

**Psychometric Properties and Longitudinal Measurement Invariance of the Spanish Version of the Alcohol Expectancies Questionnaire – Short Form among Young Adult Binge Drinkers**

**Running title: LMI of the Spanish version EQ-SF**

Bella M. González-Ponce<sup>a,b\*</sup>, Angelina Pilatti<sup>c,d</sup>, Gabriela Rivarola Montejano<sup>c,d</sup>, Adrian J. Bravo<sup>e</sup>, Fermín Fernández-Calderón<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Clinical and Experimental Psychology, University of Huelva, Avda. Fuerzas Armadas, s/n, Huelva 21071, Spain.

<sup>b</sup> Research Center on Natural Resources, Health and the Environment, University of Huelva, Avda. Fuerzas Armadas, s/n, Huelva 21071, Spain.

<sup>c</sup> Faculty of Psychology. National University of Cordoba, Enfermera Gordillo Esq. Enrique Barros S/N, Córdoba 5000, Argentina.

<sup>d</sup> Institute of Psychological Research, IIPsi-CONICET-UNC, National University of Córdoba, Enfermera Gordillo Esq. Enrique Barros s/n, piso 2, Córdoba 5000, Argentina.

<sup>e</sup> Department of Psychological Sciences, William & Mary, Williamsburg VA, United States.

**\*Corresponding author:** Bella María González Ponce. Telephone number: 0034 959 218 474. Fax number: 959 219199. Address: Department of Clinical and Experimental Psychology, University of Huelva. Office number PB 3-12. Campus de «El Carmen». Avenida de las Fuerzas Armadas, S/N. 21071, Huelva, Spain. Email address: [bellamaria.gonzalez@dpces.uhu.es](mailto:bellamaria.gonzalez@dpces.uhu.es)

**Funding:** This work was supported by the Consejería de Salud (Junta de Andalucía, Andalucía, Spain) under Grant Number PI-0503-2018 (Principal Investigator: Fermín Fernández Calderón).

**Disclosure statement:** The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

#### **ORCID**

Bella M. González-Ponce <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3359-694X>

Angelina Pilatti <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7277-0835>

Gabriela Rivarola Montejano <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3323-7293>

Adrian J. Bravo <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4630-6449>

Fermín Fernández-Calderón <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2981-1670>

## Abstract

**Background:** Longitudinal Measurement Invariance (LMI) is critically important to evaluate changes in the alcohol expectancies over time. However, few studies have yet explored the longitudinal properties of the Spanish EQ-SF. **Objectives:** To examine the reliability, sources of validity (structural and concurrent validity), and LMI of the Spanish short version of the Alcohol Expectancy Questionnaire in a sample of young adults who engage in binge drinking. **Methods:** The participants ( $n = 279$ ; Mean age = 21.33,  $SD = 2.15$ ; 48.4% female) completed the Spanish EQ-SF, and two months later they completed this measure again, along with measures to alcohol use, drinking motives, and protective behavioral strategies (PBS). Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used to identify which of two proposed models provided the best-fitting factor structure. We aimed to determine whether the best-fitting model was invariant across assessments and to evaluate the predictive validity and reliability of the scores. **Results:** Our findings revealed that the eight-factor intercorrelated model provided the best fit. This model was invariant across assessments, providing evidence for longitudinal measurement invariance. Moreover, the scores showed adequate reliability (.68 to .90) and predictive validity (i.e., positive alcohol expectancies were positively related to alcohol use and drinking motives and negatively related to PBS). **Conclusion:** Our results support the reliability, validity, and temporal invariance of the EQ-SF scores among Spanish young adults with binge drinking patterns. The evidence supports the suitability of this measure for accurately assessing changes in alcohol expectancies over time in interventions aimed at preventing binge drinking in young adults.

*Keywords:* Alcohol Expectancies; Young Adults; Binge Drinking; Longitudinal Measurement Invariance; Psychometric Properties

## Introduction

Heavy drinking is positively associated with various alcohol-related negative consequences (1). Binge drinking, which is typically defined as the consumption of 4/5 standards drinks (women/men) within  $\leq 2$  hours (2), is a prevalent behavior among emerging adults worldwide (3). To illustrate, a study with college students from the U.S., Spain, and Argentina who reported alcohol use within the previous month revealed that, overall, students reported consuming alcohol drink 6 days per month, with 2 of these occasions involving binge drinking episodes (4). In Spain, alcohol ranks as the most frequently used psychoactive substance among individuals aged between 15 and 65. Among young adults (i.e., 18-25 years) binge drinking is highly prevalent, reaching 35.4% among men and 24.1% among women compared to 15.4% in the overall population (5).

Engaging in binge drinking can be, at least in part, explained and predicted by alcohol expectancies. Rooted in the framework of Social Learning Theory (6), alcohol expectancies refer to learned associations about the effects of alcohol consumption on behavior, mood, and emotions (7). Individuals, either through their own experience with alcohol or by observing others (8), develop “if ... then” expectations (e.g., *if I drink alcohol then I would feel less nervous at a party*) that influence alcohol consumption. Alcohol expectancies are considered proximal predictors with a direct impact on alcohol use, including binge drinking (9), that also mediate the indirect effect of individual and environmental predictors (10). For instance, alcohol expectancies have been identified as significant mediators in the relationship between diverse distal factors such as an earlier age of first intoxication (11), personality traits (12), social norms (13), and greater alcohol use and related problems.

Alcohol expectancies are typically categorized into two broad groups: positive and negative (14). Positive alcohol expectancies encompass beliefs about the rewarding and desirable effects of alcohol use (e.g., social facilitation, feeling calm and relaxed, or feeling more sexually appealing) and have been positively associated with drinking initiation (15), higher levels of alcohol consumption (16), greater occurrence of binge drinking (9), and more alcohol-related negative consequences (17). Moreover, positive alcohol expectancies are negatively associated with the use of Protective Behavioral Strategies ([PBS], specific behaviors implemented to mitigate the harmful consequences of alcohol consumption [18]), ultimately leading to more alcohol-related negative consequences (19). In contrast, negative alcohol expectancies, which include beliefs about physical, cognitive, and emotional impairment (e.g., feeling guilty, sick, or confused), have been associated with limited alcohol use or complete abstinence (20).

A key feature of alcohol expectancies is their capacity for change, and they have been targeted in interventions aimed at reducing or preventing alcohol use by manipulating (i.e., changing) these beliefs (21). Given the relevance of alcohol expectancies in understanding drinking involvement, coupled with the potential to reduce alcohol-related problems by targeting these beliefs, this construct has attracted increasing interest among the research community. Thus, a substantial body of research has been dedicated to accurately assessing alcohol expectancies. While various measurement tools have been developed (e.g., the Alcohol Expectancy Questionnaire [AEQ] [22], the Comprehensive Effects of Alcohol [CEOA] [23]), the Expectancy Questionnaire (EQ) (14) offers several notable advantages. Unlike the AEQ, the EQ assesses both positive and negative alcohol expectancies, and, in contrast to the CEOA, it includes two separate dimensions for assessing both cognitive and physical

impairment. This approach better discriminates between these two forms of harm, which have been differentially associated to alcohol use (24).

Additionally, and relevant to the present study, a Spanish adaptation of this measure was validated in a sample of Spanish adolescents, with the findings providing supporting evidence of validity and reliability of the measure (24). Despite these advantages, this measure could be lengthy to administer, particularly in research or clinical settings where individuals are repeatedly asked to answer the same questions. This feature could potentially deter individuals from completing the assessment. To address this concern, Mezquita et al. (25) developed and validated a brief version of the Spanish EQ in two separate samples of adolescents and adults (EQ-SF). By employing a combination of Classical Test Theory and Item Response Theory analyses, these authors obtained a reduced version comprising of 24 items loaded onto the eight original dimensions of the EQ, grouped into two second-order factors: positive expectancies (social positive, fun, sex, and tension reduction) and negative expectancies (social negative, emotional negative, physical negative, and cognitive negative). Different sources of validity, adequate reliability, and measurement invariance across sex (male, female) and age (adolescents, adults) indicated the EQ-SF is an adequate measure for evaluating alcohol expectancies in Spanish youths and adults.

### **Purpose of Present Study**

When validating a scale, particularly in the context of repeated assessments, it is important to examine the stability of scores over time, a concept known as Longitudinal Measurement Invariance (LMI). LMI serves as a method to determine if the instrument consistently captures the underlying construct across different time points (26). A consistent LMI suggests that the assessment remains relatively stable over time (27) so

that any changes in mean scores can be taken to indicate genuine changes in the construct levels (28). In general, tests of LMI involve three sequential steps, each introducing additional equality constraints on the parameters (29). These levels of invariance are configural (i.e., whether the factor structure shows adequate fit across time points), metric (i.e., if factor loadings are equivalent over time), and scalar (whether the item intercepts remain equivalent across time points) (30). As indicated previously, research has established the measurement invariance of the Spanish EQ-SF across sex and age (25). However, limited research has investigated the invariance of the EQ-SF across time and in a high-risk population (i.e., emerging adults who engage in binge drinking). Therefore, the present study aimed to examine the LMI properties of the EQ-SF in a sample of young adults who have reported engaging in binge drinking in the past two months. Specifically, we aimed to examine LMI and test two models with different factorial structures: one with eight correlated factors and another where these subscales were grouped into two (positive and negative) second-order factors. Additionally, we conducted reliability estimations of the scale scores at both baseline (Time 1) and follow-up (Time 2) in our sample. To provide evidence of the scale's validity based on its relationship with other variables, we analyzed the EQ-SF scores at Time 1 with respect to alcohol-related outcomes (e.g., frequency of alcohol use and alcohol-related consequences), drinking motives, and the use of PBS at Time 2.

## Method

### Participants and Procedure

Participants were 360 young adults (*Mean age* = 21.1 years; *SD* = 2.21) who were part of a longitudinal research project (31) approved by the Regional Bioethics Research Committee of Andalusia (Consejería de Sanidad, Government of Andalusia,

Spain). Participants were selected through a targeted sampling procedure from various community settings, including parks, pubs, bars, and discotheques in the province of Huelva (Spain). The inclusion criteria were as follows: a) being between 18 and 25 years old, b) a history of alcohol use on two or more occasions within the past month, and c) agreeing to participate in the two-month follow-up. A psychosocial psychologist recruited participants who met these criteria from the selected settings, and information about the study was also disseminated through posters displayed within those settings. The targeted sampling procedure (32) often utilizes the participants' social networks to identify new candidates (a form of snowball sampling, as described by Goodman [33]). Consequently, using this procedure, a total of 360 participants were recruited for the initial assessment, of which 174 (48.3%) were recruited directly by the interviewer in the selected contexts, 155 participants (43.1%) were nominated from the participants' social network, and 31 (8.6%) contacted the interviewer after seeing the posters in the selected contexts.

Participants completed the questionnaires for the first session (Time 1 [T1]) in paper and pencil format at the University of Huelva. Before their participation, all participants gave their informed consent, and upon completing the questionnaires, they received compensation in the form of an Amazon voucher worth 15 euros. Those who completed the follow-up questionnaire (Time 2 [T2]) after two months also received a 15-euro Amazon voucher. Most of the sample ( $n = 339$ , 94.2%) participated in the two-month follow-up assessment.

For the purposes of the present study, we selected those participants who reported having consumed 5 or more alcoholic drinks (for males) or 4 or more alcoholic drinks (for females) within a 2-hour period on at least one occasion in the past two months. A subgroup of 279 (93.94%) young adults of the total sample engaged in binge



drinking and returned to complete the EQ-SF and other related measures at the follow-up assessment, which took place two months after the initial assessment. Thus, the analytic sample comprised of 279 young adults who engaged in binge drinking (*Mean age* = 21.33, *SD* = 2.15; 51.6% male). The vast majority of participants (96.3%) reported being born in Spain and attending university (87.2%) at the time of participating in the study. Most of the participants (78.5%) lived with their parents, with the primary source of income being family allowance (51.9%), and 30.3% were studying and working. The mean number of binge drinking days at both the baseline and follow-up assessments was 6.9 (*SD* = 8.4) and 4.6 (*SD* = 5.7), respectively.

## **Instruments**

*Alcohol expectancies (at baseline and follow-up).* The Spanish Short Form (EQ-SF) (25) of the Expectancies Questionnaire (14) comprises 24 items and employs a Likert response scale with 6 options, ranging from 0 (never) to 5 (always), to measure positive and negative expectancies. This scale is composed of 8 dimensions, 4 of which correspond to positive expectations (12 items): expectancies about social facilitation (Social Positive), positive affect potentiation (Fun Positive), sexual disinhibition (Sex Positive), and tension reduction (Tension Reduction). The remaining four dimensions correspond to negative expectations (also comprising 12 items): expectancies about the antisocial effects of alcohol (Social Negative), negative emotional states (Emotional Negative), as well as undesirable physical (Physical Negative) and cognitive effects (Cognitive Negative). Participants were asked to indicate the likelihood of experiencing the aforementioned consequences when consuming alcohol. The reliability of the Spanish version of the EQ-SF (25) was adequate, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging between .77 and .93.

*Alcohol consumption (at follow-up).* At follow-up, we collected information on frequency of drinking, and drunkenness and binge drinking episodes. For each of these frequency measures, items measured the number of days within the past two months during which participants had engaged in: alcohol consumption, drunkenness, and binge drinking. Binge drinking was defined as consuming  $\geq 5$  drinks (in men) or  $\geq 4$  drinks (in women) within a two-hour interval (2, 34).

*Quantity of alcohol consumed in a typical week during the past month (at follow-up).* The modified version of the Daily Drinking Questionnaire (DDQ) (35) was used to assess the amount of alcohol consumed in a typical week during the past month. This questionnaire gathers information on the consumption of six types of alcoholic beverages, each accompanied by visual representations, according to the Spanish Observatory of Drugs and Addictions (36). The number of drinks consumed by participants was converted into Standard Drinking Units (SDUs). In Spain, 1 SDU equals 10 grams of pure alcohol (37).

*Negative alcohol-related consequences (at follow-up).* We used the 48-item Spanish version (S-YAACQ) (38) of the Young Adult Alcohol Consequences Questionnaire (YAACQ) (39). Each item assesses the presence or absence (0 = no, 1 = yes) of negative alcohol-related consequences in the last month. The total score indicates the number of consequences experienced in that period. As recommended by the authors of the original scale (39), tetrachoric correlations were used to estimate internal consistency Ordinal alpha values were .95 (follow-up).

*Drinking Motives (at follow-up).* We used the Spanish version (DMQ-R SF) (40) of the Drinking Motives Questionnaire-Revised (DMQ-R SF) (41). This instrument consists of 12 items grouped into four dimensions (with three items per dimension):

social motives, coping motives, enhancement motives, and conformity motives. The response format was a 5-point scale (1 = *almost never or never* to 5 = *almost always or always*). Cronbach's alpha values were as follows: social motives  $\alpha = 0.82$ ; enhancement motives  $\alpha = 0.77$ ; coping motives  $\alpha = 0.80$ ; conformity motives  $\alpha = 0.83$ .

*Protective Behavioral Strategies* (at follow-up). We used the Spanish version (S-PBSS-20) (42) of the Protective Behavioral Strategies Scale (PBSS-20) (43). This scale consists of 20 items grouped into three dimensions: Manner of Drinking (MOD-5 items), Stopping/Limiting Drinking (SLD-7 items), and Serious Harm Reduction (SHR-8 items). Participants reported using PBS within the last two months using a Likert-type response format ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*). Consistent with the Spanish version of the PBSS (42), internal consistency was estimated using McDonald ordinal alpha (MOD  $\alpha = 0.65$ ; SLD  $\alpha = 0.69$ ; SHR  $\alpha = 0.69$ ).

### **Data analysis**

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to examine the internal structure of the EQ-SF, and two models with different factorial structures were evaluated. The first model (Model 1) comprises eight correlated factors, each with three items as observable variables. The second model (Model 2) is structured around two second-order factors (each with 12 items), with four dimensions per factor, and three items per dimension. These models were estimated using the Robust Maximum Likelihood Estimator (MLR) method. The following goodness-of-fit indicators were used to assess model fit: the  $\chi^2$  statistic, the comparative fit index (CFI), and the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), with values  $>.90$  considered acceptable and  $>.95$  as optimal. The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) were also used, with values  $\leq .10$  indicating acceptable fit and

values  $\leq .08$  indicating good fit (44, 45). Additionally, the fit of both models was compared by applying the Chi-Square Difference Testing using the Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-Square (46). To estimate the internal consistency of each subscale of the EQ-SF, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated separately for each subscale at the two time points.

The longitudinal invariance analysis of the EQ-SF was conducted across the two time points. Three levels of invariance were examined: configural (i.e., whether the items load onto the proposed factors), metric (i.e., whether the factor loadings remain consistent across time), and scalar (to establish whether the factor loadings are stable, and the intercepts remain constant) (47). The CFI, TLI, and RMSEA indices were utilized to evaluate model fit, along with the previously mentioned reference values (44, 45). In addition, the change in model fit was examined from one model to another ( $\Delta\text{CFI}$  and  $\Delta\text{TLI} \geq -.010$ ,  $\Delta\text{RMSEA} \geq .015$  and  $\Delta\text{SRMR} \geq .010$ ) (48). To provide evidence of criterion-related validity, based on the relationship with other variables, Pearson's correlations were employed to examine the between EQ-SF dimensions measured at T1 and five alcohol-related outcomes (frequency of alcohol use, frequency of drunkenness, frequency of binge drinking, quantity of alcohol consumed, and alcohol-related consequences), drinking motives (four dimensions: social, enhancement, coping, and conformity), and use of PBS (three dimensions: manner of drinking, stopping/limiting drinking, serious harm reduction) measured at T2. *Mplus* 8.0 (49) was used for CFA and LMI analyses and SPSS 27 (51) was used to estimate Cronbach's alpha values and conduct correlation analyses.

## Results

### Confirmatory factor analysis and reliability

Table 1 displays the fit measures of the two tested models. Both models showed an acceptable fit to the data according to most indices (CFI, TLI, and RMSEA). Notably, Model 1 (eight correlated factors) showed better fit in SRMR index ( $< .06$ ) compared to Model 2 (two second-order factors; SRMR  $< .08$ ). The Satorra-Bentler (46) chi-square difference test revealed that the model with eight correlated factors showed a significantly better fit than the second-order two-factor model ( $\Delta\chi^2 (\Delta df) = 60.83 [19], \Delta CFI = .00$ ).

[Table 1 around here]

Table 2 shows the factor loadings for the EQ-SF eight correlated factors model, organized according to items and time of assessment (T1 and T2). All item loadings were moderate to high across both assessment times, ranging from .50 to .92. The reliability coefficients, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, for each dimension were consistently strong at both time points (from .69 to .90 at T1 and .68 to .89 at T2).

[Table 2 around here]

### Longitudinal Measurement Invariance of the EQ-SF

The results of the longitudinal measurement invariance analysis across the two assessment times are shown in Table 3. Configural invariance showed acceptable to optimal fit indices. Metric and scalar invariance across times were also found, as changes in fit indices were lower than the specified cut-off criteria. These findings suggest that increasing constraints (i.e., in the item factor loadings and intercepts) across the two time points (T1 and T2) did not significantly worsen the model fit and that LMI was held.

[Table 3 around here]

### **Criterion-related validity**

Bivariate correlations are presented in Table 4. Small- and medium-sized significant positive correlations were found between alcohol expectancies at baseline, alcohol-related outcomes, and drinking motives at follow-up. The strongest correlations were observed between positive expectancies and social and enhancement motives. Further, most alcohol expectancies at T1 (except emotional negative) showed significant and negative correlations with use of PBS (T2).

[Table 4 around here]

### **Discussion**

The present study examined the reliability, validity, and longitudinal measurement invariance of the Spanish Alcohol Expectancy Questionnaire Short Form (EQ-SF) (25) in a sample of young adults binge drinkers. The results of the CFA revealed that, although both models evaluated (i.e., the eight-factor correlated model and the eight-factor hierarchical model grouped into two general factors of positive and negative expectancies) showed acceptable fit indices, the eight-factor correlated model showed a significantly better fit than the two-factor second-order model. This finding contrasts with previous studies conducted with college students (14), adolescents (24), and adults (25), which have reported a better fit for the hierarchical two-factor (positive and negative) second-order model. Previous research (e.g., (51)) has demonstrated that the relationships between specific dimensions of alcohol expectancies (e.g., fun positive) and drinking behavior may differ between various subpopulations, which could explain the variation in model fit results observed in our study compared to previous findings. The information derived from the subscales can serve to identify

young adults with specific beliefs about the effects of alcohol, which may be targeted in interventions. Our findings support the use of specific sub-scales (e.g., (52), for social positive) either alongside or instead of the total score (positive or negative, e.g., (53)) in community-based samples of young adults who engage in binge drinking patterns.

A novel and relevant finding of the present study is that we found evidence to support the temporal invariance of the Spanish version of the EQ-SF. Longitudinal measurement invariance is a central issue in psychological assessment, particularly in the context of repeated assessments (e.g., interventions aimed at reducing alcohol use by reducing positive alcohol expectancies). Unless temporal invariance is met, the meaningful comparison of correlations and mean scores across different time points is unattainable (54). Notably, our research findings establish the presence of configural, metric, and scalar invariance in the multidimensional structure of the EQ-SF across two measurement waves (spaced two months apart). These results suggest the utility of the scale as a reliable instrument for assessing alcohol expectancies in a similar way over time in a high-risk Spanish-speaking population. Given these findings, it is possible to compare mean scores across different time points, and any observed differences can be accurately interpreted as genuine changes in alcohol expectancies.

Additionally, we examined the reliability of the EQ-SF scores and explored evidence of concurrent validity. Alpha coefficients indicated acceptable values ( $.68 \leq \alpha \leq .90$ ) of internal consistency for the EQ-SF dimensions, which aligns with previous findings (e.g., (25);  $.77 \leq \alpha \leq .90$ ) suggesting that the EQ-SF is a reliable measure for assessing alcohol expectancies in young adults who engage in binge drinking patterns. The relationship between EQ-SF scores and other variables, including alcohol-related outcomes (e.g., frequency of alcohol use, frequency of drunkenness, frequency of binge drinking, quantity of alcohol consumed, and alcohol-related consequences), drinking

motives, and PBS use, provide evidence of concurrent validity. Specifically, and in accordance with findings from previous studies (e.g., (16)), we observed positive associations between scores on all four factors measuring positive expectancies and indicators of alcohol consumption, such as frequency of alcohol use, frequency of binge drinking, and alcohol-related consequences. Furthermore, our study revealed a positive relationship between the four scales of positive expectancies and a higher frequency of drunkenness. Additionally, the positive correlation between alcohol expectancies and drinking motives is consistent with the postulates of the Motivational Model of Alcohol Consumption (55, 56).

Finally, and in line with previous research conducted with college students (for a review, see 18), individuals with more positive alcohol expectancies were less likely to engage in PBS use, increasing the likelihood of experiencing alcohol-related problems. However, our findings do not support the negative relationship shown in previous studies (e.g., (24)) between negative alcohol expectancies (for most of its dimensions) and drinking behaviors. From a psychometric perspective, the absence of such a relationship may be explained by the fact that a substantial body of research (for a systematic review, see 57) has failed to establish a clear and consistent relationship between negative expectancies and outcomes related to alcohol consumption.

### **Limitations and Future Directions**

The results of our study should be interpreted in light of certain limitations. One limitation stems from the use of a non-probabilistic sample, given the absence of a sampling frame of young adults who binge drink within community settings. This limitation restricts the generalizability of our findings to the wider population of Spanish young adults. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that the gender distribution of our



sample, with 47% females, closely aligns with that of the Spanish young adult population aged 18-25 years (reported as 48.8% females by the National Statistics Institute, 58). Moreover, we recruited both university and non-university students, enhancing the diversity of our sample.

Additionally, although our study utilized a relatively short time frame (last two months) to collect follow-up data, the validity of our results may have been affected by certain self-report biases, particularly recall bias. To mitigate these potential biases and further test the validity of our findings, future research could explore the use of Ecological Momentary Assessments (e.g., (59), (60)).

## **Conclusions**

The results of this study provide favorable psychometric evidence regarding the reliability and validity of the Spanish EQ-SF in a community sample of Spanish young adult binge drinkers. Furthermore, our findings suggest that the brief version of the EQ-SF is a valuable tool for examining changes in expectancies over time that can be targeted in interventions (e.g., (61)) aimed at young adults who binge drink.

## References

1. Krieger H, Young CM, Anthenien AM, Neighbors C. The Epidemiology of Binge Drinking Among College-Age Individuals in the United States. *Alcohol Res Health*. 2018; 39: 23–30.
2. National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, NIAAA. Rethinking drinking. 2022. [accessed 2023 February 15].  
[https://www.niaaa.nih.gov/sites/default/files/publications/NIAAA\\_RethinkingDrinking.pdf](https://www.niaaa.nih.gov/sites/default/files/publications/NIAAA_RethinkingDrinking.pdf)
3. Chentsova VO, Bravo AJ, Pilatti A, Pautassi RM, Mezquita L, Hogarth L, & Team, C. C. A. S. (2023). Age of First Use, Age of Habitual Use, and Problematic Alcohol Use: a Cross-cultural Examination Among Young Adults in Seven Countries. *Int J Ment Health Addict*. 2023; 1-19. doi:10.1007/s11469-023-01016-y
4. Bravo AJ, Pilatti A, Pearson MR, Read JP, Mezquita L, Ibáñez MI, & Ortet G. Cross-cultural examination of negative alcohol-related consequences: Measurement invariance of the Young Adult Alcohol Consequences Questionnaire in Spain, Argentina, and USA. *Psychol Assess*. 2019; 31: 631–642. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000689>
5. Observatorio Español de las Drogas y las Adicciones [OEDA]. Estadística 2022. Alcohol, tabaco y drogas ilegales en España. Ministerio de Sanidad. Delegación del Gobierno para el Plan Nacional sobre Drogas, Madrid. 2022. [accessed 2022 December 15]  
<https://pnsd.sanidad.gob.es/profesionales/sistemasInformacion/informesEstadisticas/pdf/2022OEDA-ESTADISTICAS.pdf>

6. Bandura A. Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall; 1986
7. Leigh BC. (1999). Thinking, feeling, and drinking: Alcohol expectancies and alcohol use. In: Peele S, Grant M, editors. Alcohol and pleasure: A health perspective. Philadelphia, PA: Brunner/Mazel; 1999. pp. 215–231.
8. Smit K, Voogt C, Otten R, Kleinjan M, Kuntsche E. (2020). Alcohol expectancies change in early to middle adolescence as a function of the exposure to parental alcohol use. *Drug Alcohol Depend*, 2020; 211:107938. doi: [10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2020.107938](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2020.107938)
9. McBride NM, Barrett B, Moore KA, Schonfeld L. The role of positive alcohol expectancies in underage binge drinking among college students. *J Am Coll Health*. 2014; 62: 370–379. doi: [10.1080/07448481.2014.907297](https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2014.907297)
10. Smit K, Voogt C, Hiemstra M, Kleinjan M, Otten R, Kuntsche E. Development of alcohol expectancies and early alcohol use in children and adolescents: A systematic review. *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2018; 60: 136–146. doi: [10.1016/j.cpr.2018.02.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2018.02.002)
11. Stamatés AL, Lau-Barraco C, Linden-Carmichael AN. (2016). Alcohol expectancies mediate the relationship between age of first intoxication and drinking outcomes in college binge drinkers. *Subst Use Misuse*. 2016; 51:598-607. doi: [10.3109/10826084.2015.1126745](https://doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2015.1126745)
12. Paternó-Manavella MA, Rivarola Montejano GB, Michelini YN, Rodríguez Espínola SS, Pilatti A. Evaluación del Modelo de Predisposición Adquirida para consumo de alcohol en adolescentes. *Rev Cienc de la Salud*. 2022; 20: 1-22. doi: [10.12804/revistas.urosario.edu.co/revsalud/a.9460](https://doi.org/10.12804/revistas.urosario.edu.co/revsalud/a.9460)

13. Wells S, Flynn A, Tremblay PF, Dumas T, Miller P, Graham K. Linking masculinity to negative drinking consequences: the mediating roles of heavy episodic drinking and alcohol expectancies. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs*. 2014; 75: 510–519. doi:10.15288/jsad.2014.75.510
14. Leigh BC, Stacy AW. Alcohol outcome expectancies: Scale construction and predictive utility in higher order confirmatory models. *Psychol Assess*. 1993; 5: 216-229. doi: [10.1037/1040-3590.5.2.216](https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.5.2.216)
15. Jester JM, Wong MM, Cranford JA, Buu A, Fitzgerald HE, Zucker RA. (2015). Alcohol expectancies in childhood: change with the onset of drinking and ability to predict adolescent drunkenness and binge drinking. *Addiction*. 2015; 110: 71–79. doi:10.1111/add.12704
16. Anthenien AM, Lembo J, Neighbors C. Drinking motives and alcohol outcome expectancies as mediators of the association between negative urgency and alcohol consumption. *Addict Behav*, 2017; 66: 101–107. doi: [10.1016/j.addbeh.2016.11.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2016.11.009)
17. Pabst A, Kraus L, Piontek D, Mueller S, Demmel R. Direct and indirect effects of alcohol expectancies on alcohol-related problems. *Psychol Addict Behav*. 2014; 28: 20–30. doi: [10.1037/a0031984](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031984)
18. González-Ponce BM, Rojas-Tejada AJ, Carmona-Márquez J, Lozano-Rojas Ó. M, Díaz-Batanero C, Fernández-Calderón F. Harm reduction strategies among university students who use alcohol and cannabis, and related psychological variables: a systematic review. *J Psychoactive Drugs*. 2022; 54: 403-418. doi:10.1080/02791072.2021.2023240
19. Madden DR, Clapp JD. The event-level impact of one's typical alcohol expectancies, drinking motivations, and use of protective behavioral

- strategies. *Drug and Alcohol Depend.* 2019; *194*: 112-120. doi:  
10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.08.032
20. Cranford JA, Zucker RA, Jester JM, Puttler LI, Fitzgerald HE. Parental alcohol involvement and adolescent alcohol expectancies predict alcohol involvement in male adolescents. *Psychol Addict Behav.* 2010, *24*: 386–396.  
[doi:10.1037/a0019801](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019801)
21. Gesualdo C, Pinquart M. Expectancy challenge interventions to reduce alcohol consumption among high school and college students: A meta-analysis. *Psychol Addict Behav.* 2021, *35*: 817–828. [doi:10.1037/adb0000732](https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000732)
22. Brown SA, Goldman MS, Inn A, Anderson LR. Expectations of reinforcement from alcohol: Their domain and relation to drinking patterns. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 1980; *48*: 419–426. [doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.48.4.419](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.48.4.419)
23. Fromme K, Stroot E, Kaplan D. Comprehensive Effects of Alcohol: Development and psychometric assessment of a new expectancy questionnaire. *Psychol Assess.* 1993, *5*: 19-26. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.5.1.19
24. Camacho L, Mezquita L, Ibáñez MI, Moya J, Villa H, Viruela AM, Ortet G. Spanish adaptation of the Expectancy Questionnaire (EQ) about alcohol effects in adolescents. *Psicothema.* 2013; *25*: 529-535. [doi:  
10.7334/psicothema2012.354](https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2012.354)
25. Mezquita L, Camacho-Guerrero L, Suso-Ribera C, Ortet G, Ibáñez MI. Development and validation of the alcohol Expectancy Questionnaire Short Form (EQ-SF). Desarrollo y validación de la versión corta del cuestionario sobre expectativas de los efectos del alcohol (EQ-SF). *Adicciones.* 2018; *30*: 271–281. doi:10.20882/adicciones.920

26. Nelemans SA, Meeus WHJ, Branje SJT, Van Leeuwen K, Colpin H, Verschueren K, Goossens L. Social Anxiety Scale for Adolescents (SAS-A) Short Form: Longitudinal Measurement Invariance in Two Community Samples of Youth. *Assessment*. 2019; 26: 235–248. doi:10.1177/1073191116685808
27. Putnick DL, Bornstein MH. (2016). Measurement Invariance Conventions and Reporting: The State of the Art and Future Directions for Psychological Research. *Dev Rev*. 2016; 41: 71–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2016.06.004>
28. Chungkham HS, Ingre M, Karasek R, Westerlund H, Theorell T. Factor structure and longitudinal measurement invariance of the demand control support model: evidence from the Swedish Longitudinal Occupational Survey of Health (SLOSH). *PLoS One*. 2013; 8: e70541. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0070541](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0070541)
29. Bialosiewicz S, Murphy K, Berry T. An introduction to measurement invariance testing: Resource packet for participants. *Am Eval Assoc*. 2013; 27: 1-37.
30. Lee STH. Testing for Measurement Invariance: Does your measure mean the same thing for different participants? *Psychol Sci*; 2018 September 28; [accessed 2023 May 3] <https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/testing-for-measurement-invariance>
31. Fernández-Calderón F, González-Ponce BM, Díaz-Batanero C, Lozano-Rojas OM. Predictive utility of Protective Behavioral Strategies for Alcohol-related Outcomes in a Community Sample of Young Adults. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs*. 2021; 82; 476-485. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2021.82.476>
32. Watters JK., Biernacki P. Targeted sampling: Options for the study of hidden populations. *Soc Probl*. 1989; 36: 416-430. doi:10.2307/800824
33. Goodman LA. Snowball sampling. *Ann Math Stat*.1961;148-170.

34. Courtney KE, Polich J. Binge drinking in young adults: Data, definitions, and determinants. *Psychol Bull.* 2009; 135: 142. doi: 10.1037/a0014414
35. Collins RL, Parks GA, Marlatt GA. Social determinants of alcohol consumption: the effects of social interaction and model status on the self-administration of alcohol. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 1985; 53: 189.
36. Observatorio Español de las Drogas y las Adicciones, OEDA. Encuesta sobre uso de drogas en enseñanzas secundarias en España (ESTUDES) 1994-2018. Delegación del Gobierno para el Plan Nacional sobre Drogas, Madrid. 2019. [accessed 2022 November 9]  
[http://www.pnsd.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/sistemasInformacion/sistemaInformacion/pdf/ESTUDES\\_2018\\_Cuestionario\\_ALUMNOS\\_castellano.pdf](http://www.pnsd.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/sistemasInformacion/sistemaInformacion/pdf/ESTUDES_2018_Cuestionario_ALUMNOS_castellano.pdf)  
[Accessed 01 May 2020](#)
37. Rodríguez-Martos DA, Gual SA, Llopis LJ. The " standard drink unit" as a simplified record of alcoholic drink consumption and its measurement in Spain. *Med Clin.* 1999; 112: 446–450.
38. Pilatti A, Read JP, Caneto F. Validation of the Spanish version of the young adult alcohol consequences questionnaire (S-YAACQ). *Psychol Assess.* 2016; 28: e49. doi:10.1037/pas0000140
39. Read JP, Kahler CW, Strong DR, Colder CR. Development and preliminary validation of the young adult alcohol consequences questionnaire. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs.* 2006; 67: 169–177. doi: 10.15288/jsa.2006.67.169
40. Mezquita L, Ibáñez MI, Moya-Higueras J, Villa H, Arias B, Fañanás L, Ortet G. Psychometric properties of Drinking Motives Questionnaire-Revised (DMQ-R) in Spanish adolescents. *Eur J Psychol Assess.* 2018; 34: 145. doi: 10.1027/1015-5759/a000319

41. Kuntsche E, Kuntsche S. Development and validation of the drinking motive questionnaire revised short form (DMQ-R SF). *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol*. 2009; 38: 899-908. [doi:10.1080/15374410903258967](https://doi.org/10.1080/15374410903258967)
42. Sánchez-García M, Lozano-Rojas ÓM, Díaz-Batanero MC, Carmona-Márquez J, Rojas-Tejada AJ, Fernández-Calderón F. Spanish adaptation of the protective behavioral strategies scale-20 (S-PBSS-20) and evaluation of its psychometric properties in university students. *Psicothema*. 2020; 32: 598-606. doi: 10.7334/psicothema2020.172
43. Treolar H, Martens MP, McCarthy DM. The Protective Behavioral Strategies Scale-20: improved content validity of the Serious Harm Reduction subscale. *Psychol Assess*. 2015; 27: 340-346. doi:10.1037/pas0000071
44. Hu L, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Struct Equ Modeling*. 1999; 6: 1–55. [doi: 10.1080/10705519909540118](https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118)
45. Marsh HW, Hau KT, Wen Z. In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis-testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Struct Equ Modeling*. 2004; 11: 320-341. doi:10.1207/s15328007sem1103\_2
46. Satorra A, Bentler PM. A scaled difference chi-square test statistic for moment structure analysis. *Psychometrika*. 2001; 66: 507-514.
47. Cheung GW, Rensvold RB. Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Struct Equ Modeling*. 2002; 9: 233-255. [doi: 10.1207/S15328007SEM0902\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5)



48. Chen FF. Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement invariance. *Struct Equ Modeling*. 2007; 14: 464-504.  
[doi:10.1080/10705510701301834](https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510701301834)
49. Muthén LK, Muthén BO. *Mplus user's guide* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). 2017. Authors.
50. IBM Corporation. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 24.0. IBM Corp. 2016
51. Leigh BC. Beliefs about the effects of alcohol on self and others. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs*. 1987; 48: 467-475. doi:10.15288/jsa.1987.48.467
52. Linden AN, Lau-Barraco C, Milletich RJ. Protective behavioral strategies, alcohol expectancies, and drinking motives in a model of college student drinking. *Psychol Addict Behav*. 2014; 28: 952-9. [doi:10.1037/a0037041](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037041)
53. Madson MB, Moorer KD, Zeigler-Hill V, Bonnell MA, Villarosa M. Alcohol expectancies, protective behavioral strategies, and alcohol-related outcomes: A moderated mediation study. *Drugs (Abingdon Engl)*, 20: 286-296. doi: 0.3109/09687637.2013.766788
54. International Test Commission. The ITC guidelines for translating and adapting tests [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2018 Mar 21].
55. Cooper ML, Kuntsche E, Levitt A, Barber LL, Wolf S. Motivational models of substance use: A review of theory and research on motives for using alcohol, marijuana, and tobacco. *The Oxford handbook of substance use and substance use disorders*. 2016; 1: 375-421.
56. Cox WM, Klinger E. A motivational model of alcohol use. *J Abnorm Psychol*. 1988; 97:168. doi:10.1037/0021-843X.97.2.168

57. Monk RL, Heim D. A critical systematic review of alcohol-related outcome expectancies. *Subst Use Misuse*. 2013; 48: 539–557.  
[doi:10.3109/10826084.2013.787097](https://doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2013.787097)
58. National Statistics Institute [Instituto Nacional de Estadística]. 2019 [accessed 2023 April 3]  
[https://www.ine.es/dyngs/INEbase/es/categoria.htm?c=Estadistica\\_P&cid=1254734710984](https://www.ine.es/dyngs/INEbase/es/categoria.htm?c=Estadistica_P&cid=1254734710984)
59. Freeman LK, Haney AM, Griffin SA, Fleming MN, Vebares TJ, Motschman CA, Trull TJ. Agreement between momentary and retrospective reports of cannabis use and alcohol use: Comparison of ecological momentary assessment and timeline followback indices. *Psychol Addict Behav*. 2023; 37: 606–615. [doi:10.1037/adb0000897](https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000897)
60. Lee CM, Fairlie AM, Ramirez JJ, Patrick ME, Luk JW, Lewis MA. Self-fulfilling prophecies: Documentation of real-world daily alcohol expectancy effects on the experience of specific positive and negative alcohol-related consequences. *Psychol Addict Behav*. 2020, 34: 327.  
[doi:10.1037/a0000537](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0000537)
61. Miller MB, Leffingwell T, Claborn K, Meier E, Walters S, Neighbors C. Personalized feedback interventions for college alcohol misuse: an update of Walters & Neighbors (2005). *Psychol Addict Behav*. 2013; 27: 909.  
[doi:10.1037/a0031174](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031174)

**Table 1**

*Fit statistics: Confirmatory Factor Model of EQ-SF*

Models	$\chi^2$	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Model 1: Eight correlated factors	395.59	224	.000	0.929	0.913	0.051	0.057
Model 2: Two second order factors	456.32	243	.000	0.912	0.900	0.054	0.072

*Note.*  $\chi^2$  = chi-square; *df* = degree of freedom; *p* = *p* value; *CFI* = Comparative Fit Index; *TLI* = Tucker-Lewis Index; *SRMR* = Standardized Root Mean-Square Residual; *RMSEA* = Root Mean-Square Error of Approximation

**Table 2**

*Factor Loadings and reliability of the EQ-SF Items across times*

	<b>Subscales</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>T<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>T<sub>2</sub></b>	<b><math>\alpha_1</math></b>	<b><math>\alpha_2</math></b>
PE	Social positive	11. It is easier for me to socialize	.84	.82	.90	.89
		19. I am friendlier	.87	.86		
		22. I feel more social	.91	.87		
	Full positive	2. I enjoy the buzz	.58	.57	.78	.78
		17. It is fun	.79	.74		
		23. I feel good	.84	.85		
	Sex positive	7. I become more sexually active	.75	.78	.86	.86
		13. I am more sexually responsive	.92	.86		
		18. I am more sexually assertive	.81	.82		
	Tension reduction	5. It take away my negative moods and feelings	.68	.70	.69	.80
		9. I feel less stressed	.65	.73		
		15. I am able to take my mind off my problems	.64	.83		
NE	Social negative	1. I become aggressive	.75	.70	.68	.68
		6. I get into a fights	.67	.71		
		14. I get mean	.57	.55		
	Emotional negative	3. I feel ashamed of myself	.74	.67	.75	.75
		8. I feel guilty	.78	.81		
		16. I feel sad or depressed	.62	.63		
Physical negative	4. I feel sick	.55	.53	.76	.71	
	10. I get a hangover	.82	.68			
	20. I get a headache	.80	.80			
Cognitive negative	12. I become clumsy or uncoordinated	.57	.50	.74	.72	
	21. I can't concentrate	.75	.77			
	24. I have problems with memory and concentration	.81	.76			

*Note.* PE = Positive expectancies; NE = negative expectancies; T<sub>1</sub> = Time 1; T<sub>2</sub> = Time 2.  $\alpha$  = Cronbach's alpha

**Table 3**

*Model Fit Statistics for the Different Levels of Measurement Invariance of the EQ-SF across times*

Model	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR	$\Delta$ CFI	$\Delta$ TLI	$\Delta$ RMSEA	$\Delta$ SRMR
Configural invariance	0.920	0.904	0.045	0.057				
Metric invariance	0.920	0.906	0.045	0.058	0	-0.002	0	-0.001
Scalar invariance	0.916	0.903	0.046	0.059	0.004	0.003	-0.001	-0.001

*Note.* CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root Mean-Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean-Square Residual.

**Table 4**

*Bivariate correlations between EQ-SF subscale at time 1 with and alcohol-related outcomes indicators (frequency of alcohol use, drunkenness, and binge drinking, quantity of alcohol, and alcohol-related negative consequences), dimensions of drinking motives, and use of PBS at time 2*

Time 1	Time 2											
	Alcohol-related outcomes					Drinking motives			Protective behavioral strategies			
	ALC	DRU	B DR	CAN	CONS	SOC	ENH	COP	CONF	MOD	LSD	SHR
Social positive	.09	<b>.13</b>	.04	.10	<b>.20</b>	<b>.44</b>	<b>.34</b>	<b>.11</b>	<b>.15</b>	<b>-.22</b>	<b>-.16</b>	-.01
Fun positive	<b>.20</b>	<b>.26</b>	<b>.23</b>	<b>.19</b>	<b>.25</b>	<b>.48</b>	<b>.55</b>	<b>.20</b>	<b>.05</b>	<b>-.29</b>	<b>-.28</b>	<b>-.15</b>
Sex positive	<b>.20</b>	<b>.16</b>	<b>.16</b>	<b>.25</b>	<b>.26</b>	<b>.37</b>	<b>.29</b>	<b>.14</b>	<b>.13</b>	<b>-.19</b>	<b>-.14</b>	<b>-.14</b>
Tension reduction	<b>.19</b>	<b>.13</b>	<b>.17</b>	.08	<b>.20</b>	<b>.34</b>	<b>.39</b>	<b>.25</b>	.06	<b>-.17</b>	<b>-.14</b>	<b>-.18</b>
Social negative	<b>.13</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.16</b>	<b>.17</b>	<b>.33</b>	<b>.30</b>	<b>.31</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.13</b>	<b>-.18</b>	-.08	<b>-.22</b>
Emotional negative	.01	-.01	.01	.06	<b>.28</b>	.11	.11	<b>.17</b>	<b>.27</b>	.02	.02	.00
Physical negative	.07	.10	<b>.12</b>	<b>.14</b>	<b>.34</b>	<b>.28</b>	<b>.22</b>	<b>.22</b>	<b>.16</b>	<b>-.17</b>	-.03	-.13
Cognitive negative	<b>.12</b>	.05	<b>.12</b>	.07	<b>.36</b>	<b>.28</b>	<b>.22</b>	<b>.15</b>	<b>.14</b>	<b>-.22</b>	-.08	<b>-.22</b>

*Note:* ALC = frequency of alcohol; DRU = frequency of drunkenness; B DR = frequency of binge drinking; CAN = quantity of alcohol; CONS = alcohol-related consequences; SOC = social motives; ENH = enhancement motives; COP = coping motives; CONF = conformity motives; MOD = manner of drinking; SLD = stopping/limiting drinking; SHR = serious harm reduction. Statistically significant associations ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) are shown in bold.