The International Journal of
INDIAN PSYCHOLOGY

A Study of Drinking Motives and Self-Regulation among Young Adults

Dr. Roshan Lal[1]*, Dr Ritu Sekhri[2]

ABSTRACT

The degree of alcohol consumption may vary from individual to individual. Some might drink heavy amounts of alcohol and fall in the category of alcoholics or heavy drinkers while others can be moderate or occasional drinkers. The study aimed to explore drinking motives and self-regulation among young adult drinkers. The study included 100 Indian young adults of Delhi; NCR aged 18 to 30 years. The technique of random sampling was employed. The participants were divided into two different groups i.e. moderate drinkers (N=50) and heavy drinkers (N=50). Three tools were used for the study which were AUDIT-C (WHO), Drinking Motives Questionnaire (DMQ-R) (Cooper) and Self-Regulation Questionnaire (SRQ) (Brown, Miller, & Lawendowski). T-test revealed that there was a significant difference between both the groups of adult drinkers on self-regulation and negative drinking motives though there was a negligible difference on positive drinking motives which was insignificant. There was also significant correlation between self-regulation and negative drinking motives .It can be inferred that drinking motivation, particularly the negatives motives (coping and conformity) are highly linked to excessive alcohol use. Also the level of self-regulation of heavy alcohol drinkers is comparatively very low than people who consume less alcohol (moderate drinkers).

Keywords: *drinking motives, self-regulation, young adults*

Young adulthood is a phase of life set apart by change and investigation. Individuals move out of their homes and into residences or houses with peers. They head off to college, start to work all day, and shape genuine connections. They investigate their own identities and how they fit in their surroundings. The parts of parents debilitate and the impacts of peers increase more prominently. Youthful grown-ups are alone out of the blue, allowed to settle on their own choices, including the choice to drink alcohol. Young adulthood additionally is the time amid which youngsters acquire education and prepare themselves for future vocations. Authority of these undertakings is indispensable to future achievement; issues with school and work can create dissatisfaction and stress, which can prompt an assortment of undesirable practices, including increased drinking.

Attitudes of family members- Many parents trust that serving alcohol at home instructs youngsters to drink mindfully - however researches show that parents who have a liberal attitude towards alcohol will probably have kids who drink at dangerous levels. Furthermore, other

---

[1] Asst. Professor of Psychology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India
[2] Asst. professor of psychology, PGGCG , sector-11, Chandigarh, India
*Corresponding Author

research demonstrates that young adults whose families declined to serve alcohol to them at home were more averse to drink in different circumstances.

According to NESARC information, around 46 percent of young adults (12.4 million) engaged with drinking that surpassed the prescribed day by day limits at any rate once in the previous year, and 14.5 percent (3.9 million) had a normal utilization that surpassed the suggested week by week limit. According to the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism [NIAAA], men might get into danger for alcohol-related issues if their alcohol intake surpasses 14 standard beverages for every week or 4 drinks for each day, and ladies might be in danger on the off chance that they have in excess of 7 standard beverages for every week or 3 drinks for every day. A standard drink is characterized as one 12-ounce container of beer, one 5-ounce glass of wine, or 1.5 ounces of refined spirits.

The idea of the motives behind drinking rely on the assumption that individuals drink with a specific end goal to accomplish certain valuable consequences. It also accepts that drinking behavior is propelled by various needs or serves distinctive functions, and particular motives in drinking are linked to a unique pattern of preceding events and their outcomes. Excessive drinking, for instance, is quite likely amidst individuals those who encounter stress and have coping as a motive to drink, and additionally those whose companions drink intensely and who drink themselves for motives which are social (Abbey, Smith, and Scott, 1993). Drinking motives or reasons project the subjective framework for alcohol intake.

Motivational Model of Motivation: The need or want to have alcohol and even to get drunk can highly motivate one's behavior. At the point when people expect that drinking alcohol will bring about positive changes, alcohol use turns into a constructive motivating force. This begins a covert motivational process which directs an individual's thoughts, attention, feelings, and behavior towards drinking as an objective or goal. In view of these considerations, Cox and Klinger (1988; 1990) built up the MotivationaI Model of Alcohol Use, which believes that a man settles on a choice about consuming alcohol or not. Thus the choice to drink is a mix of emotional or rational procedures and the choice made on the grounds of affective change that the individual hopes to accomplish by drinking in contrast to not drinking.

Self-regulation is the capacity of the self to modify its behaviors. It increases the flexibility and adaptability of the behavior of humans, thus it enables them to adjust their actions to a variety of social and situational demands. It is an important basis for understanding free will and for socially desirable behavior. It provides benefits to the individuals and to society, and indeed good self-control seems to contribute a lot to desirable outcomes, including task performance, school and work success, popularity, mental health, adjustment, and good interpersonal relationships as postulated by Baumeister, Heatherton, & Tice, 1994; Duckworth & Seligman, 2005; Mischel, Shoda, & Peake, 1988; Shoda, Mischel, & Peake, 1990; Tangney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004; Wolfe & Johnson, 1995).

The second component is monitoring. Without keeping the behavior in track it is difficult to regulate it. The self regulation theory is highly influenced by Carver and Scheier (1981, 1982, and 1998). Their major contribution was the theory of feedback loop in self regulation. The individual performs a test and compares one's self to the standard. Initiating a change is required in self-regulation in case the self falls short so as to maintain it.

The third component in self-regulation is strength, also known as will power. When we aim at transforming the self, it requires some will power. Regulating the self depends on few resources which functions as energy or strength and thereafter becomes temporarily exhausted and thus a condition of ego depletion is created.

The fourth component of self-regulation is motivation. When there is motivation to reach a goal or meet a certain standard then there is also a motivation to regulate the self. Even though standards are clear monitoring is highly effective and there is availability of resources one may fail to regulate the self because of not caring about reaching to the goal.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Merrill, J. E., et al. (2014) examined the anticipation of specific alcohol consequences by enhancement and coping motives over the span of one year. It was hypothesized that unique consequences would be directly predicted by motives of coping and indirectly by motives of enhamcement. A sample of 552 college students was taken and structural equation modeling was used. Results indicated that data supported the above hypotheses. Models were constant across year in school, gender and post traumatic stress.

Vohs, K. D., et al. (2014) tested the assumption wherein subsequent self-control is impaired by making many choices. The author predicted that the same resources used for active responding and self-control is depleted by decision making. In 4 lab studies it was thus found that making choices had to led to reduced level of self control. Further field studies also found that the self report of shopper's extent of active decision making predicted reduced self-control.

 Dlima, G. M., et al. (2012) studied protective behavioural strategies (PBS) as a probable moderator and mediator of the interrelation between alcohol-related consequences and self-regulation. A sample of 249 first year undergrad students was taken. Thorugh the findings it was indicated that there was in interrelation between alcohol related consequences and self-regulation which was mediated partially by the use of PBS. Use of PBS was much more important for individuals who had low self-regulation abilities.

Armeli, S., et al. (2010) analyzed among college students (N = 530) the directing impacts of coping and appetitive drinking motives on the relationship amongst depressive effect and anxious and quantity and drinking frequency. Results from models inspecting both the aggregate and retrospective daily information demonstrated that people with high contrasted with low social-enhancement motives indicated stronger positive relationship among changes in monthly adverse effect and frequency in drinking.

Lyvers, M., et al. (2010) studied the relationship between drinking restraint, alcohol consequences, alcohol related problems and motives to drink. There was a sample of 221 young adults who were examined with the help of self report measures. Through multiple regression analysis it was seen that enhancement, social and coping motives were significantly associated to alcohol use and problems related to alcohol. Emotional and cognitive preoccupation with drinking were related to all criterion variables.

Rice, K. G., & Arsdale, A. C. (2010) conducted a study showing associations between perfectionism, drinking to cope, perceived stress, and problems which were related to alcohol in

a sample of college students (N=354). Higher levels of stress and drinking to cope were reported more by maladaptive perfectionists in contrary to non perfectionists or adaptive perfectionists. Drinking to cope was also indirectly associated as the mediator between alcohol- related problems and stress. It also further revealed that stress levels for women were higher and a stronger connection prevailed between drinking to cope for women contrary to men.

Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2007) studied moderators of ego depletion which were ego control and self-regulation. In terms of timing and leverage point, the moderators were organized in a two-factor grid. Their moderating roles from the view of two major models: the strength and process model of self control. A clash b/w selfish motives and behaviour causes motivational conflicts.

Magid, V., et al. (2007) examined to see whethe impulsivity and sensation seeking could solitarily predict alcohol use and related problems and tested how drinking motives mediated these relations. Data was collected from a sample of 310 college students through self report. Results indicated that impulsivity and sensation seeking were correlated with alcohol use and problems related to alcohol through various meditational pathways.

Neal, D. J., & Carey, K. B. (2007) postulated that negative consequences related to alcohol are experienced by heavy drinking students. A sample of 183 college students was taken who finished four consecutive 7-day drinking diaries which were turned into weekly. Results indicated the association of alcohol intoxication on a given day with increase in the level of risk. There was also an association of increase in the likelihood of negative consequences with self-control. It was also suggested that self-control and impulsivity were subsumed by self-regulation. Buckner, J. D., et al. (2006) conducted a study on motives of drinking and drinking situations in undergraduates (N=293). Social anxiety was significantly found to be associated with drinking motives of enhancement and not with social or coping motives. . Critically, enhancement motives and each of these drinking circumstances mediated the connection between social anxiety and alcohol related issues. Findings recommend that alcohol use to improve positive effect or in light of these particular situations may represent the risk for alcohol related issues among those having social anxiety.

Kuntsche, E., et al. (2006) reviewed researches of the last 15 years. These researches were based on characteristics of young people who have specific drinking motives. Around 82 studies were reviewed with the help of a computer assisted search. Drinking motives were quite general and were undifferentiated in late childhood and early adolescence and were also found to be more gender specific in subsequent years. In context to factors of personality, enhancement motives correlated with sensation seeking and extraversion coping motives correlated with anxiety and neuroticism.

Ostafin, B. D., & Palfai, T. P. (2006) conducted a study so as to examine validity of the alcohol Implicit Association Test (IAT) which had 88 risky drinking college students who completed the explicit measure of alcohol motivation, drinking behaviour and IAT so that alcohol-motivation correlations could be assessed. Through regression analysis it was indicated that there was a correlation of IAT scores with cue reactivity and binge drinking by replicating the results of Palfai, et al (2003). Convergent and incremental validity was also indicated by results.

Kuntsche, E., et al. (2005) reviewed the proof of young adult and adolescent drinking motives and their connection to possible results throughout last 15 years. A computer based search of relevant articles was directed. Results uncovered that most youngsters drank for social motives, some demonstrated enhancement motives, and just a few of them for coping motives. It was also seen that moderate alcohol appeared to be associated with social motives, heavy drinking with enhancement motives and the alcohol-related problems with coping motives.

Neal, D. J., & Carey, K. B. (2004) designed a study to whether the methods suggested to develop the discrepancy actually do so and also to differentiate the methods of developing discrepancy on the basis of intention for the reduction of alcohol use. A sample of 92 female and male college drinkers were taken, provided they had reported 2 or more binge drinking episodes during the last month, or have scored 4 or more on Rutgers alcohol Problem index (RAPI). For the same, a Personalized normative feedback and personal strivings assessment had been designed. It was predicted that participants involved in discrepancy building activities would encounter discrepancy related to the activity in which they were involved and those who show discrepancy would also show greater levels of intention to decrease alcohol use. Results showed that the intention to reduce alcohol and discrepancy could only be increased by personalized normative feedback.

Neighbors, C., et al. (2004) examined the motives behind drinking behavior in college students from a self-determination perspective. It was hypothesized that there are positive associations between controlled orientation and drinking which are a source of social approval and regulating affect. A sample of college students (N=204) was taken whose contingent self esteem, controlled orientation, patterns of alcohol use and motives for drinking behaviour was evaluated. The support for mediation analysis was provided by theoretical framework. Results indicated that 'controlled' people drink so they can regulate social approval and affect as they have higher tendency to base their self worth on contingencies.

Lecci, L., et al. (2002) studied whether the non-alcohol related motives can anticipate drinking motives, alcohol related problems and self-reported drinking in college students. A sample of 290 undergraduate (121 men, 169 women) was taken who completed drinking motives (DMQ), quantity and frequency of alcohol problems (drinking inventory of consequences) and measures of daily goal functioning (personal projects analysis). Results, using path analysis had indicated that goals related to non alcoholic behaviour were the significant predictors of alcohol related problems and their effects are moderated by drinking motives.

Park, C. L., & Levenson, M. R. (2002) reviewed four issues that were related to drinking to cope among college students: (1) The pervasiveness of drinking to cope among college students in a medium-sized Midwestern state college; (2) the connections among drinking to cope and alcohol related results; (3) the utilization of drinking to cope in a large setting of student's coping procedures; and (4) gender variations in drinking to cope. Data were drawn from a specimen of 275 students (164 women, 104 men, 7 subjects of unreported sexual orientation) in a sample that was cross-sectional. Results had indicated that the most common form of motive of drinking among college students was drinking to cope which was related to higher levels of alcohol consumption.

Patock-Peckham, J. An., et al. (2001) directed an investigation on how different child rearing styles are identified with self-regulation procedures which are associated with alcohol use and abuse. An example of 107 male and 144 female undergrads currently utilizing alcohol was taken. They were assessed on a questionnaire on alcohol use and issues, saw style of child rearing of their parents, control over drinking with alcohol use, alcohol issues and self regulation. A model connecting every one of these angles was inspected by utilizing structural equation modelling. Results demonstrated that child rearing style of parent of same sex from that of the respondent was altogether identified with self-regulation. Those ladies having tyrant mother were likewise identified with more elevated amount of self regulation.

Kassel, J. D., et al. (2000) studied and assessed relationship between problem-related drinking and negative mood regulation expectancies and thereby controlling for the effect of coping behaviours, alcohol consumption, motives behind drinking, affective distress and demographic variables. A sample of 136 participants of undergraduate scholars was taken with 82% females. A battery of self-report questionnaires was conducted on 2 different occasions which were separated by 8 weeks. Correlation showed a strong negative relationship between problem-related drinking and negative mood regulation (NMR) expectancies.

Wills, T. A., et al. (2000) examined predictions which had derived from the model of self-regulation, about the variables which moderated the relationship between substance use levels and the problems related to its use. Data was derived from two autonomous studies of adolescents having means ages 15.4 and 15.5 respectively (N=1699, 1225). Through factor analysis it was derived correlated dimensions of conduct and control problems. For variables that indexed good self control, protective moderation was found and for variables that indexed poor self control risk enhancing moderation was found.

Objectives:
- To explore the differences in self-regulation among moderate drinkers and heavy drinkers.
- To explore the differences in positive and negative drinking motives among moderate drinkers and heavy drinkers.
- To study the relationship between drinking motives and self-regulation among young adult drinkers.

Hypotheses:
Hyp1- There will be a significant difference in moderate drinkers and heavy drinkers on self-regulation.
Hyp2- There will be a significant difference in moderate drinkers and heavy drinkers on positive and negative drinking motives
Hyp3- There will be a significant correlation between drinking motives and self regulation among young adult drinkers.

METHODOLOGY:
Participants:
The study included 100 Indian young adults of Delhi, NCR. The age group of the sample was between 18 to 30 years. Participants were divided into two groups i.e. Moderate alcohol drinkers and heavy drinkers on the basis of AUDIT-C . The participation in the study was voluntary.

Sample:

Purposive sampling technique was used for sampling, where sampling is based on the population's characteristics and according to the study's objective.

Tools used:

S. No.	Name of the tool	Author and year	No of items	Reliability and Validity
1.	Drinking Motives Questionnaire-Revised (DMQ-R)	Cooper, 1994	20	A fair estimate of reliability was found, cronbach's alpha between from 75 to .84
2.	The Self-Regulation Questionnaire (SRQ)	Brown, Miller, & Lawendowski, 1999	63	Test-retest reliability (r = .94) and internal consistency (α = .91) was also high
3.	AUDIT-C	WHO,1993	3	Cronbach's alpha=0.98

Statistical analysis:

After data collection it was tabulated and analysed on Microsoft Excel and SPSS. Firstly, the sum total, mean and standard deviation was calculated.

T-test was used to make a comparison between the means of two independent groups. It also indicated the significant differences between the two group means. The difference in the means of moderate alcohol drinkers and hazardous alcohol drinkers was calculated on self-regulation and drinking motives (positive and negative).
Pearson's correlatio n was used to calculate the correlation among the variables self regulation, positive drinking motives and negative drinking motives.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

Table 1: shows mean and standard deviation of self regulation, positive motives and negative motives.

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation
Self-regulation		
Moderate drinkers	227.20	32.40
Heavy drinkers	210.20	28.20

Table indicates the mean and standard deviation values of self regulation among both moderate drinkers and heavy drinkers. The values clearly show that the mean of self- regulation is higher for moderate drinkers as compared to heavy drinkers.

Table 1.2 shows mean and standard deviation of positive and negative drinking motives among moderate drinkers and heavy drinkers

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation
Positive drinking motives		
Moderate drinkers	24.28	8.20
Heavy drinkers	26.90	8.22
Negative drinking motives		
Moderate drinkers	18.50	4.77
Heavy drinkers	27.14	8.24

Table indicates the mean and standard deviation of positive drinking motives among both moderate and heavy drinkers. The mean values show that moderate drinkers have lower positive motives as compared to heavy drinkers.

Table also indicates the mean and standard deviation of negative drinking motives of both moderate and heavy drinkers. The mean values show that moderate drinkers score low on negative motives as compared to heavy drinkers.

Table 3: Shows values of t and p for self-regulation, positive drinking motives and negative drinking motives.

Variable	t value	df	sig (2 tailed)
Self-regulation	2.77	98	0.007
Positive drinking motives	1.59	98	.114
Negative drinking motives	6.413	98	0.001

Table shows that there is a significant difference between moderate alcohol drinkers and heavy alcohol drinkers on self-regulation and negative drinking motives as the p values are 0.007 and 0.001 respectively, which is less than 0.05 level. Whereas, there is no significant difference between both the groups on positive drinking motives as the p value is more than 0.05.

Table 4 shows correlation value for self-regulation and positive drinking motives in young adults.

Variable	Self-regulation
Positive drinking motives	
R	-0.11
Sig. (2 tailed)	0.91
Negative drinking motives	
R	-2.14
Sig. (2 tailed)	0.32

The table indicates that there is no significant correlation between self-regulation and positive drinking motives as the r value is not significant at 0.05 level. Similarly the Correlation is also significant at the 50.05 level (2-tailed). The table indicates that there is a significant negative

correlation between self-regulation and negative drinking motives as the r value is significant at 0.05 level.

DISCUSSION:

The study was conducted to analyze drinking motives and self-regulation capacities in young adult drinkers. After analyzing the statistical data, significant results were obtained on each variable. Alcohol is quite likely to be perceived as a rival as it can be harmful to oneself as well as others. Although alcohol is related to great personal risk factors like health issues, injury, accidents and many more negative consequences, alcohol tends to be consumed voluntarily among individuals, especially young adults. The degree of consumption may vary from individual to individual. Some might drink heavy amounts of alcohol and fall in the category of alcoholics or heavy drinkers while others can be moderate or occasional drinkers. What do they gain, hope to gain, or what are the motives behind their drinking behaviour might also vary.

Drinking motives are considered as the ultimate decision to consume or not to consume alcohol. A few researchers have contended that individuals' drinking behaviour is unequivocally influenced by the motives for drinking they support. Cox and Klinger (1988) proposed a system in which motives are described by two measurements mirroring the valence (positive or negative) and the source (inward and outward) (Cooper, 1994). This structure brings about four sorts of motives: drinking to acquire social rewards, drinking to improve the positive state of mind, drinking to manage negative feelings, and drinking to stay away from social dismissal.
Self-regulation is ones capacity to modify or regulate ones behaviour. It is also the ability to maintain and plan behaviour for achieving a particular goal. There is a lot of evidence which supports the importance of self-regulatory skills in substance use across different cultures. Particularly it can be quite knowledgeable to study if self regulatory skills can predict the motives behind alcohol use and the degree of substance use. Moreover, how much the estimation of self- regulatory.

The obtained results depicted that there is a significant difference between the two groups, thus the hypotheses was accepted. So, it is revealed that the p value (0.007) <0.05, indicating that there is a significant difference between moderate drinkers and heavy drinkers. From table 1 it can be seen that on self-regulation, the mean score of moderate drinkers was 227.20 and moderate drinkers was 210.20. Since the mean of moderate drinkers is high, we can infer that they have better self regulatory capacity as compared to heavy drinkers.

 Kuvaas (2014) suggested that intake of alcohol can cause problems. There are differences in the problems according to different classes of drinkers, especially among heavy drinkers. He also suggested that there are differences in self-regulation across various classes of drinkers.

Further, results indicate that there is no significant difference between the two groups, thus the hypotheses was rejected. In table 2 it is shown that the p value (.114) >0.05, indicating that there is no significant difference between moderate drinkers and heavy drinkers. From table 1 it can be seen that on positive drinking motives, the mean score of moderate drinkers 24.28 and alcoholics was 26.90. Since the mean of moderate drinkers was less than heavy drinkers, we can infer that moderate drinkers are higher on positive motives though the difference in the mean is not significant.

It is indicated that there is a significant difference between the two groups, thus the hypotheses was accepted. In table 2 it is shown that the p value (0.001) <0.05, indicating that there is significant difference between moderate drinkers and heavy drinkers. From table 1 it can be seen that on negative drinking motives, the mean score of moderate drinkers was 18.50 and heavy drinkers was 27.14. Since the mean of moderate drinkers is more than the mean of heavy drinkers, we can infer that moderate drinkers are higher on negative drinking motives.

The results can substantiated by previous literature. Kuntsche et al (2005) through their study uncovered that moderate alcohol use was associated with social motives (positive) and alcohol-related problems were associated with coping motives (negative). Park & Levenson (2002) studied issues related to drinking to cope among college students. Results indicated that drinking to cope, which was a negative motive, was the most common motive related to higher alcohol consumption. Merrill, J. E., et al. (2014) examined the anticipation of specific alcohol consequences by enhancement and coping motives over the span of a year. Results suggested that coping motives are directly related to unique alcohol consequences.

Table shows the correlation for self-regulation and negative drinking motives. The correlation value (r) came out to be -2.14 which show a negative correlation between the two variables. Thus, indicating that higher the negative drinking motives lower will be the self regulation of the target population.

The findings suggest that alcohol use has a significant relationship with self-regulation capacity of young adults. Thus the self-regulation capacity can predict alcohol use, and vice-versa. Individuals with low self-regulation capacity are usually unable to plan or modify behaviour and have low motivation to achieve their goals. This further predicts the motives behind drinking behaviour. Heavy drinkers or alcoholics have negative motives for alcohol consumption, whereas moderate or light drinkers mostly have positive drinking motives.

CONCLUSION:

The study aimed to explore drinking motives and self-regulation among young adult drinkers. The study included 100 Indian young adults of Delhi; NCR aged 18 to 30 years. The technique of random sampling was employed. The participants were divided into two different groups i.e. moderate drinkers (N=50) and heavy drinkers (N=50). Three tools were used for the study which were AUDIT-C (WHO), Drinking Motives Questionnaire (DMQ-R) (Cooper) and Self-Regulation Questionnaire (SRQ) (Brown, Miller, & Lawendowski). DMQ-R has four sub-scales which are social, enhancement, coping and conformity. Social and enhancement indicates positive drinking motives and coping and conformity indicates negative drinking motives. The scores on SRQ can be categorized as high, moderate and low. A high score indicated high self regulating capacity and a low score indicated low self regulating capacity. There were four hypotheses in total. The first three hypotheses stated that there will be significant differences in self-regulation, positive drinking motives and negative drinking motives among moderate drinkers and heavy drinkers. The fourth one stated that there will be a significant relationship between self-regulation, positive drinking motives and negative drinking motives among young adult drinkers. There was a significant difference between both the groups of adult drinkers on self-regulation and negative drinking motives though there was a negligible difference on positive drinking motives which was insignificant. There was also significant correlation between self regulation and negative drinking motives.

REFERENCES

Armeli, S., Conner, T. S., Cullum, J., & Tennen, H. (2010). A longitudinal analysis of drinking motives moderating the negative affect-drinking association among college students. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 24*(1), 38-47. doi:10.1037/a0017530

Baumeister, R.F., & Vohs K. D. (2007). Self-Regulation, Ego Depletion, and Motivation. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 1*(1), 115-128. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00001.x

Buckner,J. D., Eggleston, A. M., & Schmidt, N. B. (2006). Social Anxiety and Problematic Alcohol Consumption: The Mediating Role of Drinking Motives and Situations. *Behavior Therapy, 37*(4), 381-391. doi:10.1016/j.beth.2006.02.007

Caudwell, K. M., & Hagger, M. S. (2015). Predicting Alcohol Pre-Drinking in Australian Undergraduate Students Using an Integrated Theoretical Model. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 7*(2), 188-213. doi:10.1111/aphw.12044

Cooper, M. L., Frone, M. R., 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.

Dlima, G. M., Pearson, M. R., & Kelley, M. L. (2012). Protective behavioral strategies as a mediator and moderator of the relationship between self-regulation and alcohol-related consequences in first-year college students. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 26*(2), 330-337. doi:10.1037/a0026942

Goldstein, A. L., & Flett, G. L. (2008). Personality, Alcohol Use, and Drinking Motives. *Behavior Modification, 33*(2), 182-198. doi:10.1177/0145445508322920

Kassel, J. D., Jackson, S. I., & Unrod, M. (2000). Generalized expectancies for negative mood regulation and problem drinking among college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 61*(2), 332-340. doi:10.15288/jsa.2000.61.332

Kuntsche, E., Knibbe, R., Gmel, G., & Engels, R. (2005). Why do young people drink? A review of drinking motives. Clinical Psychology Review, 25(7), 841-861. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2005.06.002

Kuvaas, N. J., Dvorak, R. D., Pearson, M. R., Lamis, D. A., & Sargent, E. M. (2014). Self-regulation and alcohol use involvement: A latent class analysis. *Addictive Behaviors, 39*(1), 146-152. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2013.09.020

Loschelder, D., & Friese, M. (2016). Moderators of the Ego Depletion Effect. *Self-Regulation and Ego Control,* 21-42. doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-801850-7.00002-0

Lyvers, M., Hasking, P., Hani, R., Rhodes, M., & Trew, E. (2010). Drinking motives, drinking restraint and drinking behaviour among young adults. *Addictive Behaviors*, 35(2), 116-122. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2009.09.011

Magid, V., Maclean, M. G., & Colder, C. R. (2007). Differentiating between sensation seeking and impulsivity through their mediated relations with alcohol use and problems. *Addictive Behaviors, 32*(10), 2046-2061. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2007.01.015

Mcnally, A. M., Palfai, T. P., Levine, R. V., & Moore, B. M. (2003). Attachment dimensions and drinking-related problems among young adults. *Addictive Behaviors, 28*(6), 1115-1127. doi:10.1016/s0306-4603(02)00224-1

Neal, D. J., & Carey, K. B. (2007). Association between alcohol intoxication and alcohol-related problems: An event-level analysis. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 21*(2), 194-204. doi:10.1037/0893-164x.21.2.194

Neal, D. J., & Carey, K. B. (2004). Developing discrepancy within self-regulation theory: Use of personalized normative feedback and personal strivings with heavy-drinking college students. *Addictive Behaviors, 29*(2), 281-297. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2003.08.004

Neighbors, C., Larimer, M. E., Geisner, I. M., & Knee, C. R. (2004). Feeling Controlled and Drinking Motives Among College Students: Contingent Self-Esteem as a Mediator. *Self and Identity, 3*(3), 207-224. doi:10.1080/13576500444000029

Ostafin, B. D., & Palfai, T. P. (2006). Compelled to consume: The Implicit Association Test and automatic alcohol motivation. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 20*(3), 322-327. doi:10.1037/0893-164x.20.3.322

Park, C. L., & Levenson, M. R. (2002). Drinking to cope among college students: prevalence, problems and coping processes. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 63*(4), 486-497. doi:10.15288/jsa.2002.63.486

Patock-Peckham, J. A., Cheong, J., Balhorn, M. E., & Nagoshi, C. T. (2001). A Social Learning Perspective: A Model of Parenting Styles, Self-Regulation, Perceived Drinking Control, and Alcohol Use and Problems. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 25*(9), 1284-1292. doi:10.1097/00000374-200109000-00007

Rice, K. G., & Arsdale, A. C. (2010). Perfectionism, perceived stress, drinking to cope, and alcohol-related problems among college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57*(4), 439-450. doi:10.1037/a0020221

Simons, J. S., Gaher, R. M., Correia, C. J., Hansen, C. L., & Christopher, M. S. (2005). An affective-motivational model of marijuana and alcohol problems among college students. Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 19(3), 326-334. doi:10.1037/0893-164x.19.3.326

Vohs, K. D., Baumeister, R. F., Schmeichel, B. J., Twenge, J. M., Nelson, N. M., & Tice, D. M. (2014). Making choices impairs subsequent self-control: A limited-resource account of decision making, self-regulation, and active initiative. *Motivation Science, 1*(S), 19-42. doi:10.1037/2333-8113.1.s.

Wills, T. A., Sandy, J. M., & Shinar, O. (1999). Cloningers constructs related to substance use level and problems in late adolescence: A mediational model based on self-control and coping motives. Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology, 7(2), 122-134. doi:10.1037//1064-1297.7.2.122.