as Outcome	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	99% <i>CI</i>
Age of First Use → Typical Quantity	-4.39	-0.08	0.02	-0.12, -0.04
Age of Habitual Use → Typical Quantity	-4.92	-0.08	0.02	-0.12, -0.04
AUDIT as Outcome	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	99% <i>CI</i>
Age of First Use → AUDIT	-0.24	-0.09	0.02	-0.13, -0.04
Age of Habitual Use → AUDIT	-0.42	-0.15	0.02	-0.18, -0.10
BYAACQ as Outcome	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	99% <i>CI</i>
Age of First Use → BYAAQ	-0.13	-0.06	0.02	-0.11, -0.02
Age of Habitual Use → BYAAQ	-0.26	-0.12	0.02	-0.15, -0.08

Note. Significant associations are bolded for emphasis (determined by a 99% bias-corrected standardized bootstrapped confidence interval that does not contain zero). *SE* and 99% *CI* depicted refer to standardized effects.

Table 4
Standardized Estimates for Age of First Use and Age of Habitual use Predicting Drinking Outcomes by Country

Association	USA	Canada	South Africa	Spain	Argentina	Uruguay	England	Significant Difference in Strength of Associations
Age of First Use → Drinking Frequency	-13	-12	-15	-14	-10	-43	-10	N/A
Age of Habitual Use → Drinking Frequency	.03	-01	-08	-06	-05	.06	-18	N/A
Age of First Use → Binge Frequency	-09	-05	-07	-08	-02	-19	.02	N/A
Age of Habitual Use → Binge Frequency *	-15	-16	-15	-08	-07	-.002	-23	<i>USA > Argentina, Uruguay Canada > Uruguay England > Spain, Argentina, Uruguay</i>
Age of First Use → Typical Quantity	-11	-12	-14	-11	-19	-08	.04	N/A
Age of Habitual Use → Typical Quantity	-11	-16	-09	-11	-03	-13	-17	N/A
Age of First Use → AUDIT*	-11	-08	-22	-17	-09	-10	.07	<i>US, South Africa, Spain > England</i>
Age of Habitual Use → AUDIT*	-20	-19	-09	-04	-14	-17	-28	<i>US > Spain Canada > Spain England > US, Canada, South Africa, Spain, Argentina, Uruguay</i>
Age of First Use → BYAAQ	-08	-04	-23	-09	-08	-07	.07	N/A
Age of Habitual Use → BYAAQ	-14	-17	-05	-09	-12	-08	-24	N/A

Note. Significant associations are bolded for emphasis (determined by a 99% bias-corrected standardized bootstrapped confidence interval that does not contain zero). Estimates depicted refer to standardized effects. Significant differences in country associations are starred and direction of those differences are provided in the Significant Difference column. Differences in associations between specific countries was determined using chi-square difference test ($p < .01$) when constraining associations to be equal across comparison groups.

Supplemental Table 1

Alcohol Policies (concerning legal age to purchase or consume alcohol) across Data Collection Sites during Data Collection Period (2019-2020)

Country	Legal Age to Purchase Alcohol	Legal Age to Consume Alcohol
Argentina	18 years old	None
Canada	19 years old, except for Quebec, Manitoba and Alberta (where it is 18)	19 years old, except for Quebec, Manitoba and Alberta (where it is 18 years old) No limit on alcohol consumed in the home provided by parents or legal guardian except for Ontario
England	18 years old	No limit if consumed in private, 16 years old if purchased with a meal, accommodated by an adult, and limited to beer, wine, and cider, 18 years old for full access
South Africa	18 years old	No limit if consumed in private, 18 years old for full access
Spain	18 years old	None
USA	21 years old	Varies by state with special exceptions for private consumption, typically 21 years old
Uruguay	18 years old	None

Supplemental Table 2*Bivariate correlations among study variables by country – United States (n = 2,168)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Age of First Use	---							15.67	2.11
2. Age of Habitual Use	.48	---						17.94	1.88
3. Drinking Last 30 Days	-.12	-.04	---					6.12	5.10
4. Binge Drinking Last 30 Days	-.16	-.19	.60	---				2.87	3.54
5. Typical Quantity	-.16	-.16	.53	.66	---			152.16	131.16
6. BYAACQ	-.15	-.18	.32	.41	.40	---		5.43	4.76
7. AUDIT	-.21	-.25	.45	.62	.60	.62	---	10.22	5.74

Note. Significant correlations are bolded for emphasis and were determined by a 99% bias-corrected standardized bootstrapped confidence interval (based on 10,000 bootstrapped samples) that does not contain zero.

Supplemental Table 3*Bivariate correlations among study variables by country – Canada (n = 972)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Age of First Use	---							15.31	2.06
2. Age of Habitual Use	.32	---						17.68	1.89
3. Drinking Last 30 Days	-.12	-.04	---					5.21	4.81
4. Binge Drinking Last 30 Days	-.10	-.18	.57	---				2.17	3.16
5. Typical Quantity	-.16	-.19	.44	.59	---			132.58	118.48
6. BYAACQ	-.09	-.18	.25	.39	.47	---		4.53	4.18
7. AUDIT	-.14	-.22	.27	.48	.53	.67	---	9.47	5.42

Note. Significant correlations are bolded for emphasis and were determined by a 99% bias-corrected standardized bootstrapped confidence interval (based on 10,000 bootstrapped samples) that does not contain zero.

Supplemental Table 4*Bivariate correlations among study variables by country – South Africa (n = 353)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Age of First Use	---							15.07	2.13
2. Age of Habitual Use	.51	---						17.41	1.72
3. Drinking Last 30 Days	-.19	-.15	---					7.30	5.19
4. Binge Drinking Last 30 Days	-.15	-.18	.54	---				2.92	3.62
5. Typical Quantity	-.19	-.16	.38	.62	---			106.20	91.59
6. BYAACQ	-.25	-.17	.24	.39	.46	---		6.40	4.62
7. AUDIT	-.26	-.20	.30	.46	.55	.71	---	11.13	5.97

Note. Significant correlations are bolded for emphasis and were determined by a 99% bias-corrected standardized bootstrapped confidence interval (based on 10,000 bootstrapped samples) that does not contain zero.

Supplemental Table 5*Bivariate correlations among study variables by country – Spain (n = 566)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Age of First Use	---							14.58	1.64
2. Age of Habitual Use	.55	---						16.65	1.77
3. Drinking Last 30 Days	-.17	-.14	---					4.95	4.11
4. Binge Drinking Last 30 Days	-.12	-.12	.45	---				1.45	2.30
5. Typical Quantity	-.16	-.18	.46	.52	---			104.71	94.82
6. BYAACQ	-.14	-.14	.24	.40	.36	---		4.37	3.84
7. AUDIT	-.20	-.14	.36	.46	.49	.61	---	9.04	4.93

Note. Significant correlations are bolded for emphasis and were determined by a 99% bias-corrected standardized bootstrapped confidence interval (based on 10,000 bootstrapped samples) that does not contain zero.

Supplemental Table 6*Bivariate correlations among study variables by country – Argentina (n = 780)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Age of First Use	---							14.44	1.65
2. Age of Habitual Use	.57	---						16.64	2.02
3. Drinking Last 30 Days	-.12	-.10	---					5.46	4.56
4. Binge Drinking Last 30 Days	-.06	-.08	.46	---				1.45	2.40
5. Typical Quantity	-.20	-.14	.51	.45	---			114.26	110.34
6. BYAACQ	-.15	-.16	.26	.30	.39	---		4.45	3.78
7. AUDIT	-.17	-.19	.38	.37	.52	.64	---	8.68	4.94

Note. Significant correlations are bolded for emphasis and were determined by a 99% bias-corrected standardized bootstrapped confidence interval (based on 10,000 bootstrapped samples) that does not contain zero.

Supplemental Table 7*Bivariate correlations among study variables by country – Uruguay (n = 129)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Age of First Use	---							14.86	2.25
2. Age of Habitual Use	.63	---						17.46	2.68
3. Drinking Last 30 Days	-.40	-.21	---					4.65	4.46
4. Binge Drinking Last 30 Days	-.19	-.12	.38	---				0.85	1.46
5. Typical Quantity	-.18	-.19	.38	.52	---			64.04	64.67
6. BYAACQ	-.12	-.12	.22	.51	.36	---		3.06	3.28
7. AUDIT	-.21	-.24	.35	.53	.54	.70	---	6.95	4.20

Note. Significant correlations are bolded for emphasis and were determined by a 99% bias-corrected standardized bootstrapped confidence interval (based on 10,000 bootstrapped samples) that does not contain zero.

Supplemental Table 8*Bivariate correlations among study variables by country – England (n = 368)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Age of First Use	---							14.41	2.23
2. Age of Habitual Use	.31	---						17.18	1.41
3. Drinking Last 30 Days	-.15	-.21	---					9.38	5.27
4. Binge Drinking Last 30 Days	-.06	-.22	.66	---				4.72	4.45
5. Typical Quantity	-.02	-.16	.55	.72	---			138.35	106.07
6. BYAACQ	-.01	-.22	.32	.49	.52	---		6.93	4.47
7. AUDIT	-.01	-.25	.38	.60	.60	.75	---	13.63	6.60

Note. Significant correlations are bolded for emphasis and were determined by a 99% bias-corrected standardized bootstrapped confidence interval (based on 10,000 bootstrapped samples) that does not contain zero.

Supplemental Table 9*Invariance testing results of the model across gender*

		<i>Model for 30 Day Drinking Frequency</i>		
		Overall Fit Indexes		
		χ^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
1	Unconstrained	0	0	0
2	Constrained – First Use	1.658	1	.198
3	Constrained – Habitual Use	1.189	1	.276
		<i>Model for 30 Day Binge Drinking Frequency</i>		
		Overall Fit Indexes		
		χ^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
1	Unconstrained	0	0	0
2	Constrained – First Use	0.130	1	.719
3	Constrained – Habitual Use	6.632	1	.010
		<i>Model for Typical Quantity</i>		
		Overall Fit Indexes		
		χ^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
1	Unconstrained	0	0	0
2	Constrained – First Use	3.183	1	.074
3	Constrained – Habitual Use	3.853	1	.050
		<i>Model for AUDIT</i>		
		Overall Fit Indexes		
		χ^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
1	Unconstrained	0	0	0
2	Constrained – First Use	0.000	1	.994
3	Constrained – Habitual Use	3.061	1	.080
		<i>Model for BYAACQ</i>		
		Overall Fit Indexes		
		χ^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
1	Unconstrained	0	0	0
2	Constrained – First Use	0.452	1	.502
3	Constrained – Habitual Use	0.873	1	.350

Note. To test for invariance of the models across gender and countries, we conducted sets of χ^2 difference tests ($p < .01$) comparing unconstrained models, in which regression effects were free to vary across country/gender groups, to a constrained model, in which corresponding regression effects were forced to be equivalent across countries/gender groups.

Supplemental Table 10*Invariance testing results of the model across country*

		<i>Model for 30 Day Drinking Frequency</i>		
		Overall Fit Indexes		
		χ^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
1	Unconstrained	0	0	0
2	Constrained – First Use	7.982	6	.239
3	Constrained – Habitual Use	15.664	6	.016
		<i>Model for 30 Day Binge Drinking Frequency</i>		
		Overall Fit Indexes		
		χ^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
1	Unconstrained	0	0	0
2	Constrained – First Use	4.846	6	.564
3	Constrained – Habitual Use	32.331	6	<.001
		<i>Model for Typical Quantity</i>		
		Overall Fit Indexes		
		χ^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
1	Unconstrained	0	0	0
2	Constrained – First Use	15.637	6	.016
3	Constrained – Habitual Use	11.184	6	.082
		<i>Model for AUDIT</i>		
		Overall Fit Indexes		
		χ^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
1	Unconstrained	0	0	0
2	Constrained – First Use	17.318	6	.008
3	Constrained – Habitual Use	25.798	6	<.001
		<i>Model for BYAACQ</i>		
		Overall Fit Indexes		
		χ^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
1	Unconstrained	0	0	0
2	Constrained – First Use	16.286	6	.012
3	Constrained – Habitual Use	14.327	6	.026

Note. To test for invariance of the models across gender and countries, we conducted sets of χ^2 difference tests ($p < .01$) comparing unconstrained models, in which regression effects were free to vary across country/gender groups, to a constrained model, in which corresponding regression effects were forced to be equivalent across countries/gender groups.

Author Disclosures

Role of Funding Sources:

Dr. Bravo was supported by a training grant (T32-AA018108) from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) in the United States during the duration of data collection for this project. Data collection was supported, in part, by grant T32-AA018108. NIAAA had no role in the study design, collection, analysis or interpretation of the data, writing the manuscript, or the decision to submit the paper for publication. Data collection in Spain was also supported by grants UJI-A2019-08 from the Universitat Jaume I and RTI2018-099800-B-I00 from the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities (MCIU). Data collection in Argentina was also supported by grants from the National Secretary of Science and Technology (FONCYT, grant number PICT 2015-849) and by grants from the Secretary of Science and Technology- National University of Córdoba (SECyT-UNC).

Disclosures

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement:

Data and analytic outputs are available at <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/UG6D5>