Published in final edited form as:

Prev Sci. 2019 July ; 20(5): 800–809. doi:10.1007/s11121-019-0986-x.

Pathways from Positive, Negative, and Specific Alcohol Expectancies to Weekday and Weekend Drinking to Alcohol Problems

Andrew Lac and

University of Colorado at Colorado Springs

Jeremy W. Luk

Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Development

Abstract

The current study tested and identified risk and protective pathways from alcohol expectancies to weekday and weekend consumption to problematic consequences. Adult alcohol users ($N = 395$) completed measures of alcohol expectancies, daily consumption habits during a typical week, and alcohol-related problems. Confirmatory factor analysis supported the five-factor structure of positive expectancy, negative expectancy, weekday drinking, weekend drinking, and alcohol problems. The structural equation model specifying general positive and negative expectancy to weekday and weekend use to alcohol problems exhibited satisfactory fit indices. Specifically, positive expectancy contributed to greater weekend drinking, but negative expectancy prompted greater weekday drinking. Furthermore, lower positive expectancy, higher negative expectancy, higher weekday drinking, and higher weekend drinking each uniquely explained greater alcohol problems. The structural equation model involving the seven specific expectancies to weekday and weekend use to alcohol problems produced high fit indices. Specifically, higher risk and aggression, higher self-perception, and lower cognitive and behavioral impairment expectancies uniquely predicted weekday drinking. In contrast, higher sociability, higher liquid courage, higher risk and aggression, and lower cognitive impairment expectancies explained weekend drinking. The predictive model premised on specific alcohol expectancies as distinct constructs exhibited higher fit indices and more nuanced insights regarding risk and protective pathways for prevention than the model involving general positive versus negative expectancy constructs. Findings underscore that different types of self-fulfilling alcohol expectancy beliefs distinctively explain weekday versus weekend intake and problems.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Andrew Lac, Department of Psychology, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, 1420 Austin Bluffs Pkwy, Colorado Springs, CO 80918. alac@uccs.edu.

Author Note

Andrew Lac, Department of Psychology, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs; Jeremy W. Luk, Health Behavior Branch, Division of Intramural Population Health Research, *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest. The authors declare that they do not have conflicts of interest.

Informed consent. Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Ethical approval. All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. This article does not contain any studies with animals performed by any of the authors.

Keywords

alcohol expectancies; weekend drinking; alcohol problems; structural equation model

Weekend relaxation is essential to help recover from work and stress during the weekdays and contributes to positive emotions and well-being (Binnewies, Sonnentag, & Mojza, 2010; Fritz, Sonnentag, Spector, & McInroe, 2010). During the weekend, people are more likely to socialize and engage in pleasurable activities and events in which alcohol is served, with this respite period coinciding with substantially higher consumption rates compared to the weekdays (Kuntsche & Cooper, 2010; Orcutt & Harvey, 1991; Studer et al., 2014). The elevated consumption rate during the weekends relative to weekdays leads to more deleterious alcohol-induced problems such as vehicular accidents (Hingson & Winter, 2003), aggression and violence (Pridemore, 2004), and mortality (Plunk, Syed-Mohammed, Cavazos-Rehg, Bierut, & Grucza, 2014). Alcohol expectancy beliefs regarding the anticipated effects of drinking could help to understand weekend use and problematic outcomes. The current study scrutinized pathways from alcohol expectancies to weekday and weekend use to alcohol problems.

Weekend versus Weekday Drinking

Previous studies have investigated the risk characteristics of alcohol ingestion during the weekend (Kuntsche & Labhart, 2012; Kuntsche, Otten, & Labhart, 2015), identified consumption intentions and environmental factors responsible for weekend drinking (Trim et al., 2011), and documented enhancement motives as a reason for weekend intake (Kuntsche & Cooper, 2010). Suffoletto and Chung (2016) examined patterns of change in weekend drinking perceptions in association with drinking risks in the context of an alcohol intervention. The study discovered that those uncommitted to restricting weekend alcohol use were less responsive to the intervention. Thus, research that seeks to identify risks and consequences of weekend drinking habits should help inform prevention programs targeting diurnal alcohol consumption habits.

A fundamental challenge in understanding the daily drinking patterns across the week concerns the exact days that conceptually embody and demarcate the boundaries of “weekends” and “weekdays” in the context of alcohol use. Despite inconsistencies in measurement, the research consensus is that people ingest alcohol more heavily on the “weekends” compared to “weekdays” (Del Boca, Darkes, Greenbaum, & Goldman, 2004; Maggs, Williams, & Lee, 2011). Approaches to this operational definition have varied, ranging from adopting a two-day drinking weekend of Friday to Saturday or Saturday to Sunday (e.g., Ekholm, Strandberg-Larsen, & Grønbaek, 2011; Matzopoulos, Peden, Bradshaw, & Jordaan, 2006) to a three-day weekend of Thursday to Saturday or Friday to Sunday (e.g., Luk, Fairlie, & Lee, 2017; Mohr, Brannan, Wendt, Jacobs, Wright, & Wang, 2013). Competing definitional variations have been pursued including applying five days of the week to measure weekend (Friday and Saturday) and weekday (Monday to Wednesday) consumption but not categorizing the other days (Cleveland & Almeida, 2013; Turrisi et al., 2013).

Recently, Lac, Handren, and Crano (2016) applied confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to resolve the classification of the days that optimally embody weekend versus weekday intake patterns by testing common measurement manifestations put forth in the previous literature. This psychometric investigation based on adults across a wide age spectrum discovered that the best fitting model was a correlated two-factor structure permitting Friday and Saturday to load on weekend drinking and Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday to represent weekday drinking. Moreover, Sunday and Thursday, constituting transitional consumption days, each double loaded on both weekend and weekday drinking.

Alcohol Expectancies

Alcohol expectancies represent personal beliefs about the anticipated effects of drinking. Research has established that positive and negative alcohol expectancies are consistently correlated with overall alcohol use and its consequences (Brown, Christiansen, & Goldman, 1987; Jones, Corbin, & Fromme, 2001). The Comprehensive Effects of Alcohol questionnaire (Fromme, Stroot, & Kaplan, 1993) is the most widely administered alcohol expectancy scale and represented by four positive (sociability, tension reduction, liquid courage, and sexuality) and three negative (cognitive and behavioral impairment, risk and aggression, and self-perception) expectancies. Drinking in younger adults is usually prompted by higher sociability and higher sexuality expectancies, whereas drinking in older adults is driven by higher tension reduction and lower cognitive and behavioral impairment expectancies (Nicolai, Moshagen, & Demmel, 2012; Pabst, Baumeister, & Kraus, 2010).

Current Study

Drinking expectancies and motives have been evaluated as risk factors for weekday and weekend drinking. Lau-Barraco et al. (2016) determined that tension reduction expectancies were associated with weekday drinking (defined as Sunday to Wednesday), whereas social expectancies were associated with weekend drinking (defined as Thursday to Saturday). Studer et al. (2014) documented that coping motives were related to weekday drinking (defined as Monday to Thursday), whereas enhancement motives explained weekend drinking (defined as Friday to Sunday). These studies indicate that tension reduction and coping beliefs prompt weekday use, whereas sociability and enhancement beliefs facilitate weekend use.

The purpose of the current study is to test pathways from alcohol expectancies to weekday and weekend use to alcohol-related consequences. The examination of these connections would help to identify risk and protective factors to offer insights for prevention efforts tailored to the consumption habits of weekdays versus weekends. The proposed research overcomes several limitations of prior research. First, the current study applied a paradigm to conceptualize weekday and weekend consumption based on a validated two-factor measurement structure (Lac et al., 2016). Past investigations have applied inconsistent or arbitrary definitions or measured weekday and weekend drinking based on descriptive data (Del Boca et al., 2004; Maggs et al., 2011). Second, the present study comprehensively tested all seven specific alcohol expectancies as predictors of weekday and weekend use. The practical utility of disaggregating specific types of alcohol expectancies has been noted

(Blume & Guttu, 2015; Lac & Brack, 2018), but the extent that these specific expectations are related to weekend versus weekday use has been largely neglected. For instance, previous research has evaluated social and tension-reduction expectancies but has did not incorporate and control for the other types of specific expectancies in the same predictive model to understand weekend versus weekday drinking (Lau-Barraco et al., 2016). Finally, this is the first study to test relations involving expectancies and problems with the two-factor structure of weekday and weekend drinking (Lac et al., 2016). Thus, to maximize relevance for prevention, the outcome of alcohol problems was incorporated to test a mediational model from alcohol expectancies to weekday and weekend use to problems.

Method

Participants

The sample of alcohol users ($N = 395$) averaged 32.42 ($SD = 11.27$) years of age (range: 18 to 71). Gender distribution included 54% male and 46% female. Racial identity included 81% White, 4% Latino, 6% Black, 6% Asian, and 3% multiracial. The original data collection involved 512 participants (117 nondrinkers during the typical seven-day week were excluded from analyses).

Procedure

Participants were recruited from Mechanical Turk (MTurk), a crowdsourcing site permitting the completion of tasks including research studies for nominal compensation. Data from this source are considered convenience sampling (Antoun, Zhang, Conrad, Schober, 2016), with methodological studies showing that participants answered candidly, paid attention to questions, and completed measures that exhibited measurement reliabilities and validities similar to that in community samples (Kim & Hodgins, 2017). Participants are more demographically diverse than undergraduate and standard Internet sources (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Goodman, Cryder, & Cheema, 2013), with results comparable to in-person recruitment methods (Rand, 2012). Although MTurk participants are drawn from geographically diverse regions across the U.S. (Azzam & Jacobson, 2013), they tend to be younger and higher in education attainment than the overall U.S. population (Paloacci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2010). Among MTurk respondents who reported being alcohol users, 27% of the days they used alcohol satisfied the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) criteria for binge drinking (Boynton & Richman, 2014), and 66% were classified by a clinical screening tool to possess alcohol problems (Kim & Hodgins, 2017).

Participation was restricted to a 90% or higher approval rating on previously completed MTurk tasks to ensure adequate response quality (Peer, Vosgerau, & Acquisti, 2014) and U.S. residency because of alcohol use disparities across countries (Balogun, Koyanagi, Stickley, Gilmour, & Shibuya, 2014). An institutional IRB approved the research protocols.

Measures

Alcohol Expectancies.—The Comprehensive Effects of Alcohol questionnaire (Fromme, Stoot, & Kaplan, 1993) assessed beliefs regarding the anticipated effects of alcohol intake.

Instructions indicated “Check a response from disagree to agree, depending on whether you would expect the effect to happen to you if you were under the influence of alcohol.” The 38-item inventory consists of seven subscales including sociability ($\alpha = .91$; e.g., “I would be friendly”), tension reduction ($\alpha = .81$; e.g., “I would feel calm”), liquid courage ($\alpha = .88$; e.g., “I would feel powerful”), sexuality ($\alpha = .87$; e.g., “I would be a better lover”), cognitive & behavioral impairment ($\alpha = .86$; e.g., “I would be clumsy”), risk & aggression ($\alpha = .88$; e.g., “I would take risks”), and self-perception ($\alpha = .88$; e.g., “I would feel self-critical”). The first four subscales are classified as positive expectancy ($\alpha = .76$) and the last three subscales as negative expectancy ($\alpha = .70$). Response options ranged from 1 (*disagree*) to 4 (*agree*).

Weekday and Weekend Drinking.—The Daily Drinking Questionnaire-Revised (Lac, Handren, & Crano, 2016), previously validated using CFA and item response theory analysis, measured daily drinking patterns. Instructions indicated “Consider a typical week during the past month. How much alcohol, on average (measured in number of drinks), do you drink on each day of a typical week?” Participants responded to seven parallel items corresponding to each day of the week (e.g., “On a typical Monday, I have ____ drinks”) using open-ended quantitative responses. Consistent with measurement specifications for the factor structure of intake frequency across the seven days of the week (Lac, Handren, & Crano, 2016), Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday represented weekday drinking and Friday and Saturday represented weekend drinking. Thursday and Sunday were permitted to double load on weekday and weekend use. Weekday ($\alpha = .82$) and weekend ($\alpha = .75$) drinking were estimated as latent factors. Based on the NIAAA (2004) definition of binge drinking as consuming 5 or more alcoholic beverages for males and 4 or more alcoholic beverages for females on a single occasion, 28% of the sample binge drank at least one day per week.

Alcohol Problems.—The Rutgers Alcohol Problem Index (RAPI) is a 23-item instrument designed to assess alcohol consequences in clinical and nonclinical samples (White, Filstead, Labouvie, Conlin, & Pandina, 1988; White & Labouvie, 1989). This screening tool covers almost all the DSM-III-R diagnostic criteria for an alcohol disorder (White & Labouvie, 1989) and exhibits strong convergent validity with other clinical assessments of alcohol abuse and problems (White, Filstead, Labouvie, Conlin, & Pandina, 1988). Instructions indicated “How many times did the following things happen to you while you were drinking or because of your alcohol use in the past 30 days?” Response options ranged from 0 (*never*) to 5 (*5 or more times*). Consistent with scoring recommendations (Martens, Neighbors, Dams-O'Connor, Lee, & Larimer, 2007), each item was dichotomously coded as to whether the problem was experienced (1 = *1 or more times*) or not (0 = *never*). Items could be arranged into three intercorrelated facets (Martens, Neighbors, Dams-O'Connor, Lee, & Larimer, 2007): abuse/dependence consequences ($\alpha = .93$, 12 items, e.g., “Felt psychologically dependent on alcohol”), personal consequences ($\alpha = .90$, 7 items, e.g., “Neglected your responsibilities”), and social consequences ($\alpha = .83$, 4 items, e.g., “Caused shame or embarrassment to someone”). These three summed indices served as parcels (Coffman & MacCallum, 2005; Matsunaga, 2008) for the alcohol problems factor.

Statistical Analysis

In Model 1, the CFA tested the five-factor structure involving positive expectancy, negative expectancy, weekday drinking, weekend drinking, and alcohol problems to examine bivariate correlations across these latent factors. In Model 2, a structural equation model (SEM) estimated predictive pathways from the positive and negative expectancy to weekday and weekend use to alcohol problems. In Model 3, another SEM tested pathways from the seven specific alcohol expectancies to weekday and weekend use to alcohol problems.

The models were specified with the Mplus program (Muthen & Muthen, 2017). Based on the recommended approach to adjust for nonnormally distributed variables (Hoyle, 2012; Kline, 2016; Maydeu-Olivares, 2017), robust maximum likelihood (MLM) served as the estimation method to automatically correct fit indices and *p*-values of direct effect estimates based on normality departures. Accordingly, four robust fit indices (Hoyle, 2012; Muthen & Muthen, 2017) judged the adequacy of each model. The model chi-square (χ^2) test is oversensitive in rejecting a model when the sample size is not small (Bollen, 1989). Thus, the CFI and TLI with higher values, preferably between .90 to 1.00 indicating a good model (Ullman & Bentler, 2003) were also interpreted. The RMSEA is appropriately sensitive in detecting misspecifications, with a value below .05 denoting close fit, between .05 and .08 fair fit, and between .08 and .10 mediocre fit, and above .10 poor fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1992; MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996).

Results

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The five-factor CFA involving the latent factors of positive expectancy, negative expectancy, weekday drinking, weekend drinking, and alcohol problems was estimated. The CFA exhibited satisfactory fit indices, $\chi^2 = 259.99$, $df = 107$, $p < .05$, $\chi^2/df = 2.43$, CFI = .93, TLI = .91, RMSEA = .06 [90% CI: .05 to .07]. Factor loadings and interfactor correlations are presented in Figure 1. All items loaded significantly and highly on their respective factors. Interfactor correlations ranged from .14 to .63, with these magnitudes falling below the recommended .80 correlation to signify discriminant validity of factors (Brown, 2006). Furthermore, the imposition of constraints forcing each correlation pair between factors to be equivalent ($r = 1.00$) statistically degraded the CFA model, all $ps < .001$. These results corroborated that the five factors embodied distinct constructs.

Structural Equation Model: General Positive and Negative Expectancy

Pathways from general positive and negative expectancy to weekday and weekend drinking to alcohol problems were estimated in an SEM. Positive expectancy and negative expectancy were specified to be correlated and to predict weekday and weekend use and alcohol problems. Both weekday and weekend drinking were stipulated to explain alcohol problems. The disturbance terms (predictive errors of latent factors) of weekday and weekend use were permitted to be correlated.

The predictive model demonstrated satisfactory fit indices, $\chi^2 = 339.40$, $df = 143$, $p < .05$, $\chi^2/df = 2.37$, CFI = .92, TLI = .90, RMSEA = .06 [90% CI: .05 to .07]. Trimming the two

nonsignificant predictive paths yielded the final model, $\chi^2 = 340.89$, $df = 145$, $p < .05$, $\chi^2 = 2.35$, CFI = .92, TLI = .90, RMSEA = .06 [90% CI: .05 to .07]. Estimates are found in Figure 2. All item loadings for the factors attained significance. Positive expectancy uniquely predicted greater weekend drinking, whereas negative expectancy uniquely explained greater weekday drinking. Lower positive expectancy, higher negative expectancy, higher weekday drinking, and higher weekend drinking uniquely contributed to greater alcohol problems. The mediational processes depicted in Figure 2 were corroborated by tests of indirect effects presented in the top part of Table 1.

Structural Equation Model: Specific Expectancies

Pathways from the seven specific expectancies to use to problems were estimated with SEM. The specific expectancies were stipulated to be intercorrelated and to explain weekday and weekend drinking and alcohol problems. Weekday and weekend drinking were proposed to explain problems. Disturbance terms for weekday and weekend drinking were permitted to correlate.

The proposed model rendered strong fit indices: $\chi^2 = 150.68$, $df = 100$, $p < .05$, $\chi^2/df = 1.50$, CFI = .97, TLI = .96, RMSEA = .04 [90% CI: .02 to .05]. Deletion of nonsignificant predictive paths supported the final model, $\chi^2 = 162.83$, $df = 109$, $p < .05$, $\chi^2/df = 1.49$, CFI = .97, TLI = .96, RMSEA = .04 [90% CI: .02 to .05]. Model estimates are presented in Figure 3. All item loadings for the latent factors attained significance (Figure 3). Lower cognitive and behavioral impairment, higher risk and aggression, and higher self-perception expectancies uniquely contributed to weekday drinking. Higher sociability, higher liquid courage, lower cognitive and behavioral impairment, and higher risk and aggression expectancies explained weekend drinking. Greater alcohol problems were explicated by lower sociability, higher sexuality, higher cognitive and behavioral impairment, higher risk and aggression, higher self-perception expectancies, higher weekday drinking, and higher weekend drinking. Test of indirect effects, as shown in the bottom part of Table 1, corroborated the statistical significance of all mediational processes in Figure 3.

Discussion

The study examined general and specific alcohol expectancies (in separate models) as uniquely contributing to weekday versus weekend drinking habits. Previous studies usually assessed an overall composite of alcohol usage without conceptually distinguishing between weekday versus weekend intake (Bloomfield, Hope, & Kraus, 2013; Lahaut, Jansen, van de Mheen, & Garretsen, 2003). Findings support that belief expectations regarding alcohol serve as mental schemas (Moss & Albery, 2009) that differentially guide weekday and weekend use and alcohol problems.

The CFA supported that the five factors were positively intercorrelated, except for the nonsignificant correlation between positive expectancy and weekday drinking. The SEM premised on general positive versus negative expectancy determined that positive expectancy was a risk for weekend drinking, but negative expectancy was a risk for weekday drinking. Previous research has documented that positive, but not negative, expectancy explicated overall alcohol use, but that factor was not separated into weekend versus weekday intake

(Lac & Brack, 2018). Also in the present study, lower positive expectancy served as a protective factor, but higher negative expectancy, higher weekday drinking, and higher weekend drinking served as risk factors for alcohol problems. Findings also disclosed that expectancy could operate differently in its indirect and direct effects. Notably, a risky indirect effect was evidenced from positive expectancy to weekend use to alcohol problems, but positive expectancy emerged as a protective direct effect against alcohol problems after controlling for negative expectancy, weekday use, and weekend use.

The SEM using seven specific expectancies as predictors yielded information about the risk and protective connections with weekday and weekend use. Self-perception expectancy uniquely related to weekday, but not weekend, drinking. A rationale for this connection is that people might seek solace in the bottle to regulate self-image as an ego-defensive strategy (Steele & Josephs, 1990) to manage weekday stressors. Experimental evidence has shown that self-perception became elevated after alcohol use (Wall, Thursell, & Lalonde, 2003). Sociability and liquid courage expectancies uniquely predicted weekend but not weekday usage. These findings are consistent with the common utilitarian perception that alcohol serves as a lubricant to muster the courage to engage in social activities and events (Engels, Wiers, Lemmers, & Overbeek, 2005; Kuntsche & Cooper, 2010; LaBrie, Grant, & Hummer, 2011; Lau-Barraco et al., 2016). The liquid courage expectation reflects the perception that ingesting alcohol will make one feel brave, powerful, and creative. Consistent with Studer et al. (2014), the sociability and liquid courage expectancies are based on the functional perspective that recreational use could enhance social gatherings and celebratory activities that tend to occur more during weekends than weekdays.

Cognitive and behavioral impairment expectancy as protective against weekday and weekend alcohol intake is consistent with research indicating that espousing the belief that alcohol compromises psychomotor abilities serves as a deterrent against consumption (Magrys & Olmstead, 2014). The risk and aggression expectancy association with greater daily drinking has been documented (Zhang, Welte, & Wieczorek, 2002), and supports the role of alcohol in establishing an excuse for risky and aggressive acts as postulated by the deviance disavowal hypothesis (Spunt, Goldstein, Brownstein, Fendrich, & Langley, 1994). This framework posits that people believe that they will be less likely to incur punishment and retaliation after engaging in nonnormative actions when intoxicated by blaming the bottle for their irresponsible behaviors (Quigley & Leonard, 2006).

Alcohol expectancies have applications in the prevention and treatment of alcohol use and problems (Goldman, 1994). Five of the seven specific expectancies uniquely explained alcohol problems, over and beyond the significant pathways from both weekday and weekend drinking. The risk and protective pathways from expectancies offer opportunities to correct these malleable beliefs in efforts to curtail the susceptibility to usage and problems (Labbe & Maisto, 2011; Scott-Sheldon, Terry, Carey, Garey, & Carey, 2012). Clinicians working with those who consume alcohol more heavily during the weekdays might address their clients' self-perception expectancy belief, as this association was evidenced in the present study. In contrast, drinkers who consume at higher rates during the weekend were more likely to possess sociability and liquid courage expectancies and therefore might benefit from informational messages that address and reduce these risk perceptions. Risk

and aggression expectancy was predictive of weekday drinking, weekend drinking, and alcohol problems, so prevention programs targeting the expectation that alcohol could be consumed to facilitate aggressive acts might benefit from strategies designed to help channel these beliefs into more constructive behaviors (Kachadourian, Quigley, & Leonard, 2014). Weekday and weekend use both contributed uniquely to alcohol problems, so training drinkers on how to be mindful in applying protective behavioral strategies during events where alcohol is served could curtail risks for deleterious consequences (Brett, Leffingwell, & Leavens, 2017).

Additional prevention and treatment opportunities could be pursued based on the present findings. The modification of maladaptive expectancy beliefs in the context of alcohol treatment approaches is a possibility (Neighbors et al. 2009). Cognitive-behavioral treatment, for example, has been conducted to modify preexisting beliefs regarding alcohol expectancies (Coates et al., 2018). Furthermore, the “alcohol expectancy challenge,” an intervention designed to correct expectations about the anticipated effects of alcohol, applies experiential learning and informational feedback to modify alcohol expectations (NIAAA, 2002). A meta-analysis of “alcohol expectancy challenge” interventions that compared treatment versus control groups discovered that the program was efficacious in reducing positive but not negative expectancies (Scott-Sheldon, Carey, Garey, & Carey, 2012). However, the role of negative expectancies should not be neglected as it is a risk factor that increases the vulnerability to subsequently relapsing in alcohol-dependent individuals who completed treatment (Jones & McMahon, 1994). The literature on whether it is preferable for preventions to target weekday or weekend use is limited, but research tends to show that weekend intake is the window to more serious alcohol-induced consequences that inflict harm to the self and others (Kuntsche & Cooper, 2010; Orcutt & Harvey, 1991; Studer et al., 2014). The reason is that drinkers tend to make an active effort to restrict alcohol intake during the weekdays owing to school or work obligations and to avoid compromising task completion (Pabst et al., 2010; Luk et al., 2017), so prevention designs targeting the elevated consumption patterns of the “wet” weekends might be a more critical endeavor

Additional considerations are warranted in designing expectancy belief modification interventions. The assessment of alcohol expectancies in treatment designs should apply validated measures (Fromme & D’Amico, 2000). The identification of at-risk profiles through more effective screening, needs assessments, brief pilot interventions, and referral to treatment are warranted. It would be important to establish normative information about alcohol expectancies and usage habits for any demographic sample, so that tailored programs could be effectively implemented in clinical and community settings (Li & Dingle, 2012). Moreover, prevention scientists ought to consider the roles of social and contextual environments of drinkers that shape and activate their alcohol expectancy beliefs (LaBrie Grant, & Hummer, 2011).

Findings should be interpreted in the context of limitations. Although the recruitment of participants using MTurk offers a demographically diverse sample (Buhrmester et al., 2011; Goodman et al., 2013), the extent that findings could be extrapolated to high-risk samples, including clinically diagnosed alcohol abusers, warrants scrutiny in future research. The current study ruled out the demographic covariates of age, gender, and race, but additional

potential confounds such as socioeconomic status should be measured and controlled in future studies. Future investigations extending upon this study should evaluate the possibility of a bifactor structure (Chen, Hayes Carvery, Laurenceau, & Zhang, 2012) of drinking days. In such a three-factor measurement model, separate weekday and weekend factors could be specified (as in the present study) in addition to permitting items from all seven days to load on a third “omnibus drinking” factor. Additionally, the findings are not generalizable to nondrinkers as the current research included only drinkers. Although nondrinkers could also possess alcohol expectancy beliefs (Fromme & D’amico, 2000; Fromme, Stoot, & Kaplan, 1993), the decision in the present study to include only consumers is consistent with the protocol of administering the Rutgers Alcohol Problems Index to users only (White & Labouvie, 1989). Another reason that nondrinkers were excluded is that they would be reporting zero incidences of weekday drinking, weekend drinking, and alcohol problems.

The current cross-sectional study could be extended by applying longitudinal designs. Although the current research tested pathways from alcohol expectancies (beliefs) to weekday and weekend drinking (behavior) to drinking problems (outcomes) that are theoretically and directionally consistent with the literature, the results isolated in this investigation ought to be cross-validated in longitudinal designs to scrutinize the temporal precedence of these constructs. A cross-lagged panel study determined that alcohol expectancies longitudinally preceded alcohol use in assessments separated by three years (Sher, Wood, & Raskin, 1996), but that investigation did not separate drinking into weekday and weekend use and neglected to incorporate alcohol problems.

The understanding of how alcohol expectancies and consequences are connected with weekend drinking is critical in helping to address alcohol misuse as a public health problem as people usually ingest more than anticipated on weekends (Labhart, Anderson, & Kuntsche, 2017). The insights afforded in the clarification of risk pathways from expectancies to weekend and weekday use to problems yields implications to modify expectancy beliefs in informational interventions tailored to drinking patterns across the week.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Funding.

Manuscript preparation by the 1st author was partially supported by NIH/NIAA (L30 AA024314–01). Manuscript preparation by the 2nd author was partially supported by the *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Manuscript preparation by first author was supported by NIH/NIAAA (L30 AA024314–01; PI: Lac). Manuscript preparation by the second author was supported by the Intramural Research Program of the *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

References

- Antoun C, Zhang C, Conrad FG, & Schober MF (2016). Comparisons of Online Recruitment Strategies for Convenience Samples: Craigslist, Google AdWords, Facebook, and Amazon Mechanical Turk Field Methods, 28, 231–246.
- Azzam T, & Jacobson MR (2013). Finding a comparison group: Is online crowdsourcing a viable option? *American Journal of Evaluation*, 34, 372–384.
- Binnewies C, Sonnentag S, & Mojza EJ (2010). Recovery during the weekend and fluctuations in weekly job performance: A week-level study examining intra-individual relationships. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 419–441.
- Bloomfield K, Hope A, & Kraus L (2013). Alcohol survey measures for Europe: A literature review. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 20, 348–360.
- Bollen KA (1989). *Structural equations with latent variables*. Oxford, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Boynton MH, & Richman LS (2014). An online daily diary study of alcohol use using Amazon's Mechanical Turk. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 33, 456–461. [PubMed: 24893885]
- Brett EI, Leffingwell TR, & Leavens EL (2017). Trait mindfulness and protective strategies for alcohol use: Implications for college student drinking. *Addictive Behaviors*, 73, 16–21. [PubMed: 28441572]
- Buckley L, & Foss MS (2012). Protective factors associated with young passenger intervening in risky driving situations. *Journal of Safety Research*, 43(5), 351–356. [PubMed: 23206507]
- Blume AW, & Guttu BL (2015). Categories of alcohol outcome expectancies and their relationships to alcohol related consequences. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 1, 64–67. [PubMed: 29531981]
- Brown SA, Christiansen BA, & Goldman MS (1987). The Alcohol Expectancy Questionnaire: An instrument for the assessment of adolescent and adult alcohol expectancies. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 48(5), 483–491. [PubMed: 3669677]
- Brown TA (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York: Guilford
- Browne MW, & Cudeck R (1992). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 21, 230–258.
- Buhrmester M, Kwang T, & Gosling SD (2011). Amazon's mechanical turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6, 3–5. [PubMed: 26162106]
- Charlton SG, & Starkey NJ (2015). Driving while drinking: performance impairments resulting from social drinking. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 74, 210–217. [PubMed: 25463962]
- Chen FF, Hayes A, Carver CS, Laurenceau JP, & Zhang Z (2012). Modeling general and specific variance in multifaceted constructs: a comparison of the bifactor model to other approaches. *Journal of Personality*, 80(1), 219–251. [PubMed: 22092195]
- Cleveland HH, & Almeida DM (2013). A behavioral genetic investigation of weekend drinking among an adult sample. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 48(5), 359–370. [PubMed: 23421388]
- Coates JM, Gullo MJ, Feeney GF, Young RM, Dingle GA, & Connor JP (2018). Alcohol expectancies pre-and post-alcohol use disorder treatment: Clinical implications. *Addictive Behaviors*, 80, 142–149. [PubMed: 29407685]
- Coffman DL, & MacCallum RC (2005). Using parcels to convert path analysis models into latent variable models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 40, 235–259. [PubMed: 26760108]
- Collins RL, Parks GA, & Marlatt GA (1985). Social determinants of alcohol consumption: The effects of social interaction and model status on the self-administration of alcohol. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 189–200. [PubMed: 3998247]
- Cooper ML, Frone MR, Russell M, & Mudar P (1995). Drinking to regulate positive and negative emotions: a motivational model of alcohol use. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(5), 990–1005. [PubMed: 7473043]
- Del Boca FK, Darkes J, Greenbaum PE, & Goldman MS (2004). Up close and personal: Temporal variability in the drinking of individual college students during their first year. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 72, 155–164. [PubMed: 15065951]

- Ekholm O, Strandberg-Larsen K, & Grønbaek M (2011). Influence of the recall period on a beverage-specific weekly drinking measure for alcohol intake. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 65(4), 520–525. [PubMed: 21326272]
- Engels RC, Wiers R, Lemmers LEX, & Overbeek G (2005). Drinking motives, alcohol expectancies, self-efficacy, and drinking patterns. *Journal of Drug Education*, 35, 147–166. [PubMed: 16312111]
- Fritz C, Sonnentag S, Spector PE, & McInroe JA (2010). The weekend matters: Relationships between stress recovery and affective experiences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 1137–1162.
- Fromme K, & D'amico EJ (2000). Measuring adolescent alcohol outcome expectancies. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 14, 206–212. [PubMed: 10860120]
- Fromme K, Stroot EA, & Kaplan D (1993). Comprehensive effects of alcohol: Development and psychometric assessment of a new expectancy questionnaire. *Psychological Assessment*, 5, 19–26.
- Greeley J, & Oei T (1999). Alcohol and tension reduction In Leonard KE, & Blane HT (Eds.), *Psychological theories of drinking and alcoholism* (2nd ed.). (pp. 14–53). New York: Guilford Press.
- Goldman MS (1994). The alcohol expectancy concept: Applications to assessment, prevention, and treatment of alcohol abuse. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 3(3), 131–144.
- Goodman JK, Cryder CE, & Cheema A (2013). Data collection in a flat world: The strengths and weaknesses of mechanical turk samples. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 26, 213–224.
- Hingson R, & Winter M (2003). Epidemiology and consequences of drinking and driving. *Alcohol Research and Health*, 27(1), 63–78. [PubMed: 15301401]
- Hoyle RH (2012). *Handbook of structural equation modeling*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Jones BT, Corbin W, & Fromme K (2001). A review of expectancy theory and alcohol consumption. *Addiction*, 96(1), 57–72. [PubMed: 11177520]
- Jones BT, & McMahon J (1994). Negative alcohol expectancy predicts post-treatment abstinence survivorship: the whether, when and why of relapse to a first drink. *Addiction*, 89(12), 1653–1665. [PubMed: 7866249]
- Kachadourian LK, Quigley BM, & Leonard KE (2014). Alcohol expectancies and evaluations of aggression in alcohol-related intimate-partner verbal and physical aggression. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 75(5), 744–752. [PubMed: 25208191]
- Kim HS, & Hodgins DC (2017). Reliability and validity of data obtained from alcohol, cannabis, and gambling populations on amazon's mechanical turk. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 31, 85. [PubMed: 27893213]
- Kline RB (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). New York: Guilford.
- Kuntsche E, & Cooper ML (2010). Drinking to have fun and to get drunk: Motives as predictors of weekend drinking over and above usual drinking habits. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 110(3), 259–262. [PubMed: 20363080]
- Kuntsche E, & Labhart F (2012). Investigating the drinking patterns of young people over the course of the evening at weekends. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 124(3), 319–324. [PubMed: 22377089]
- Kuntsche E, Otten R, & Labhart F (2015). Identifying risky drinking patterns over the course of Saturday evenings: An event-level study. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 29(3), 744. [PubMed: 25844829]
- Labbe AK, & Maisto SA (2011). Alcohol expectancy challenges for college students: A narrative review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 31(4), 673–683. [PubMed: 21482325]
- Labhart F, Anderson KG, & Kuntsche E (2017). The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak: Why young people drink more than intended on weekend nights—An event-level study. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 41(11), 1961–1969.
- LaBrie JW, Grant S, & Hummer JF (2011). “This would be better drunk”: Alcohol expectancies become more positive while drinking in the college social environment. *Addictive Behaviors*, 36(8), 890–893. [PubMed: 21497024]
- Lac A, & Brack N (2018). Alcohol expectancies longitudinally predict drinking and the alcohol myopia effects of relief, self-inflation, and excess. *Addictive Behaviors*, 77, 172–179. [PubMed: 29049894]

- Lac A, Handren L, & Crano WD (2016). Conceptualizing and measuring weekend versus weekday alcohol use: Item response theory and confirmatory factor analysis. *Prevention Science*, 17, 872–881. [PubMed: 27488456]
- Lac A, & Brack N (2018). Alcohol expectancies longitudinally predict drinking and the alcohol myopia effects of relief, self-inflation, and excess. *Addictive Behaviors*, 77, 172–179. [PubMed: 29049894]
- Lahaut VMHCJ, Jansen HAM, van de Mheen D, & Garretsen HFL (2003). Comparison of two formats of the weekly recall and quantity–frequency alcohol measures. *Journal of Substance Use*, 8, 164–169.
- Lau-Barraco C, Braitman AL, Linden-Carmichael AN, & Stamates AL (2016). Differences in weekday versus weekend drinking among nonstudent emerging adults. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 24(2), 100–109. [PubMed: 26901592]
- Lau-Barraco C, & Dunn ME (2008). Evaluation of a single-session expectancy challenge intervention to reduce alcohol use among college students. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 22(2), 168–175. [PubMed: 18540714]
- Li HK, & Dingle GA (2012). Using the Drinking Expectancy Questionnaire (revised scoring method) in clinical practice. *Addictive Behaviors*, 37(2), 198–204. [PubMed: 22036055]
- Luk JW, Fairlie AM, & Lee CM (2017). Daily-level associations between negative mood, perceived stress, and college drinking: do associations differ by sex and fraternity/sorority affiliation? *Substance Use & Misuse*, 1–9.
- MacCallum RC, Browne MW, & Sugawara HM (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 130–149.
- MacKinnon DP, Lockwood CM, & Williams J (2004). Confidence limits for the indirect effect: Distribution of the product and resampling methods. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39(1), 99–128. [PubMed: 20157642]
- Maggs JL, Williams LR, & Lee CM (2011). Ups and downs of alcohol use among first-year college students: Number of drinks, heavy drinking, and stumble and pass out drinking days. *Addictive Behaviors*, 36, 197–202. [PubMed: 21106298]
- Magrys SA, & Olmstead MC (2014). Alcohol intoxication alters cognitive skills mediated by frontal and temporal brain regions. *Brain and Cognition*, 85, 271–276. [PubMed: 24487348]
- Martens MP, Neighbors C, Dams-O'Connor K, Lee CM, & Larimer ME (2007). The factor structure of a dichotomously scored Rutgers Alcohol Problem Index. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 68, 597–606. [PubMed: 17568966]
- Matsunaga M (2008). Item parceling in structural equation modeling: A primer. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 2, 260–293.
- Matzopoulos R, Peden M, Bradshaw D, & Jordaan E (2006). Alcohol as a risk factor for unintentional rail injury fatalities during daylight hours. *International Journal of Injury Control and Safety Promotion*, 13(2), 81–88. [PubMed: 16707343]
- Maydeu-Olivares A (2017). Maximum likelihood estimation of structural equation models for continuous data. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 24, 383–394.
- Moss AC, & Albery IP (2009). A dual-process model of the alcohol-behavior link for social drinking. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135, 516–530. [PubMed: 19586160]
- Muthen LK, & Muthen BO (2017). *Mplus user's guide* (8 ed.). Los Angeles: Muthen & Muthen.
- Mohr CD, Brannan D, Wendt S, Jacobs L, Wright R, & Wang M (2013). Daily mood– drinking slopes as predictors: A new take on drinking motives and related outcomes. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 27(4), 944–955. [PubMed: 23647154]
- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2002). *A call to action: Changing the culture of drinking at US colleges*. Washington, DC: Office of Research Translation and Communication.
- National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (2004). *NIAAA council approves definition of binge drinking*. Washington, DC: Office of Research Translation and Communication.
- Nicolai J, Moshagen M, & Demmel R (2012). Patterns of alcohol expectancies and alcohol use across age and gender. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 126(3), 347–353. [PubMed: 22748519]
- Orcutt JD, & Harvey LK (1991). The temporal patterning of tension reduction: Stress and alcohol use on weekdays and weekends. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 52(5), 415–424. [PubMed: 1943096]

- Pabst A, Baumeister SE, & Kraus L (2010). Alcohol-expectancy dimensions and alcohol consumption at different ages in the general population. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 71(1), 46–53. [PubMed: 20105413]
- Plunk AD, Syed-Mohammed H, Cavazos-Rehg P, Bierut LJ, & Grucza RA (2014). Alcohol Consumption, Heavy Drinking, and Mortality: Rethinking the J-Shaped Curve. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 38(2), 471–478.
- Pridemore WA (2004). Weekend effects on binge drinking and homicide: the social connection between alcohol and violence in Russia. *Addiction*, 99(8), 1034–1041. [PubMed: 15265100]
- Quigley BM, & Leonard KE (2006). Alcohol expectancies and intoxicated aggression. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 11, 484–496.
- Rand DG (2012). The promise of mechanical turk: How online labor markets can help theorists run behavioral experiments. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 299, 172–179. [PubMed: 21402081]
- Sayette MA (1999). Does drinking reduce stress? *Alcohol Research and Health*, 23, 250–255. [PubMed: 10890821]
- Scott-Sheldon, Terry DL, Carey KB, Garey L, & Carey MP (2012). Efficacy of expectancy challenge interventions to reduce college drinking: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 26, 393–405. [PubMed: 22428862]
- Spunt B, Goldstein P, Brownstein H, Fendrich M, & Langley S (1994). Alcohol and homicide: Interviews with prison inmates. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 24, 143–163.
- Suffoletto B, & Chung T (2016). Patterns of change in weekend drinking cognitions among non-treatment-seeking young adults during exposure to a 12-week text message intervention. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 77(6), 914–923. [PubMed: 27797693]
- Sher KJ, Wood MD, Wood PK, & Raskin G (1996). Alcohol outcome expectancies and alcohol use: A latent variable cross-lagged panel study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 105(4), 561–574. [PubMed: 8952189]
- Steele CM, & Josephs RA (1990). Alcohol myopia. Its prized and dangerous effects. *American Psychologist*, 45, 921–933. [PubMed: 2221564]
- Studer J, Baggio S, Mohler-Kuo M, Dermota P, Daepfen JB, & Gmel G (2014). Differential association of drinking motives with alcohol use on weekdays and weekends. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 28(3), 651–658. [PubMed: 25134031]
- Suffoletto B, Merrill JE, Chung T, Kristan J, Vanek M, & Clark DB (2016). A text message program as a booster to in-person brief interventions for mandated college students to prevent weekend binge drinking. *Journal of American College Health*, 64(6), 481–489. [PubMed: 27149662]
- Trim RS, Clapp JD, Reed MB, Shillington A, & Thombs D (2011). Drinking plans and drinking outcomes: Examining young adults' weekend drinking behavior. *Journal of Drug Education*, 41(3), 253–270. [PubMed: 22125921]
- Turrisi R, Mallett KA, Cleveland MJ, Varvil-Weld L, Abar C, Scaglione N, & Hultgren B (2013). Evaluation of timing and dosage of a parent-based intervention to minimize college students' alcohol consumption. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 74, 30–40. [PubMed: 23200148]
- Ullman JB, & Bentler PM (2003). Structural equation modeling In J. A. Schinka & W. F. Velicer (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology* (pp. 607–634).
- Wall AM, Thrussell C, & Lalonde RN (2003). Do alcohol expectancies become intoxicated outcomes? A test of social-learning theory in a naturalistic bar setting. *Addictive Behaviors*, 28(7), 1271–1283. [PubMed: 12915168]
- White HR, Filstead WJ, Labouvie EW, Conlin J, & Pandina RJ (1988). Assessing alcohol problems in clinical and nonclinical adolescent populations. *Alcoholism Clinical and Experimental Research*, 12, 328.
- White HR, & Labouvie EW (1989). Towards the assessment of adolescent problem drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 50, 30–37. [PubMed: 2927120]
- Zhang L, Welte JW, & Wieczorek WW (2002). The role of aggression-related alcohol expectancies in explaining the link between alcohol and violent behavior. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 37(4), 457–471.

Figure 1.

Confirmatory factor analysis involving positive expectancy, negative expectancy, weekday drinking, weekend drinking, and alcohol problems. Standardized coefficients are presented. Coefficients with bold lines are significant at $p < .05$. E = measurement error.

Figure 2.

Structural equation model of positive and negative expectancy to weekday and weekend drinking to alcohol problems. Standardized coefficients are presented. All paths shown are significant, $p < .05$. To rule out demographic characteristics, estimated but not displayed (for diagrammatic clarity) are age, gender (0 = female, 1 = male), and race (0 = racial minority, 1 = White) in covarying with the positive and negative expectancy and predicting weekday drinking, weekend drinking, and alcohol problems. E = measurement error. D = disturbance.

Figure 3.

Structural equation model of specific expectancies to weekday and weekend drinking to alcohol problems. Correlations across the seven specific expectancies were estimated as part of this model and presented in Table 3 in the online supplementary materials. Standardized coefficients are presented. All paths shown are significant, $p < .05$. To rule out demographic characteristics, estimated but not displayed (for diagrammatic clarity) are age, gender (0 = female, 1 = male), and race (0 = racial minority, 1 = White) in covarying with the specific expectancies and predicting weekday drinking, weekend drinking, and alcohol problems. Also estimated but not displayed are correlations across the seven specific expectancies (reported in Table 1). E = measurement error. D = disturbance.

Table 1

Tests of Specific Indirect Effects

Model	Predictor	Mediator	Outcome	Specific Indirect Effect β	95% CI	
					LL	UL
Figure 2	Positive expectancy	Weekend drinking	Alcohol problems	.071 *	.011	.147
Figure 2	Negative expectancy	Weekday drinking	Alcohol problems	.023 *	.003	.065
Figure 3	Sociability expectancy	Weekend drinking	Alcohol problems	.039 *	.011	.083
Figure 3	Liquid courage expectancy	Weekend drinking	Alcohol problems	.040 *	.006	.094
Figure 3	Cognitive & behavioral imp. exp.	Weekday drinking	Alcohol problems	-.021 *	-.063	-.004
Figure 3	Cognitive & behavioral imp. exp.	Weekend drinking	Alcohol problems	-.028 *	-.073	-.004
Figure 3	Risk & aggression expectancy	Weekday drinking	Alcohol problems	.020 *	.002	.056
Figure 3	Risk & aggression expectancy	Weekend drinking	Alcohol problems	.043 *	.006	.104
Figure 3	Self-perception expectancy	Weekday drinking	Alcohol problems	.020 *	.001	.062

Bootstrapping of indirect effects based on 2,000 samples using bias-corrected confidence intervals (MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004). Specific indirect effects presented here have statistically accounted for all other effects, including demographic covariates, in Figures 2 and 3. The indirect effect from positive expectancy to weekend drinking to alcohol problems was not significantly different than the indirect effect from negative expectancy to weekday drinking to alcohol problems. Standardized coefficients are presented.

*
 $p < .05$.