Family dynamics and environmental factors influencing progression from alcohol experimentation to initiation in youth: Evidence from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study

Harwood, M.I.[1], Otero-Leon, D.F.[2,3], Stringfellow, E.J.[2], Deutsch, A.[4], Jalali, M.S.[2], Dong, H.[2]

[1]Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, 02115, USA

[2]MGH Institute for Technology Assessment, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, 02144, USA

[3]Department of Systems and Information Engineering, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, 22903, USA

[4]Avera Research Institute, Avera Health, Sioux Falls, SD, 57108, USA

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Early alcohol initiation is linked to the later development of problem drinking and other negative health outcomes. While previous studies have identified predictors of alcohol use, a growing body of research is categorizing early use as experimentation (onset of sipping) or initiation (first full drink) – key stages in youth drinking patterns.

Methods: This study evaluated the influence of individual, interpersonal, and environmental factors on the time from alcohol experimentation to initiation among 11,867 preadolescent youth, using data from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study (2016-2023). Ages ranged from 8 to 11 at baseline and 12 to 14 at the end of the study period. Experimentation was defined as the first instance of alcohol sipping, while initiation was defined as consuming at least one full drink during the study period. Participants were included if they reported no alcohol use at baseline and sipped alcohol during the study. Among those who progressed to drinking, only individuals who sipped prior to consuming a full drink were retained to ensure a temporal sequence from experimentation to initiation. An extended Cox

model was used to examine the effects of sociodemographic characteristics, alcohol expectancies, family and peer dynamics, and neighborhood-level factors on the likelihood of alcohol initiation following experimentation.

Results: Among 1,225 youths in the final sample who were alcohol-naive at baseline, 87 (7.1%) participants had their first sip and later first drink by month 45 of the study period. Significant factors associated with a higher likelihood of alcohol initiation included peer alcohol use (adjusted hazard ratio [HR]=4.75, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 2.91-7.76, p<0.001), household rules allowing alcohol consumption (adjusted HR=2.60, 95% CI: 1.43-4.72, p=0.002), older age (adjusted HR=1.48, 95% CI: 1.16-1.89, p=0.002), family conflict (adjusted HR=1.14, 95% CI: 1.04-1.26, p=0.007), and positive alcohol expectancies (adjusted HR=1.10, 95% CI: 1.00-1.20, p=0.041). No significant differences were observed based on sex, race, ethnicity, household income, parental alcohol use, alcohol availability, and neighborhood safety.

Conclusion: Household dynamics, peer use, and older age emerged as robust influencing factors of early alcohol experimentation preceding initiation. These findings suggest that interventions engaging youths' social networks should be considered for prevention of alcohol use progression among preadolescent youth.

INTRODUCTION

Preadolescence and adolescence are critical stages for the onset of alcohol use. In 2024, 18.5% of eighth graders in the U.S. reported having consumed alcohol at least once in their lifetime, a figure that rose to 32% among tenth graders [1]. Early alcohol initiation is linked to the later development of problem drinking [2, 3] and other negative health outcomes, including increased risk of suicidality and long-term substance use disorders [4, 5]. Given the developmental sensitivity of preadolescence, identifying risk and protective factors for alcohol use among youth is crucial to guiding prevention efforts.

While previous research has made significant strides in identifying predictors of youth alcohol use, few studies have specifically examined the transition from alcohol experimentation (i.e., sipping) to initiation (i.e., consuming a full drink). Several existing studies on alcohol use in the ABCD cohort focus on the onset of either sipping or a full drink, without examining the progression between these distinct stages of use [6, 7]. This separation is critical, as experimentation is relatively low risk, whereas initiation signals a shift toward more intentional use and greater vulnerability to future negative health outcomes [8]. As a result, the alcohol use trajectories that lead some youth from experimentation to initiation remain underexplored.

Preadolescent sipping, defined as tasting or having a few sips of alcohol, is increasingly recognized as a qualitatively distinct stage in the developmental trajectory of youth alcohol use. Donovan and Molina's longitudinal work highlights that sipping is far more prevalent than initiation during preadolescence [9]. Their research further demonstrates that sipping is strongly driven by parental modeling and approval [10]. Focusing on the progression from sipping to initiation, rather than on youth who begin with a full drink, offers a more actionable target for

prevention efforts, as sipping is a widely experienced and often socially sanctioned behavior that precedes more serious use.

Empirical work by Wadolowski et al. reinforces this conceptual distinction, showing that early sippers differ from young drinkers in key domains. Sippers more often emerge from stricter parental monitoring and lower exposure to substance-using peers compared to those who have consumed full drinks [11]. This distinction underscores the importance of treating sipping as a developmentally unique behavior, shaped by different familial and peer influences than initiation, rather than grouping it with either abstinence or drinking. Our study builds on this foundation by aiming to identify which factors, such as parental attitudes, peer behavior, and individual expectancies, drive the transition from sipping to initiation. Understanding sipping as a unique behavior allows for more precise mapping of early alcohol use pathways and more tailored interventions before progression to full drinking occurs.

A growing body of research highlights a complex interplay of factors that influence early alcohol use behaviors, including both sipping and initiation. Intrapersonally, early sippers tend to exhibit greater sensation seeking, disinhibition, and more favorable appraisals of alcohol, including weaker negative expectancies and implicit associations, than those who don’t sip [12]. Interpersonally, early alcohol use often occurs in the context of permissive parental attitudes, frequent parental drinking, and limited communication about alcohol-related risks [12]. Environmentally, easier access to alcohol in the home and affiliation with peers who use or approve of drinking further increase the likelihood of escalation [13]. These factors are not only associated with early sipping but also predict increased alcohol-related problems later in adolescence.

Few longitudinal cohort studies on alcohol use have focused specifically on preadolescent youth, despite this being a developmentally sensitive period when early experimentation often begins [14]. Preadolescence differs from later adolescence in critical ways, including more limited autonomy and a greater susceptibility to environmental and interpersonal shaping. These distinctions suggest that the factors influencing early alcohol use trajectories may differ in both nature and timing compared to older youth. However, little is known about how youths' relationships and environment interact to influence the progression from initial experimentation to initiation during this stage. This gap in the literature underscores the need for research that captures the early and nuanced dynamics of alcohol use development in childhood.

The aim of this study is to evaluate the influence of individual, interpersonal, and environmental factors on the time from alcohol experimentation to initiation among preadolescent youth enrolled in the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study. The ABCD Study follows a cohort of over 11,000 participants ages 9-10 into early adulthood, tracking social, behavioral, academic, and health outcomes [15]. Drawing on detailed measures of peer behavior, household dynamics, and alcohol expectancies, we aim to identify modifiable risk factors of more intentional and potentially risky drinking behaviors.

METHODS

Study participants

The ABCD Study tracks the biological and behavioral development of 11,867 participants recruited at ages 9-10 across 17 US states [14] .We used data from the ABCD 5.1 release, which was collected from 2016-2021 with follow-ups occurring every six months, with ages ranging from 8 to 11 at baseline and 12 to 14 at the end of the study period [14]. For each participant, alcohol consumption was assessed during annual in-person interviews and mid-year phone

interviews. Alcohol experimentation was defined as the first instance of alcohol sipping, while alcohol initiation was defined as consuming at least one standard drink. Since the study aims to identify factors associated with alcohol initiation following experimentation, the inclusion criteria consisted of no alcohol use at baseline and engaging in experimentation (alcohol sipping) at least once during the study. Additionally, to establish a temporal relationship from alcohol experimentation to initiation, among participants who sipped alcohol and had a full drink, only those who reported sipping prior to consuming a full drink were retained. For the same reason, only participants with complete and correct interview dates were included. Figure 1 depicts the process used to determine our final cohort of 1,255 participants.



Figure 1: Flowchart for inclusion criteria

Measures

The outcome is youth self-reported alcohol initiation, assessed by the question: “Have you had a full drink containing alcohol at any time in the past 6 months?” [14]. We included thirteen explanatory factors spanning individual, interpersonal, and environmental aspects. Covariates were chosen based on established or plausible association with alcohol use [16, 17, 18], with a focus on measures of family, household, and peer dynamics, to holistically assess risk of alcohol initiation following experimentation.

Specifically, we considered five sociodemographic characteristics, including time-updated age, sex (male; female), race (White; Black; multiracial or other), ethnicity (Hispanic; non-Hispanic), and baseline household income (<$50,000; $50,000-$100,000; >$100,000) reported by a parent or guardian. Peer alcohol use, defined as whether a youth’s friends consume alcohol and collected as part of a nine-item Peer Group Deviance instrument modified from the PhenX [19], was reported by youth on a yearly basis. Family dynamics were assessed using several measures reported by a parent or guardian. This included parental drinking problems (yes or no for each parent), which was collected at baseline. Household rules regarding youth’s alcohol consumption (alcohol consumption allowed; alcohol consumption not allowed; no rules on alcohol consumption in the home) and alcohol availability in the home (easy; difficult) were collected once a year. Additionally, family conflict was measured using the Family Environment Scale-Conflict Subscale (FES-CS) modified from the PhenX, a nine-item instrument capturing the amount of openly expressed anger and conflict in a family [20]. Scores range from 1 to 9, with higher scores indicating more frequent expressions of anger and interactions that stimulate anger.

Moreover, we included positive and negative alcohol expectancies reported by youth once a year. Alcohol expectancies were assessed using the Alcohol Expectancy Questionnaire-Adolescent,

Brief, a seven-item questionnaire measuring the degree to which alcohol consumption is believed to have positive or negative outcomes [21]. Participants indicated their level of agreement with statements regarding alcohol's effects using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree"). A positive alcohol expectancy score was derived by summing responses to items 1, 2, 4, and 6, while a negative alcohol expectancy score was obtained by summing responses to items 3, 5, and 7. Lastly, neighborhood safety, which was collected from a parent or guardian once a year, was measured using a 3-item Neighborhood Safety instrument modified from the PhenX that produces scores ranging from 1 to 5 [22].

Analysis

First, we examined the characteristics of ABCD study participants and stratified them by alcohol initiation, the outcome of interest. They were further compared using Fisher's exact or chi-squared tests for categorical variables and t-tests for continuous variables. To visualize the cumulative probability of initiating alcohol use after experimentation, we constructed a cumulative incidence curve. Then, bivariable and multivariable extended Cox models were used to assess the influence of sociodemographic characteristics, family dynamics, peer alcohol use, alcohol expectancies, and neighborhood-level factors on the transition from alcohol experimentation to initiation. Unlike a standard Cox model, this approach relaxed the proportional hazards assumption and enabled the inclusion of time-dependent covariates such as age, alcohol expectancies, and peer alcohol use [23]. Participants who had not initiated drinking by the end of the study period were censored at their last recorded observation. Statistical analyses were conducted in R (version 4.1.2) using the *coxph* function in the *survival* package to fit the extended Cox model. All p-values were two-sided with the significance level as 0.05. All analytical codes can be found at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15468338.

RESULTS

Among 1,255 youths in the final sample, 87 (7.1%) participants had their first drink after taking their first sip during the study period. Table 1 summarizes key baseline characteristics of alcohol-naive participants who reported sipping alcohol during the study. Participants who initiated alcohol use were slightly older at baseline with no significant differences in sex, race, ethnicity, or household income.

Table 1: Baseline sample characteristics overall and stratified by alcohol initiation for final sample (N=1,255).

	All	Initiated Alcohol Use		Test for Difference	
	N=1225	No (N=1,138)	Yes (N=87)	Test statistic	p-value
Age				-4.17	<0.001
Mean (SD)	12.3 (1.19)	12.3 (1.18)	12.8 (1.13)		
Sex					0.18†
Male	666 (54.4%)	625 (54.9%)	41 (47.1%)		
Female	559 (45.6%)	513 (45.1%)	46 (52.9%)		
Race					0.175†
White	861 (70.3%)	792 (69.6%)	69 (79.3%)		
Black	112 (9.1%)	108 (9.5%)	4 (4.6%)		
Multiracial or Other	240 (19.6%)	226 (19.9%)	14 (16.1%)		
Ethnicity				0.32	0.324
Hispanic	226 (18.4%)	206 (18.1%)	20 (23.0%)		
Non-Hispanic	984 (80.3%)	918 (80.7%)	66 (75.9%)		
Income				0.56	0.563
<$50,000	232 (18.9%)	219 (19.2%)	13 (14.9%)		
$50,000-100,000	304 (24.8%)	280 (24.6%)	24 (27.6%)		
>$100,000	662 (54.0%)	613 (53.9%)	49 (56.3%)		
Parental Alcohol Abuse				0.53	0.531
No	1,009 (82.4%)	938 (82.4%)	71 (81.6%)		
Yes	172 (14.0%)	157 (13.8%)	15 (17.2%)		

Household Alcohol Consumption Rules				0.03	0.031
Not Allowed	968 (79.0%)	899 (79.0%)	69 (79.3%)		
Allowed	52 (4.2%)	44 (3.9%)	8 (9.2%)		
No Rules	205 (16.7%)	195 (17.1%)	10 (11.5%)		
Family Conflict Score				-2.17	0.032
Mean (SD)	2.24 (1.97)	2.71 (2.12)	2.24 (1.97)		
Alcohol Availability				0.4	0.395
Easy	516 (42.1%)	484 (42.5%)	32 (36.8%)		
Difficult	667 (54.4%)	616 (54.1%)	51 (58.6%)		
Peer Alcohol Use				<0.001	<0.001
No	1,108 (90.4%)	1,040 (91.4%)	68 (78.2%)		
Yes	117 (9.6%)	98 (8.6%)	19 (21.8%)		
Positive Alcohol Expectancy Score				-4.35	<0.001
Mean (SD)	7.16 (2.80)	7.06 (2.77)	8.47 (2.92)		
Negative Alcohol Expectancy Score				0.17	0.867
Mean (SD)	12.5 (2.55)	12.5 (2.58)	12.4 (2.13)		
Neighborhood Safety Score				0.28	0.777
Mean (SD)	3.95 (0.916)	3.95 (0.919)	3.92 (0.877)		

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100% due to missing data.
† Indicates use of Fisher's exact test.



Figure 2: Cumulative incidence of alcohol initiation following experimentation over time among 1,255 youth from 2016-2021. Dashed lines represent the 95% confidence intervals.

Table 2: Bivariable and multivariable extended Cox models examining factors associated with alcohol initiation following experimentation among 1,255 ABCD study participants from 2016-2021.

Variable	Unadjusted HR	95% CI	*p*	Adjusted HR	95% CI	*p*

Age (per year increase)	2.06	(1.65, 2.57)	<0.001	1.48	(1.16, 1.89)	0.002
Sex						
Female	0.62	(1.06, 2.47)	0.025	1.23	(0.78, 1.94)	0.373
Race						
Black	0.57	(0.21, 1.56)	0.272	0.92	(0.32, 2.67)	0.882
Multiracial or Other	0.74	(0.42, 1.32)	0.305	0.70	(0.36, 1.36)	0.291
Ethnicity						
Non-Hispanic	0.70	(0.42, 1.15)	0.161	0.62	(0.35, 1.07)	0.088
Income						
$50,000-100,000	0.96	(0.47, 1.95)	0.900	0.83	(0.37, 1.83)	0.638
>$100,000	1.25	(0.68, 2.29)	0.470	1.43	(0.69, 2.97)	0.331
Parental Alcohol Abuse						
Mother	2.43	(0.98, 5.99)	0.055	2.56	(0.93, 7.01)	0.068
Father	1.30	(0.73, 2.31)	0.367	1.10	(0.57, 2.10)	0.798
Household Alcohol Consumption Rules						
Allowed	3.37	(1.94, 5.84)	<0.001	2.60	(1.43, 4.72)	0.002
No Rules	0.70	(0.36, 1.46)	0.341	1.19	(0.56, 2.56)	0.650
Family Conflict	1.23	(1.12, 1.34)	<0.001	1.14	(1.04, 1.26)	0.007
Alcohol Availability						
Easy	1.34	(0.85, 2.12)	0.212	1.16	(0.69, 1.95)	0.580
Peer Alcohol Use						
Yes	8.79	(5.76, 13.41)	<0.001	4.75	(2.91, 7.76)	<0.001
Positive Alcohol Expectancy	1.21	(1.12, 1.31)	<0.001	1.10	(1.00, 1.20)	0.041
Negative Alcohol Expectancy	0.98	(0.91, 1.07)	0.669	0.96	(0.87, 1.05)	0.344
Neighborhood Safety	0.92	(0.73, 1.17)	0.508	0.88	(0.67, 1.16)	0.371

CI: confidence interval; HR: hazard ratio

Several peer and family dynamics were significantly associated with alcohol use progression. Specifically, peer alcohol use emerged as the strongest predictor of alcohol initiation. Youth who reported having friends who consumed alcohol were nearly five times likely to initiate drinking themselves compared to those whose peers did not drink (adjusted HR = 4.75, 95% CI: 2.91–

7.76). Household rules also played a significant role. Compared to youth living in homes where alcohol consumption was not allowed, those whose parents allowed alcohol use were at a 160% higher risk of initiating alcohol (adjusted HR = 2.60, 95% CI: 1.43–4.72). Family conflict was also positively associated with time from alcohol experimentation to initiation. For each unit increase in family conflict score, the hazard of initiation increased by 14% (adjusted HR = 1.14, 95% CI: 1.04–1.26).

Age was the only demographic characteristic significantly associated with alcohol initiation. Each additional year of age was linked to a 48% increase in the likelihood of progressing from experimentation to initiation (adjusted HR = 1.48, 95% CI: 1.16–1.89). The association between age and initiation did not vary over time, and there was no evidence that the effects of covariates were moderated by age. Other sociodemographic factors, such as sex, race, ethnicity, and household income, were not significantly associated with alcohol initiation in these study participants after adjusting for other variables.

Positive alcohol expectancies were modestly associated with alcohol initiation, suggesting that a youth's perception of potential benefits from drinking may increase their likelihood of progressing beyond experimentation (adjusted HR = 1.10, 95% CI: 1.00–1.20). In contrast, negative alcohol expectancies did not show a significant protective effect, indicating that simply recognizing the risks of alcohol use may not be enough to deter initiation.

DISCUSSION

This study examined the transition from alcohol experimentation to initiation in a large, national sample of preadolescent youth. Using data from the ABCD Study, we identified several key

factors linked to this transition, including peer alcohol use, permissive household rules, older age, family conflict, and positive alcohol expectancies. In contrast, parental drinking problems, alcohol availability, and negative alcohol expectancies were not significantly associated with initiation.

Peer alcohol use emerged as the strongest predictor of progression to alcohol initiation. Youth who reported having friends who drank were nearly five times likely to transition from sipping to consuming a full drink. This finding aligns with recent research emphasizing the importance of peer norms in shaping youth substance use behaviors [24]. While peer influence has long been recognized as a risk factor, few studies directly account for the effects of peer versus parental behavior in the same model. Our findings suggest that during preadolescence and early adolescence, peer drinking habits may have a more immediate and powerful influence on drinking progression from sipping to full drink than parental modeling. Notably, parental drinking problems did not significantly predict initiation, diverging from past research that highlights parental modeling as a key risk factor [25]. It is possible that parental drinking exerts its influence over longer-term behavioral trajectories or interacts with other parenting factors, such as rule-setting, that were separately accounted for in our model. Future studies should further explore these potential mechanisms.

Family dynamics influenced alcohol use progression in youth. Permissive household alcohol rules were significantly associated with increased initiation risk. Youth in homes where alcohol consumption was allowed were 160% more likely to initiate use compared to those in homes with no-use rules. This is consistent with prior findings that permissive parenting styles around substances contribute to earlier and riskier use [26, 27]. Additionally, family conflict was

positively associated with alcohol initiation. Youth who reported greater levels of conflict in the home had a higher likelihood of progressing to initiation. This aligns with prior studies that link high-conflict family environments to increased risk-taking and substance use in adolescence [24]. Conflict may reduce parental monitoring or increase emotional distress, both of which can contribute to early alcohol use.

Among sociodemographic variables, only age was significantly associated with initiation risk. Each additional year of age increased the likelihood of initiation by nearly 50%, echoing findings from developmental literature that substance use generally increases with age as youth gain autonomy and exposure to social situations involving alcohol [1]. In contrast, sex, race, ethnicity, and household income were not significant explanatory factors in the adjusted model, suggesting that environmental influences may better explain early alcohol transitions during preadolescence.

Our findings regarding alcohol expectancies provide further insight into the psychological mechanisms underlying initiation. Positive alcohol expectancies were significantly associated with increased initiation risk, while negative alcohol expectancies were not. This finding reflects broader behavioral science research showing that perceived benefits often exert a stronger motivational pull than perceived risks [30]. Moreover, Sanchez et al. [24] demonstrated that family conflict and peer victimization predicted higher positive alcohol expectancies among adolescents, reinforcing the idea that environmental stressors may contribute to both risk perception and alcohol-related decision-making. These findings suggest that interventions aiming to delay initiation should not only correct misinformation about alcohol's effects but also address the environmental and interpersonal contexts that shape these beliefs.

Neighborhood safety and alcohol availability were not significantly associated with initiation in our analysis. The null effect of neighborhood safety on initiation is consistent with other findings from ABCD data that reveal no association between neighborhood crime rates and substance initiation [29]. However, our alcohol availability finding contrasts with earlier studies showing that increased alcohol avaliability in the home correlates with earlier use [30]. One possibility is that in a younger age group, direct access to alcohol is more tightly controlled by parents, making household rules more immediate determinants of behavior.

Despite leveraging a rich longitudinal dataset, this study has limitations. The ABCD sample is not fully representative of the U.S. population; participants tend to come from families with above-average income and education levels [31], potentially biasing observed risk estimates. As the ABCD cohort continues into later adolescence, analyses can also assess whether early predictors of initiation remain influential or are replaced by new factors as youth gain more independence. Additionally, the six-month interval between assessments may have reduced the precision in capturing the exact timing of alcohol initiation. This possibility limited the ability to identify transitions that occurred between visits. Lastly, the current study focused on socio-demographics, family and peer dynamics, alcohol expectancies, and environmental factors. Expanding the range of variables included in predictive models could deepen our understanding of the mechanisms underlying early substance use.

In conclusion, this study highlights the critical role of peers, family dynamics, ,older age, and positive alcohol expectancies in influencing youth alcohol initiation. By focusing specifically on the transition from experimentation to initiation and leveraging time-updated covariates in a

longitudinal model, our findings offer timely insights for prevention strategies that involve family and peer networks to delay or prevent alcohol use progression in at-risk youth.

REFERENCES

1. Miech RA, Johnston LD, Patrick ME, O'Malley PM. Monitoring the Future national survey results on drug use, 1975–2024: Overview and detailed results for secondary school students. Monitoring the Future Monograph Series. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan; 2024.
2. Dawson DA, Goldstein RB, Chou SP, Ruan WJ, Grant BF. Age at first drink and the first incidence of adult-onset DSM-IV alcohol use disorders. Alcohol Clin Exp Res. 2008;32(12):2149-2160.
3. Buchmann AF, Schmid B, Blomeyer D, Becker K, Treutlein J, Zimmermann US, et al. Impact of age at first drink on vulnerability to alcohol-related problems: Testing the marker hypothesis in a prospective study of young adults. J Psychiatr Res. 2009;43(15):1205-1212.
4. Blonigen DM, Durbin CE, Hicks BM, Johnson W, McGue M, Iacono WG. Alcohol Use Initiation is Associated with Changes in Personality Trait Trajectories from Early Adolescence to Young Adulthood. Alcohol Clin Exp Res. 2015;39:2163-2170.
5. Ahuja M, Awasthi M, Records K, Lamichhane RR. Early Age of Alcohol Initiation and its Association with Suicidal Behaviors. Subst Use Misuse. 2021;56(9):1332-1338.
6. Green R, Wolf BJ, Chen A, et al. Predictors of Substance Use Initiation by Early Adolescence. Am J Psychiatry. 2024;181(5):423-433.
7. Jones SK, Benton ML, Wolf BJ, Barth J, Green R, Dolan SL. Neurocognitive latent factors associate with early tobacco and alcohol use among Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study youth. J Adolesc Health. 2024;75(6):874-882.
8. Jackson KM, Barnett NP, Colby SM, Rogers ML. The prospective association between sipping alcohol by the sixth grade and later substance use. J Stud Alcohol Drugs. 2015;76(2):212-221.
9. Donovan JE, Molina BSG. Types of alcohol use experience from childhood through adolescence. J Adolesc Health. 2013;53(4):453–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.03.024.
10. Donovan JE, Molina BSG. Antecedent predictors of children's initiation of sipping/tasting alcohol. Alcohol Clin Exp Res. 2014;38(9):2488–2495. doi:10.1111/acer.12517.
11. Wadolowski M, Hutchinson D, Bruno R, Aiken A, Clare P, Slade T, et al. Early adolescent alcohol use: Are sipping and drinking distinct? Alcohol Clin Exp Res. 2015;39(9):1805–13. doi:10.1111/acer.12826.
12. Colder CR, Shyhalla K, Frndak SE. Early alcohol use with parental permission: Psychosocial characteristics and drinking in late adolescence. Addict Behav. 2018;76:82–87. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2017.07.030.
13. Jackson KM, Colby SM, Barnett NP, Abar CC. Prevalence and correlates of sipping alcohol in a prospective middle school sample. Psychol Addict Behav. 2015;29(3):766–78. doi:10.1037/adb0000072. PMCID: PMC4584795.
14. Skylstad V, Babirye JN, Kiguli J, Skar AS, Kühl MJ, Nalugya JS, Engebretsen IMS. Are we overlooking alcohol use by younger children? BMJ Paediatr Open. 2022 Mar;6(1):e001242. doi: 10.1136/bmjpo-2021-001242. PMID: 36053657; PMCID: PMC8905875.
15. Karcher NR, Barch DM. The ABCD study: understanding the development of risk for mental and physical health outcomes. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2021;46:131-142.
16. Yuen WS, Chan G, Bruno R, Clare P, Mattick R, Aiken A, et al. Adolescent Alcohol Use trajectories: risk factors and adult outcomes. Pediatrics. 2020;146(4):e20200440.

17. Cambron C, Kosterman R, Catalano RF, et al. Neighborhood, Family, and Peer Factors Associated with Early Adolescent Smoking and Alcohol Use. J Youth Adolesc. 2018;47:369-382.
18. Khamis AA, Salleh SZ, Ab Karim MS, Mohd Rom NA, Janasekaran S, Idris A, et al. Alcohol Consumption Patterns: A Systematic Review of Demographic and Sociocultural Influencing Factors. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(13):8103.
19. PhenX Toolkit. Peer/Partner Substance Use and Tolerance of Substance Use. 2025. Available from: https://www.phenxtoolkit.org/protocols/view/540402
20. Moos RH, Moos BS. Family Environment Scale manual. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden; 1994.
21. Stein LAR, Katz B, Colby SM, Barnett NP, Golembeske C, Lebeau-Craven R, et al. Validity and Reliability of the Alcohol Expectancy Questionnaire-Adolescent, Brief. J Child Adolesc Subst Abuse. 2007;16(2):115-127.
22. PhenX Toolkit. Neighborhood Safety. 2025. Available from: https://www.phenxtoolkit.org/protocols/view/210901
23. Therneau TM, Crowson C, Atkinson EJ. Using time dependent covariates and time dependent coefficients in the Cox model [Internet]. CRAN; 2022 [cited 2025 May 19]. Available from: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/survival/vignettes/timedep.pdf
24. Sanchez ZI, Hartman CA, Trucco EM, Lopez-Quintero C. Sociocultural Influences on Alcohol Expectancies in Early Adolescents: A Study Using ABCD Data. Alcohol Clin Exp Res. 2023;47(12):2305-2319.
25. Nguyen-Louie TT, Thompson WK, Sullivan EV, Pfefferbaum A, Gonzalez C, Eberson-Shumate SC, Wade NE, Clark DB, Nagel BJ, Baker FC, Luna B, Nooner KB, de Zambotti M, Goldston DB, Knutson B, Pohl KM, Tapert SF. Multi-dimensional predictors of first drinking initiation and regular drinking onset in adolescence: A prospective longitudinal study. Dev Cogn Neurosci. 2024;69:101424. doi:10.1016/j.dcn.2024.101424.
26. Rossow I, Keating P, Felix L, McCambridge J. Does parental drinking influence children's drinking? A systematic review of prospective cohort studies. Addiction. 2016;111(2):204-217.
27. Jongenelis MI, Pratt IS, Slevin T, Chikritzhs T, Pettigrew S. Parental provision of alcohol: A systematic review of psychological and contextual factors. Subst Use Misuse. 2019;54(4):653-662.
28. Madras BK, Volkow ND, Wang GJ, Fowler JS, Goldstein RZ. The prevention of underage drinking: A developmental perspective. Pediatrics. 2022;150(2):e2021053740.
29. Assari S, Sheikhattari P. Higher Neighborhood Crime Rates Don't Always Predict Early Initiation of Tobacco, Marijuana, and Alcohol. J Soc Math Hum Eng Sci. 2024;3:29-37.
30. Adams ZW, Werner KB, Lopez-Quintero C, et al. Longitudinal tracking of alcohol expectancies and their associations with impulsivity in alcohol-naïve youth in the ABCD study. Drug Alcohol Depend Rep. 2024;12:100271.
31.
32. Compton WM, Dowling GJ, Garavan H. Ensuring the Best Use of Data: The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study. JAMA Pediatr. 2019;173(9):809-810.


Available ABCD Study participants from 2016-2021 (n=11,867)
Excluded (n=3,124)
Reported alcohol use prior to baseline
Alcohol-naive at baseline (n=8,744)
Excluded (n=7,141)
Did not sip alcohol during study
Sipped during study (n=1,603)
Excluded (n=12)
Had first drink (if any) before first sip
First sip preceded first drink (if any) (n=1,591)
Excluded (n=332)
First sip and first drink (if any) occurred in same interval
Had first drink (if any) after time origin (n=1,259)
Excluded (n=34)
Inaccurate interview dates: n=33
Missing interview dates: n=1
Final cohort of participants (n=1,255)


Cumulative incidence of alcohol initiation (%)
0.00
0.05
0.10
0.15
0.20
0
10
20
30
40
50
Months from study baseline

	All	Initiated Alcohol Use		Test for Difference	
	N=1225	No (N=1,138)	Yes (N=87)	Test statistic	p-value
Age				-4.17	<0.001
Mean (SD)	12.3 (1.19)	12.3 (1.18)	12.8 (1.13)		
Sex					0.18†
Male	666 (54.4%)	625 (54.9%)	41 (47.1%)		
Female	559 (45.6%)	513 (45.1%)	46 (52.9%)		
Race					0.175†
White	861 (70.3%)	792 (69.6%)	69 (79.3%)		
Black	112 (9.1%)	108 (9.5%)	4 (4.6%)		
Multiracial or Other	240 (19.6%)	226 (19.9%)	14 (16.1%)		
Ethnicity				0.32	0.324
Hispanic	226 (18.4%)	206 (18.1%)	20 (23.0%)		
Non-Hispanic	984 (80.3%)	918 (80.7%)	66 (75.9%)		
Income				0.56	0.563
<$50,000	232 (18.9%)	219 (19.2%)	13 (14.9%)		
$50,000-100,000	304 (24.8%)	280 (24.6%)	24 (27.6%)		
>$100,000	662 (54.0%)	613 (53.9%)	49 (56.3%)		
Parental Alcohol Abuse				0.53	0.531
No	1,009 (82.4%)	938 (82.4%)	71 (81.6%)		
Yes	172 (14.0%)	157 (13.8%)	15 (17.2%)		
Household Alcohol Consumption Rules				0.03	0.031
Not Allowed	968 (79.0%)	899 (79.0%)	69 (79.3%)		
Allowed	52 (4.2%)	44 (3.9%)	8 (9.2%)		
No Rules	205 (16.7%)	195 (17.1%)	10 (11.5%)		
Family Conflict Score				-2.17	0.032
Mean (SD)	2.24 (1.97)	2.71 (2.12)	2.24 (1.97)		
Alcohol Availability				0.4	0.395
Easy	516 (42.1%)	484 (42.5%)	32 (36.8%)		
Difficult	667 (54.4%)	616 (54.1%)	51 (58.6%)		
Peer Alcohol Use				<0.001	<0.001
No	1,108 (90.4%)	1,040 (91.4%)	68 (78.2%)		
Yes	117 (9.6%)	98 (8.6%)	19 (21.8%)		
Positive Alcohol Expectancy Score				-4.35	<0.001
Mean (SD)	7.16 (2.80)	7.06 (2.77)	8.47 (2.92)		
Negative Alcohol Expectancy Score				0.17	0.867
Mean (SD)	12.5 (2.55)	12.5 (2.58)	12.4 (2.13)		
Neighborhood Safety Score				0.28	0.777
Mean (SD)	3.95 (0.916)	3.95 (0.919)	3.92 (0.877)		

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100% due to missing data.

Variable	Unadjusted HR	95% CI	*p*	Adjusted HR	95% CI	*p*
Age (per year increase)	2.06	(1.65, 2.57)	<0.001	1.48	(1.16, 1.89)	0.002
Sex						
Female	0.62	(1.06, 2.47)	0.025	1.23	(0.78, 1.94)	0.373
Race						
Black	0.57	(0.21, 1.56)	0.272	0.92	(0.32, 2.67)	0.882
Multiracial or Other	0.74	(0.42, 1.32)	0.305	0.70	(0.36, 1.36)	0.291
Ethnicity						
Non-Hispanic	0.7	(0.42, 1.15)	0.161	0.62	(0.35, 1.07)	0.088
Income						
$50,000-100,000	0.96	(0.47, 1.95)	0.900	0.83	(0.37, 1.83)	0.638
>$100,000	1.25	(0.68, 2.29)	0.470	1.43	(0.69, 2.97)	0.331
Parental Alcohol Abuse						
Mother	2.43	(0.98, 5.99)	0.055	2.56	(0.93, 7.01)	0.068
Father	1.30	(0.73, 2.31)	0.367	1.10	(0.57, 2.10)	0.798
Household Alcohol Consumption Rules						
Allowed	3.37	(1.94, 5.84)	<0.001	2.60	(1.43, 4.72)	0.002
No Rules	0.70	(0.36, 1.46)	0.341	1.19	(0.56, 2.56)	0.650
Family Conflict	1.23	(1.12, 1.34)	<0.001	1.14	(1.04, 1.26)	0.007
Alcohol Availability						
Easy	1.34	(0.85, 2.12)	0.212	1.16	(0.69, 1.95)	0.580
Peer Alcohol Use						
Yes	8.79	(5.76, 13.41)	<0.001	4.75	(2.91, 7.76)	<0.001
Positive Alcohol Expectancy	1.21	(1.12, 1.31)	<0.001	1.10	(1.00, 1.20)	0.041
Negative Alcohol Expectancy	0.98	(0.91, 1.07)	0.669	0.96	(0.87, 1.05)	0.344
Neighborhood Safety	0.92	(0.73, 1.17)	0.508	0.88	(0.67, 1.16)	0.371

CI: confidence interval; HR: hazard ratio