

1
2
3 1
4
5 2
6
7 3
8
9 4
10
11
12 5
13
14 6
15
16 7
17
18 8
19
20 9
21
22 10
23
24 11
25
26 12
27
28 13
29
30 14
31
32 15
33
34 16
35
36 17
37
38 18
39
40 19
41
42 20
43
44 21
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Developmental trajectories of adolescent risky drinking: Predictors from the Drug Education in Victoria Schools (DEVS) study

Abstract

With alcohol misuse one of the leading causes of disability among young Australians, determination of potential predictors of risky drinking trajectories of young people is crucial. This study aimed to identify risky drinking trajectories from early to mid-adolescence and to determine if membership of a harm minimization intervention, alcohol knowledge, attitudes towards alcohol and prevalence of alcohol harms would predict trajectory group membership. Longitudinal data from 1,746 students were used to identify alcohol consumption trajectory groups for both intervention and control students. Higher baseline knowledge predicted a higher, increasing, consumption trajectory for controls, whereas, safer attitudes at baseline was not associated with a higher, increasing trajectory. All other alcohol harms at baseline were strongly associated with higher consumption trajectories. The intervention group had fewer increasing trajectories and a lower level of consumption at the end of the program, suggesting the drug education program reduced the number of students who substantially increased their consumption over time, while at the same time reducing their level of consumption in relative terms. The consistency of better intervention student outcomes across all trajectories provides evidence that the drug education program was influential with all types of student drinkers and is suitable for universal delivery.

1 **Introduction**

2 Risky drinking is more prevalent in late adolescence and early adulthood than in any other period in
3 life (Kuntsche and Gmel, 2013). In the 2014 national survey of alcohol and other drug use by
4 students in Australia, of the 14.6% of 12 to 17 year olds who had consumed alcohol in the past week,
5 33.6% of them reported drinking five or more standard drinks on one occasion in the past week
6 (White and Williams, 2016). This level of consumption is defined as risky drinking according to
7 Australia's drinking guidelines (NHMRC, 2009). Frequency of risky drinking increases with age, going
8 from 11% of 12 year old drinkers to 51% of 17 year old drinker reporting drinking at risky levels in
9 the past week (White and Williams, 2016).

10
11 Alcohol misuse is one of the leading causes of disability among young Australians (Mathews et al.,
12 2011). Frequent heavy alcohol use and risky drinking by young people are risk factors for future
13 alcohol dependence (Bonomo et al., 2004), and increase the likelihood of road traffic accidents and
14 injury, violence, suicide, drunk driving, falls, unprotected sexual intercourse, substance use, property
15 damage, and vandalism (Kuntsche and Gmel, 2013; Labhart et al., 2013). Risky drinking by young
16 people has been linked to poor academic performance and the prevalence of other health risk
17 behaviors such as riding with a driver who had been drinking, being a victim of dating violence and
18 attempting suicide (Miller et al., 2007). Moreover, risky drinking patterns from adolescence persist
19 into adulthood. An Australian prospective cohort study reported that the great majority of
20 adolescent-onset risky drinkers (90% male; 70% female) continued to drink at unsafe levels as young
21 adults (Degenhardt et al., 2013). In comparison 70% of males and 48% of females who were not
22 adolescent-onset binge drinkers reported binge drinking in young adulthood (Degenhardt et al.,
23 2013).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Developmental trajectories of risky or binge drinking in adolescence have been previously used to
2
3 2 determine potential risk factors. Being male, having a family history of alcoholism, age at drinking
4
5 3 onset, feeling drunk during the first alcohol experience and alcohol expectancies about the positive
6
7 4 effects of alcohol are all associated with significantly greater odds of being in a problem drinking
8
9 5 trajectory group (Chassin, Pitts, and Prost, 2002; Warner, White, and Johnson, 2007; Jackson, Sher,
10
11 6 and Schulenberg, 2008). Peer drinking, drug use, delinquency, pre-drinking, drinking outside the
12
13 7 home, and parental supply of alcohol for unsupervised drinking are also associated with risky
14
15 8 drinking trajectory membership (Gilligan et al., 2012; Chassin, Pitts, and Prost, 2002; Jackson, Sher,
16
17 9 and Schulenberg, 2008; Kuntsche and Gmel, 2013). Associated personality and mental wellbeing risk
18
19 10 factors include sensation seeking, negative emotionality and high levels of emotional distress, low
20
21 11 constraint, anti-sociality, and externalizing behaviour (Jackson, Sher, and Schulenberg, 2008;
22
23 12 Chassin, Flora, and King, 2004; Colder et al., 2002; Chassin, Pitts, and Prost, 2002). In addition, early
24
25 13 onset and chronic high use of alcohol is strongly associated with smoking, and cannabis use (Jackson,
26
27 14 Sher, and Schulenberg, 2008). Outcomes associated with a developmental trajectory of risky
28
29 15 drinking, include alcohol and drug use disorders, greater internalising and externalising problems,
30
31 16 poor social functioning, and high risk for not completing secondary school or being involved in pro-
32
33 17 social activities (Gmel, Kuntsche, and Rehm, 2011; Chassin, Flora, and King, 2004; Chassin, Pitts, and
34
35 18 Prost, 2002; Hill et al., 2000).

19 The Drug Education in Victorian Schools (DEVS) ‘Get Ready’ intervention was designed to provide
20 junior secondary school students with the critical disposition, practical knowledge and
21 communication and decision making skills to predict and manage risk and use strategies to minimise
22 the harms most likely to be encountered in relation to drug and alcohol use, whether their own or
23 that of others. Findings in relation to alcohol prevention from the DEVS program have been
24 reported in previous papers and show by the end of the year following a two year classroom
25 education program, there were fewer risky drinkers in the intervention group, intervention students

1 who did drink in a risky manner reduced their consumption, and alcohol harms decreased for
2 intervention group risky drinkers (Midford et al., 2015; Midford et al., 2014; Midford et al., 2016).
3 Conversely, the proportion of risky drinkers in the control group increased (Midford et al., 2016).

4 As far as the authors are aware, there are no studies to date which look at knowledge, attitudes and
5 alcohol harm predictors of risky drinking developmental trajectories of young people involved in a
6 harm minimisation intervention. In this study we aim to identify developmental trajectories of risky
7 drinking from early to mid-adolescence and to determine if intervention or control group
8 membership, alcohol knowledge, attitudes towards alcohol and prevalence of alcohol harms would
9 predict trajectory group membership. The specific hypotheses are:

- 10 1. The risky drinking developmental trajectories of intervention students will be lower than
11 those of control students; and
- 12 2. Knowledge and attitudes towards alcohol will more likely be predictors of risky drinking
13 membership in the control group than the intervention group.

14 **Methods**

15 The research methodology for this study has been previously described in the study protocol and the
16 paper reporting findings from the first year (Midford et al., 2014; Midford et al., 2012a). The study
17 was approved by Edith Cowan University's and the University of Melbourne's human research ethics
18 committees. It was also approved by the Research Branch, Education Policy and Research Division of
19 the Victorian Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD).

20
21 This research is part of a three year, cluster-randomized, controlled study that followed a cohort of
22 students from the start of Grade eight (average age 13) to the end of Grade ten (average age 16).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 The intervention students received 10 lessons of the 18 lesson research-derived education program
2 in the first year, followed by eight lessons in the second year. No lessons from the DEVS *Get Ready*
3 program were provided in the third year (Cahill, Pose, and Beadle, 2013b, 2013a). The control
4 students received drug education lessons usually provided by their school. These varied considerably
5 from school to school, as no standard curriculum was specified.

6
7 At the commencement of the project, 21 Victorian government secondary schools were recruited to
8 the study on a voluntary basis, and allocated to greater metro/rural location and high/low
9 socioeconomic (SES) strata to approximate the proportion of Victorian secondary schools in each
10 category. Schools within each strata were then randomly allocated to either the intervention or
11 control condition on a two to one proportion to allow more precise statements about the effects of
12 the intervention (Hendricks Brown, 2006). Subsequently, schools were further partitioned into high,
13 medium and low socioeconomic strata so as to better align with the school SES categories derived
14 from DEECD’s Student Family Occupation Index. One intervention school, with 44 participating
15 students at Post1, withdrew from the second year of the study because they did not have the
16 resources to implement the program. The statistical power of the study was not affected by this
17 withdrawal.

18
19 Written active assent was sought from the 2700 Grade 8 students in the 21 original participating
20 schools and their parents. Of this total population 1752 (64.9%) agreed to participate in the
21 research. The self-report survey instrument used to measure change was trialled in the pilot
22 research that preceded this study (Midford, Cahill, Ramsden, et al., 2012). Of relevance to this
23 study, the survey gathers information on knowledge, and attitudes related to alcohol and drugs, plus
24 patterns and context of use with implications for harm. At Baseline, 1161 usable surveys were

1 returned by intervention students and 585 by control students. At Post3 54% of intervention (n=621)
2 students and 60% of control students (n=345) returned surveys.

3

4 **Measures**

5 Knowledge: The knowledge index represented the number of correct answers to 38 knowledge
6 questions on alcohol, smoking and other drugs ($\alpha=.86$, $p<0.001$) (Midford, Cahill, Foxcroft, et al.,
7 2012).

8 Attitudes: The alcohol attitude scale was a sum of five individual attitude variables (alcohol harm,
9 alcohol education, safe use of alcohol, getting drunk on purpose and talking with parents about
10 alcohol) measured on a five-point Likert scale, with higher scores representing safer alcohol-related
11 attitudes ($\alpha=.39$, $p<0.001$) (Midford, Cahill, Foxcroft, et al., 2012).

12 Alcohol consumption: Those students who indicated they had consumed a full drink of alcohol were
13 asked, in the past 12 months how many standard drinks (containing 10g of alcohol) they usually
14 drank in one session. Responses ranged from non-drinker, 1-2 standard drinks, 3-4 standard drinks,
15 5-6 standard drinks, 7-10 standard drinks, 11-20 standard drinks, to more than 20 standard drinks.

16 Risk factors: Binary alcohol consumption patterns included whether in the past 12 months the
17 student drank alcohol alone, drank alcohol with family, drank at parties with adults present, drank at
18 parties without adults present, planned to drink to get drunk, and drank more than planned.

19 **Statistical Analysis**

20 A previous paper has reported (using CONSORT criteria) intention-to-treat analyses of the primary
21 and secondary outcomes at final follow-up (Midford et al., 2017). Cronbach's Alpha was used as a

1
2
3 1 measure of the lower bound of scale reliability, with $\alpha > 0.7$ reflecting acceptable reliability. One
4
5 2 session alcohol consumption trajectories were modelled within MPlus with the censored normal
6
7 3 distribution used to account for the censoring at the lower bounds of the alcohol consumption scale.
8
9 4 A polynomial relationship was used to link consumption with time. All four time-points from
10
11 5 longitudinal data collected at baseline, Post 1, Post 2 and Post 3 were used in the calculation of
12
13 6 trajectories. Missing data at each time point were handled through Full Information Maximum
14
15 7 Likelihood (FIML) estimation enabling the use of all students with at least one valid score in the
16
17 8 analyses. FIML assumes missing at random and produces unbiased parameter estimates and
18
19 9 standard errors of the data (Wothke, 1998). Developmental trajectories of alcohol consumption
20
21 10 were identified using the semi-parametric group-based trajectory approach (Nagin, 2005). To
22
23 11 determine the best fitting models, models were compared through an examination of fit statistics as
24
25 12 well as theoretical justification and interpretability. Fit statistics examined included the Bayesian
26
27 13 Information Criterion (BIC; a smaller BIC value represents a better fit), and the Lo-Mendell-Rubin
28
29 14 Likelihood Ratio Test (LMR; comparing the current model against the model with one less class
30
31 15 should give a LMR and BLRT p -value less than 0.05) (Jung and Wickrama, 2008; Nylund, Asparouhov,
32
33 16 and Muthén, 2007). To ensure optimal solutions were obtained from the analysis, rather than local
34
35 17 maxima, 500 random sets of starting values were used in the model. Using both intervention and
36
37 18 control students, application of the minimum BIC for developmental trajectory model selection did
38
39 19 not result in the determination of a clear best model, with BIC improving with the addition of
40
41 20 classes. The LMR-BLRT test of model fit indicated that increasing the model from four classes to five
42
43 21 classes was not significant ($p=0.6278$). Given this non-significant result and the small proportion of
44
45 22 students in the fifth class, the four-class model was chosen as optimal. Students were assigned to a
46
47 23 trajectory class based on their individual probability scores. The distributions indicated that
48
49 24 trajectory classes differed significantly on the proportion of intervention and control students. Due
50
51 25 to these significant differences and previous analyses which has shown differences in the control
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 and intervention groups, with respect to knowledge, consumption and harms over time [19],
2 trajectory analyses were conducted separately on the intervention and control samples to
3 determine the difference in the trajectories and the number of classes for each group.
4 The BIC and LMR-LRT values for two-, three-, four-, and five-class models were compared. The LMR-
5 LRT test of model fit indicating the three-class solution was a better fit than the four-class solution
6 for intervention students ($p=0.072$), while examination of BIC showed a four-class solution was the
7 best fit for intervention students ($p=0.489$).
8 Separate multi-level multinomial logistic regression models (using robust standard error estimation
9 to account for school level clustering in the data) were fitted in Stata v12 (STATA Corp., College
10 Station, Texas) for intervention and control students and were used to determine whether the
11 knowledge, attitudes and harm predictors at baseline could individually be used to predict the
12 identified one session alcohol consumption trajectory groups. Due to baseline differences, all
13 models took into account school location (metropolitan/regional), SES and gender.

15 **Results**

16 Overall, the majority of students were females (54%), were from schools within the greater
17 metropolitan area (78%), and classified as medium SES (54%) (Table 1). Controls schools have a
18 significantly higher proportion of females (64% compared to 49%) ($X^2=32.919$, $p<0.001$), and a
19 significantly higher proportion of students from regional areas (27% compared to 20%) ($X^2=7.964$,
20 $p=0.005$) than intervention schools. Intervention schools have a higher proportion of low SES (22%
21 compared to 14%) and medium SES (59% compared to 45%), and a lower proportion of high SES
22 (19% compared to 41%) students than control schools ($X^2=100.263$, $p<0.001$).

23 ----- Table 1 here -----

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 At Baseline and Post 1 intervention and control students had similar distributions of alcohol
2
3 2 consumption in one session (both $p<0.05$)(Table 2). At Post 2 ($\chi^2=14.90$, $p=0.011$) and Post 3
4
5 3 ($\chi^2=12.441$, $p=0.029$), a significantly greater proportion of control students consumed larger
6
7 4 amounts of alcohol in one session than intervention students.
8
9
10
11
12 5 ---- Table 2 here ----
13
14
15 6 There were no significant differences between intervention and control students with respect to
16
17 7 knowledge, attitudes and drinking behaviours (all $p>0.05$) at baseline (Table 3).
18
19
20 8 ---- Table 3 here ----
21
22
23 9 *Trajectories of alcohol consumption in one session*
24
25 10 Using both intervention and control students, 40% of students were allocated to a *low stable*
26
27 11 trajectory, 48% to a *low decreasing* trajectory, 9% to a *medium increasing* trajectory and 3% to a
28
29 12 *high decreasing* trajectory. The distributions indicated that trajectory classes differed significantly on
30
31 13 the proportion of intervention and control students ($\chi^2=36.946$, $p<0.001$). Distributions within the
32
33 14 *low stable* class were higher for intervention (45%) than for control (30%) students, and higher for
34
35 15 control students (56%) within the *low increasing* class than for intervention students (44%). There
36
37 16 were no significant differences in trajectories with respect to gender ($\chi^2=0.641$, $p=0.887$).
38
39
40 17
41
42 18 As described above, intervention and control distributions were significantly different. For the
43
44 19 intervention students (see Figure 1), the three alcohol consumption trajectories consisted of: *low*
45
46 20 *stable overall* (88%), *medium increasing overall* (9%) and *high with post program decrease* (3%). The
47
48 21 *low stable overall* trajectory corresponds to alcohol consumption of 1-2 standard drinks in one
49
50 22 session, but decreasing within that range. The *medium increasing overall* trajectory corresponds to
51
52 23 students starting at 1-2 standard drinks in one session and increasing to 5-6 standard drinks in one
53
54 24 session. The *high with post program decrease* trajectory corresponds to students starting at 1-2

1 standard drinks in one session and increasing to 7-10 standard drinks in one session before decreasing to 5-6 standard drinks in one session.

---- Figure 1 here ----

For control students the four alcohol consumption trajectory classes consisted of: *low stable overall* (30%); *low with post program increase* (56%); *medium increase overall* (10%) and *high increasing overall* (4%). The *low stable overall* trajectory corresponds to alcohol consumption of 1-2 standard drinks in one session. The *low with post program increase* trajectory corresponds to students starting at 2-3 standard drinks in one session, decreasing during the course of the program to 1-2 standard and then increasing post program, but remaining in range of 1-2 standard drinks. The *medium increase overall* trajectory corresponds to students starting at 1-2 standard drinks in one session and increasing to 5-6 standard drinks in one session. The *high increasing overall* trajectory corresponds to students starting at 1-2 standard drinks in one session and increasing to 6-8 standard drinks in one session.

Are knowledge, attitudes, alcohol harms predictive of trajectories?

Knowledge, attitudes and all alcohol harms are predictive of all increasing trajectories for both intervention and control students. Decreasing trajectories for intervention and control students differ with attitudes and most alcohol harms predictive for intervention students, and knowledge and one alcohol harm predictive for control students.

Intervention medium increasing overall: Students at baseline who reported greater knowledge ($p=0.004$), had consumed alcohol (alone $p<0.001$; at parties with adults $p<0.001$; at parties without adults $p<0.001$) who planned to get drunk ($p<0.001$), and who consumed more alcohol than they planned ($p<0.001$), had increased odds of being in the *medium increasing overall trajectory* group than in the *low stable overall* trajectory group. Students at baseline who reported greater positive attitudes ($p<0.001$), and who had consumed alcohol with their families ($p<0.001$) had diminished odds of being in the *medium increasing overall* trajectory group than in the *low stable overall* trajectory group.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 *Intervention high with post program decrease*: Students at baseline who had consumed alcohol
2 (alone $p<0.001$); at parties with adults $p<0.001$); at parties without adults $p<0.001$), who planned to
3 get drunk ($p<0.001$) and who consumed more alcohol than they planned ($p<0.001$), had increased
4 odds of being in the *high with post program decrease* trajectory group than in the *low stable overall*
5 trajectory group. Students at baseline who reported greater positive attitudes ($p<0.001$), had
6 diminished odds of being in the *intervention high with post program decrease* trajectory group than
7 in the *low stable overall* trajectory group.

8 *Control with post program increase*: Students at baseline who reported greater knowledge ($p=0.002$)
9 and who consumed more alcohol than they planned ($p=0.026$) had increased odds of being in the
10 *low with post program increase* trajectory group than in the *low stable overall* trajectory group.

11 *Control medium and high increasing overall*: Students at baseline who reported greater knowledge
12 (medium $p=0.014$; high $p=0.008$), had consumed alcohol (alone medium and high $p<0.001$, with
13 family medium and high $p<0.001$, at parties with or without adults medium and high $p<0.001$), who
14 planned to get drunk (medium $p<0.001$; high $p<0.001$), and who consumed more alcohol than they
15 planned (medium $p<0.001$; high $p<0.001$), had increased odds of being in the *medium and high*
16 *increasing overall* trajectory group than in the *low stable overall* trajectory group. Students at
17 baseline who reported greater positive attitudes had diminished odds of being in the *medium*
18 ($p=0.027$) and *high* ($p=0.015$) *increasing overall* trajectory groups than in the *low stable overall*
19 trajectory group.

20 ---- Table 4 here ----

21

1 Discussion

2 This longitudinal study followed the trajectory of alcohol consumption in one session by students
3 from 21 schools involved in the DEVS *Get Ready* harm minimisation drug education program. The
4 period covered was the start of Grade 8 to the end of Grade 10. Knowledge, attitudes and drinking
5 behaviours at the beginning of Grade 8 were used to predict risky drinking trajectory class
6 membership for intervention and control students.

7 Prior studies using trajectory analyses to model adolescent risky drinking behaviour, have identified
8 between three and five trajectory groups distinguished by factors such as gender, ethnicity, family
9 structure, emotional distress, risk taking, age at drinking onset, family history of alcoholism, feeling
10 drunk during first alcohol experience, and parental and peer approval of drinking (Colder et al.,
11 2002; Warner, White, and Johnson, 2007; Tucker, Orlando, and Ellickson, 2003). Those in high risky
12 drinking trajectory groups showed elevated levels of alcohol-related problems, with those in early
13 high risky drinking trajectory groups at highest risk for alcohol dependence in adulthood (Colder et
14 al., 2002; Chassin, Flora, and King, 2004; Chassin, Pitts, and Prost, 2002). This study aimed to
15 determine if there were differences in the number, type and predictors of risky drinking trajectory
16 groups for students involved in a harm minimisation intervention compared to students not involved
17 in an intervention.

18 The control students have a greater number of consumption trajectories than the intervention
19 students: four as compared to three. The nature of each group's set of trajectories and the
20 percentage of students in each trajectory is also different. Both groups have a small percentage of
21 students with consumption trajectories that increased substantially over the course of the study (3%
22 of interventions and 4% of controls). The control group also had a higher level of consumption at the
23 end of the program. This suggests that the drug education program reduced the number of
24 students, who substantially increased their consumption over time, while at the same time reducing
25 their level of consumption in relative terms. Both groups had a percentage of students whose

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 drinking increased moderately over the course of the study (9% of interventions and 10% of
2 controls), with the control group ending with a higher level of consumption. As with the high
3 increasing trajectory there was a greater percentage of control students in the medium increasing
4 trajectory, and they ended with higher consumption. Again, this suggests that the drug education
5 program had a beneficial effect in terms of reducing numbers in the trajectory category and reducing
6 the consumption in relative terms.

7 Comparing the two groups' low consumption trajectories is more difficult because the intervention
8 students only exhibited a low stable trajectory. This identified the drinking pattern of the majority
9 (88%) of intervention students. In comparison the control students exhibited low stable (30%) and
10 low with post program increase (56%) consumption trajectories. This is the greatest difference
11 between the two study groups suggesting intervention students were more able to maintain low
12 levels of alcohol consumption than their control peers. A much smaller percentage of control
13 students had a trajectory of consistently low consumption, with a substantial number having initially
14 low consumption that increased post program.

15 When comparing the overall differences in intervention and control student consumption
16 trajectories, the intervention group have lower proportions in the higher consumption trajectories
17 and lower levels of consumption at the end of the program. This consistency of better intervention
18 student outcomes across all consumption trajectories provides strong evidence that the drug
19 education program was influential with all types of student drinkers, from low to high consumers. In
20 turn this means it is suitable for universal delivery.

21

1 The trajectory analysis was also useful in identifying the association of initial student characteristics
2 and behaviours with their pattern of drinking over time. In of terms of the influence of prior alcohol
3 and drug (AOD) knowledge, a pattern of greater knowledge at baseline increased the odds for both
4 intervention and control students being in low and medium increasing consumption trajectory
5 groups. This suggests a greater prior interest in or experience with drinking was in turn predictive of
6 a greater increase in consumption over the course of the study. It does seem, however, that
7 exposure to the program's drug education weakened this relationship for those intervention
8 students who had a trajectory of high increasing consumption. Here, having greater prior knowledge
9 did not increase the odds of having a high increasing consumption trajectory, compared to controls.

10 It would seem that the program's drug education had its strongest effect on students with the
11 highest consumption trajectory, while also maintaining a low drinking trajectory for most drinkers
12 and not encouraging non-drinkers to start using. This finding supports suggestions from previous
13 research that teaching harm minimisation strategies, which aim to meet students at their individual
14 level of experience and knowledge in relation to alcohol and drug use, does not increase
15 consumption or uptake (McBride et al., 2004; Marlatt and Witkiewitz, 2010; Hamilton et al., 2007).

16 Initial attitudes towards alcohol use were predictive in terms of consumption trajectories. A pattern
17 of more responsible attitudes at baseline increased the odds for both intervention and control
18 students being in lower consumption trajectory groups. This relationship was clear and strong for
19 both groups and suggests that the attitudes students brought to their involvement in the study were
20 potent in terms of consumption trajectory, independent of exposure to the drug education program.

21 Pre-drinking before going out, drinking with peers, and parental supply of alcohol for unsupervised
22 drinking has previously been associated with facilitating risky drinking among adolescents (Gilligan et
23 al., 2012; Kuntsche and Gmel, 2013; Jackson et al., 2002; Jackson, Sher, and Schulenberg, 2008). In
24 this study, risk factors at baseline, such as drinking alone, drinking with family, drinking at parties

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 with adults, drinking at parties without adults, drinking to get drunk, and drinking more than
2 planned, all were strongly associated with higher consumption trajectories. The practice of drinking
3 alone, when measured at baseline, was strongly predictive of higher consumption trajectories for
4 intervention students, and even more strongly predictive of higher consumption trajectories for
5 control students. This suggests that drinking alone predisposed all students to engaging in
6 progressively heavier drinking, but exposure to the drug education program ameliorated this trend.

7 The practice of drinking with family, when measured at baseline was differentially predictive in the
8 case of intervention and control students. It was weakly predictive of a lower consumption
9 trajectory in the case of intervention students, and strongly predictive of higher consumption
10 trajectories in the case of control students. This suggests that exposure to the drug education
11 program interacted with established practice of drinking in a family context to protect against higher
12 consumption over time.

13 The consumption trajectory patterns for both intervention and control students, who drank at
14 parties, were very similar, whether this involved the presence of adults or not. In the case of both
15 groups and both levels of adult involvement, party drinking at baseline was strongly predictive of
16 higher consumption trajectories. In the context where party drinking had been established neither
17 an adult presence, nor exposure to the drug education program lessened progression to higher
18 levels of consumption. This suggests that drinking with peers in party contexts is a significant
19 influence on patterns of consumption.

20 Students from both intervention and control groups, who, at baseline, planned to get drunk prior to
21 drinking, or who drank more than they planned, were much more likely to have high consumption
22 trajectories. The extremely high odds ratios for being in the highest consumption trajectory
23 compared to being in lowest were particularly notable. These patterns of baseline drinking
24 behaviour seem to identify students at greatest risk of substantially increasing consumption over

1 time. The intervention students in the case of both the planning to get drunk and drinking more than
2
3 planned categories had less extreme highest to lowest consumption trajectory odds ratios,
4
5 compared to controls, which suggests some effect of the drug education program. However,
6
7 whether the effect was sufficient to provide meaningful benefit has to be questioned given the odds
8
9 ratios were still very high. This may indicate the need to commence provision of drug education
10
11 earlier and before onset of drinking practices.
12
13
14
15

16 There are a number of limitations of this study. One-third of eligible students were not included in
17
18 this study due to the requirement to obtain active consent from both student and parents. This was
19
20 not a consequence of particular students or their parents being actively opposed to participation,
21
22 but rather a function of school follow up on the return of consent forms. The study also suffered
23
24 from 40% attrition from Baseline to Post3. Although high, this level of attrition over two years is
25
26 similar to a previous comparable study, and can be largely explained in terms of family mobility
27
28 (McBride et al., 2004). Such loss of participants at different points in the study should be expected
29
30 in this type of research, but it still has implications for the generalizability of findings. An addition
31
32 consideration is that the reliability of the attitude towards alcohol scale was low, but still significant.
33
34
35

36 The impact of risky drinking on adolescents makes understanding the predictors of those within risky
37
38 alcohol consumption trajectory classes an important priority, due to their vulnerability and the
39
40 association of alcohol use with other health risk factors. The findings from this study indicate that
41
42 the DEVS *Get Ready* drug and alcohol program can be universally delivered to change risky alcohol
43
44 consumption trajectory development and reduce alcohol consumption, with the program having
45
46 greatest impact on students within highest consumption trajectories.
47
48
49

50 22
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

References

Bonomo, Yvonne A, Glenn Bowes, Carolyn Coffey, John B Carlin, and George C Patton. 2004. "Teenage drinking and the onset of alcohol dependence: a cohort study over seven years." *Addiction* 99 (12):1520-8.

Cahill, Helen, Michelle Pose, and Sally Beadle. 2013a. *Get Ready Year 8 Teacher Manual*. Melbourne: DEECD.

Chassin, Laurie, David B Flora, and Kevin M King. 2004. "Trajectories of alcohol and drug use and dependence from adolescence to adulthood: the effects of familial alcoholism and personality." *Journal of abnormal psychology* 113 (4):483.

Chassin, Laurie, Steven C Pitts, and Justin Prost. 2002. "Binge drinking trajectories from adolescence to emerging adulthood in a high-risk sample: predictors and substance abuse outcomes." *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology* 70 (1):67.

Colder, Craig R, Richard T Campbell, Erin Ruel, Jean L Richardson, and Brian R Flay. 2002. "A finite mixture model of growth trajectories of adolescent alcohol use: Predictors and consequences." *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology* 70 (4):976.

Degenhardt, Louisa, Christina O'Loughlin, Wendy Swift, Helena Romaniuk, John Carlin, Carolyn Coffey, Wayne Hall, and George Patton. 2013. "The persistence of adolescent binge drinking into adulthood: findings from a 15-year prospective cohort study." *BMJ open* 3 (8):e003015.

Gilligan, Conor, Kypros Kypri, Natalie Johnson, Marita Lynagh, and Stephanie Love. 2012. "Parental supply of alcohol and adolescent risky drinking." *Drug and alcohol review* 31 (6):754-62.

Gmel, Gerhard, Emmanuel Kuntsche, and Jürgen Rehm. 2011. "Risky single-occasion drinking: bingeing is not bingeing." *Addiction* 106 (6):1037-45.

Hamilton, Greg, Greg Hamilton, Donna Cross, Greg Hamilton, Donna Cross, Ken Resnicow, Greg Hamilton, Donna Cross, Ken Resnicow, and Therese Shaw. 2007. "Does harm minimisation lead to greater experimentation? Results from a school smoking intervention trial." *Drug and alcohol review* 26 (6):605-13.

Hill, Karl G, Helene R White, Ick-Joong Chung, J David Hawkins, and Richard F Catalano. 2000. "Early adult outcomes of adolescent binge drinking: Person-and Variable-Centered analyses of binge drinking trajectories." *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 24 (6):892-901.

Jackson, Kristina M, Kenneth J Sher, M Lynne Cooper, and Phillip K Wood. 2002. "Adolescent alcohol and tobacco use: onset, persistence and trajectories of use across two samples." *Addiction* 97 (5):517-31.

Jackson, Kristina M, Kenneth J Sher, and John E Schulenberg. 2008. "Conjoint developmental trajectories of young adult substance use." *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 32 (5):723-37.

Jung, T., and K. Wickrama. 2008. "An Introduction to Latent Class Growth Analysis and Growth Mixture Modeling." *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 2/1.

Kuntsche, Emmanuel, and Gerhard Gmel. 2013. "Alcohol consumption in late adolescence and early adulthood—where is the problem." *Swiss Med Wkly* 143:w13826.

Labhart, Florian, Kathryn Graham, Samantha Wells, and Emmanuel Kuntsche. 2013. "Drinking before going to licensed premises: An event-level analysis of predrinking, alcohol consumption, and adverse outcomes." *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 37 (2):284-91.

Marlatt, G Alan, and Katie Witkiewitz. 2010. "Update on harm-reduction policy and intervention research." *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology* 6:591-606.

Mathews, RR, Wayne D Hall, Theo Vos, George C Patton, and Louisa Degenhardt. 2011. "What are the major drivers of prevalent disability burden in young Australians." *Med J Aust* 194 (5):232-5.

- 1 McBride, Nyanda, Fiona Farrington, Richard Midford, Lynn Meuleners, and Mike Phillips. 2004.
2 "Harm minimization in school drug education: final results of the School Health and Alcohol
3 Harm Reduction Project (SHAHRP)." *Addiction* 99 (3):278-91.
- 4 Midford, R, H Cahill, L Lester, R Ramsden, D Foxcroft, and L Venning. 2016. "Alcohol prevention: the
5 residual effects of a two year, harm minimization school drug education intervention." *In*
6 *submission*.
- 7 Midford, R, H Cahill, R Ramsden, G Davenport, L Venning, L Lester, B Murphy, and M Pose. 2012.
8 "Alcohol prevention: what can be expected of a harm reduction focused school drug
9 education programme?" *Drugs: Education, Prevention, and Policy* 19 (2):102-10.
- 10 Midford, Richard, H Cahill, David Foxcroft, L Lester, L Venning, R Ramsden, and M Pose. 2012. "Drug
11 Education in Victorian schools (DEVS): the study protocol for a harm reduction focused
12 school drug education trial." *BMC Public Health* 12:112-9.
- 13 Midford, Richard, Helen Cahill, Leanne Lester, Robyn Ramsden, David Foxcroft, and Lynne Venning.
14 2017. "Alcohol prevention for school students: Results from a 1-year follow up of a cluster-
15 randomised controlled trial of harm minimisation school drug education." *Drugs: Education,*
16 *Prevention and Policy*:1-9.
- 17 Midford, Richard, Johanna Mitchell, Leanne Lester, Helen Cahill, David Foxcroft, Robyn Ramsden,
18 Lynne Venning, and Michelle Pose. 2015. "Preventing alcohol harm: Early results from a
19 cluster randomised, controlled trial in Victoria, Australia of comprehensive harm
20 minimisation school drug education." *International Journal of Drug Policy* 25 (1):142-50.
- 21 Midford, Richard, Robyn Ramsden, Leanne Lester, Helen Cahill, Johanna Mitchell, David R Foxcroft,
22 and Lynne Venning. 2014. "Alcohol Prevention and School Students Findings From an
23 Australian 2-Year Trial of Integrated Harm Minimization School Drug Education." *Journal of*
24 *drug education* 44 (3-4):71-94
- 25 Miller, Jacqueline W, Timothy S Naimi, Robert D Brewer, and Sherry Everett Jones. 2007. "Binge
26 drinking and associated health risk behaviors among high school students." *Pediatrics* 119
27 (1):76-85.
- 28 Nagin, D.S. 2005. "Group-Based Modeling of Development." *Harvard University Press, Cambridge*
29 *Massachusetts, London England*.
- 30 NHMRC. 2009. "Australian guidelines to reduce health risks from drinking alcohol." In, edited by
31 National Health and Medical Research Council. Canberra: NHMRC.
- 32 Nylund, K., T. Asparouhov, and B. Muthén. 2007. "Deciding on the number of classes in Latent Class
33 Analysis and Growth Mixture Modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study." *Structural*
34 *Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 14 (4):535 - 69.
- 35 Tucker, Joan S, Maria Orlando, and Phyllis L Ellickson. 2003. "Patterns and correlates of binge
36 drinking trajectories from early adolescence to young adulthood." *Health Psychology* 22
37 (1):79.
- 38 Warner, Lynn A, Helene R White, and Valerie Johnson. 2007. "Alcohol initiation experiences and
39 family history of alcoholism as predictors of problem-drinking trajectories." *Journal of*
40 *studies on alcohol and drugs* 68 (1):56-65.
- 41 White, Victoria M, and Tahlia Williams. 2016. *Australian Secondary School Students' Use of Tobacco,*
42 *Alcohol, and Over-the-counter and Illicit Substances in 2014: Report: National Drug Strategy,*
43 *Department of Health and Ageing.*
- 44 Wothke, W. 1998. "Longitudinal and multi-group modeling with missing data." *Modeling*
45 *longitudinal and multiple group data:Practical issues, applied approaches and specific*
46 *examples* T. D. Little, K. U. Schnabel, and J. Baumert [Eds.].Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
47 Publishers.

Table 1 Numbers in study at all time points

	Intervention	Control	Total
Baseline			
Male	587(50.6)	211(36.0)	798(45.7)
Female	574(49.4)	374(64.0)	948(54.3)
Total	1161(66.5)	585(33.5)	1746(100)
Post 1			
Male	456(50.1)	183(36.5)	639(45.2)
Female	455(49.9)	319(63.5)	774(54.8)
Total	911(64.5)	502(35.5)	1413(100)
Post 2			
Male	350(49.4)	139(32.7)	489(43.2)
Female	358(50.6)	286(67.3)	644(56.8)
Total	708(62.5)	425(37.5)	1133(100)
Post 3			
Male	310(49.9)	117(33.9)	427(44.2)
Female	311(50.1)	228(66.1)	539(55.8)
Total	621(62.5)	345(37.5)	966(100)

Table 2 Number of standard drinks in one session by intervention and control students over time

%	Baseline	Post 1	Post 2	Post 3
Intervention	n=1160	n=954	n=708	n=621
None	76.6	72.0	62.9	48.3
1-2 standard drinks	13.4	16.9	16.7	15.3
3-4 standard drinks	5.7	6.2	11.0	16.3
5-6 standard drinks	2.5	3.2	4.4	10.0
7-10 standard drinks	1.3	1.3	3.8	7.9
11-20 standard drinks	.5	.4	1.1	1.4
More than 20 standard drinks	.1	0.0	.1	.8
Control	n=584	n=502	n=424	n=345
None	77.1	62.9	57.3	44.3
1-2 standard drinks	13.7	16.7	18.2	12.5
3-4 standard drinks	5.0	11.0	8.3	14.8
5-6 standard drinks	2.7	4.4	7.5	16.8
7-10 standard drinks	1.2	3.8	5.7	7.8
11-20 standard drinks	.2	1.1	1.9	3.5
More than 20 standard drinks	.2	.1	1.2	.3

Table 3 Descriptive statistics of knowledge, attitudes and drinking behaviours at baseline by group

	Intervention	Control
	Mean (Sd)	Mean (Sd)
Knowledge index	20.8(5.4)	21.0(5.3)
Attitude scale	18.6(3.7)	18.6(3.7)
	%	%
Drinking alone	9.4	9.6
Drinking with family	16.5	17.6
Drinking at parties with adults	15.9	16.1
Drinking at parties without adults	16.3	14.7
Drink to get drunk	12.6	11.1
Drinking more than planned	12.2	12.8

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Table 4 Multinomial regressions of baseline knowledge, attitudes and other risks on alcohol consumption trajectories

OR(95% CI)	Knowledge	Attitudes	Drink alone	Drink with family	Drink at parties with adults	Drink at parties without adults	Plan to get drunk	Drink more than planned
Intervention								
Medium increasing overall	1.06(1.02,1.10)**	0.89(0.85,0.95)**	6.60(4.05,10.78)**	0.14(0.09,0.21)**	11.19(7.26,17.26)**	11.68(7.58,18.00)**	10.00(6.40, 15.64)**	10.73(6.84, 16.85)**
High with post program decrease	1.01(0.94,1.09)	0.78(0.70,0.87)**	24.85(11.12,55.52)**	1.84(0.78,4.35)	34.20(13.50,86.66)**	53.77(18.29,158.09)**	37.95(15.56 ,92.54)**	50.91(19.92,130.12)**
Control								
Low with post program increase	1.16(1.06,1.28)*	1.00(0.88,1.14)	1.47(0.41,5.29)	1.82(0.61,5.41)	1.25(0.41,3.77)	1.43(0.42,4.86)	1.76(0.49,6.38)	4.54(1.20,17.16)*
Medium increasing overall	1.14(1.03,1.27)**	0.89(0.80,0.99)*	12.08(4.41,33.04)**	12.46(5.10,30.39)**	9.25(3.78,22.64)**	12.46(4.84,32.10)**	14.38(5.35, 38.67)*	42.64(14.22,127.87)**
High increasing overall	1.17(1.04,1.31)**	0.85(0.75,0.97)*	34.34(10.25,115.08)**	20.86(6.75,64.52)**	22.78(7.29,71.17)**	182.76(33.34,1001.85)**	113.34(28.5 0,450.77)**	167.06(40.26,693.25)**

* $p<0.05$, ** $p<0.001$. Reference class is ‘Low stable overall’. Odds ratio is a measure of the likelihood of class membership; knowledge, attitudes and behaviours measured at baseline. All models control for school location, gender, and SES.




Figure 1 Trajectories of alcohol consumption for intervention and control students