Tridimensionality of alcohol use in Canada: Patterns of drinking, contexts and motivations to drink in the definition of Canadian drinking profiles according to gender

Marilyn Fortin, PhD,[1,2] Stéphane Moulin, PhD,[3] Elyse Picard, MSc,[4] Richard E. Bélanger, MD,[2,5] Andrée Demers, PhD[3,6]

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVES: The aim of this paper is to examine whether there is an underlying multidimensional typology of drinking according to gender among a population presenting heterogeneous drinking profiles in Canada.

METHODS: Latent class analysis was chosen to analyze the degree of statistical relationship among three indicators of drinking practices: patterns of drinking – i.e., frequency and quantity; contexts; and motivations to drink. Multivariate multilogistic regressions were conducted to explore the composition of each typology by age and education. Participants were selected from the Canadian GENACIS survey (Gender, Alcohol, and Culture: An International Study) and comprised 871 men and 843 women ($N = 1,714$) aged between 18 and 77 years and being regular alcohol drinkers (consumption at least once a month). Respondents to the GENACIS questionnaire completed questions on use, contexts and reasons to drink as well as socio-economic questions (age and education), adjusted by Canadian province of residence.

RESULTS: Six profiles were distinguished among men and five among women. Men and women share four drinking patterns but present distinctive characteristics of drinking. We also observed variability in the relationship according to socio-economic status and gender.

CONCLUSION: Our results confirmed the complexity and variability of drinking practices according to gender in Canada and the necessity to focus on gender and social dimensions in order to enhance our understanding of alcohol use. This study also reinforces the idea of adapting promotion strategies and interventions in public health by gender and social status in order to make them more efficient.

KEY WORDS: Drinking profiles; typology; gender; context; motivation; social status

La traduction du résumé se trouve à la fin de l'article.

Can J Public Health 2015;106(2):e59–e65
doi: 10.17269/CJPH.106.4665

Gender is one of the most important attributes that structure life experience and behaviours. Men and women have different social roles, are exposed to different opportunities and constraints, and have different resources, responsibilities and privileges.[1] This appears to shape the social norms regarding how a person may drink alcohol[2] as well as his or her opportunities to drink.[3]

Numerous studies have shown that women drink smaller quantities, drink less often, and get intoxicated on fewer occasions.[4–6] While the hypothesis of a convergence between drinking patterns of men and women has been debated over time, this hypothesis has found limited support.[4,7,8]

In another way, gender differences in drinking go beyond drinking patterns. Men and women differ with regards to drinking contexts[3] and drinking motives.[9] These drinking practice dimensions are intertwined.[10–12] Over and above gender, the individual's position in life course and in social structure have been shown to be key factors in the patterning of drinking.[8,13,14] Hence, a simultaneous analysis among use, contexts and motivations in the definition of drinking practices of men and women will permit us to highlight the complexity of drinking behaviours, and will offer a guide to better develop gender-sensitive prevention related to alcohol use.

The aim of this paper is to explore the variability of drinking profiles, and its determinants, among Canadian men and women who drink regularly.The following three questions are addressed: 1) What are the underlying typologies of drinking practices among men and women that adequately represent the variability in drinking practices in Canada? 2) In which respects do those typologies differ and in which are they similar? 3) Is

Author Affiliations

1. School of Psychology, Laval University, Quebec, QC
2. Population Health and Optimal Health Practices Research Unit, CHU de Québec Research Centre, Québec, QC
3. Department of Sociology, University of Montreal, Quebec, QC
4. Lifestyle and Addiction Research Lab, Concordia University, Quebec, QC
5. Department of Paediatrics, Centre mère-enfant Soleil du CHU de Québec, Laval University, Quebec, QC
6. Public Health Research Institute, University of Montreal, Quebec, QC

Correspondence: Marilyn Fortin, Population Health and Optimal Health Practices Research Unit, CHU de Québec Research Centre, 2875, boulevard Laurier, Édifice Delta II, Bureau 600, 6e étage, Québec, QC G1V 2M2, Tel: ☎418-525-4444, ext. 46581, E-mail: marilyn.fortin.2@ulaval.ca

Sources of Funding: Funding for this research was provided by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) to Katryn Graham (PI) and Andrée Demers (Co-PI) (Application no. 108626). Marilyn Fortin received a Doctoral research award (no 182174) from the CIHR. English editing was funded by the Public Health Research Institute of the University of Montreal.
Disclaimer: The content of this study is solely the responsibility of the authors.
Conflict of Interest: None to declare.

variability in female and male drinking practice related to certain socio-economic factors?

METHOD

Data

The data come from the GENACIS Canada survey as part of the Gender, Alcohol, and Culture: An International Study (www.genacis.org) (2004–2005).[15] This survey was specifically designed to observe gender differences related to drinking. Respondents aged between 18 and 77 years were chosen randomly, using the Random Digit Dialing method (RDD). Computer-Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) was used to collect data. A total of 8,055 women and 6,012 men aged 18–77 years participated in the study for a response rate of 53% ($N = 14,067$), comparable to other Canadian population-based telephone surveys.[16]

From the original sample, 22% of the respondents reported no alcohol consumption over the previous year ($N = 3,139$) and 18.5% reported drinking less than once a month ($N = 2,615$). Moreover, questions on drinking reasons in GENACIS survey were asked only to a randomly selected subsample ($N = 2,053$). After excluding cases with any missing values on studied variables, the final subsample included 871 men and 843 women ($N = 1,714$).

Measures

Drinking patterns. Two indicators of the drinking patterns were used: drinking frequency and usual quantity consumed per drinking day. The frequency of drinking was measured by the average annual frequency of drinking, ranging from 'less than once a month' to 'every day'. The variable was recoded into three categories: 'three or more times a week', 'once or twice a week', and 'once to three times a month', with drinkers drinking less than once a month being excluded from our subsample. Then, the usual quantity consumed per drinking day was measured as a continuous variable ranging from 0 to 30 ('In the past 12 months, on those days when you had any kind of beverage containing alcohol, how many drinks did you usually have?'). The variable was recoded into three categories: 'one or two', 'three or four', and 'five or more' drinks per day.

Drinking contexts. The survey assessed frequency of drinking in various contexts by asking: 'Thinking back over the last 12 months, how often did you drink in the following circumstances/situations'. The situations included: 1) the circumstances (meal and party), 2) the location (home, friend's home, bar/disco/nightclub and restaurant), and 3) whether or not alcohol was consumed alone. The response categories ranged from 'every day or nearly every day' through 'once or twice a year' to 'never in the last 12 months'. Each variable was dichotomized into drinking in a particular social context 'more than once a month' vs. 'less than once a month'.

Drinking motivations. 19 items measured drinking reasons, 15 using a 5-point scale ('never', 'rarely', 'sometimes', 'often', 'always') and 4 using a 3-point scale ('never', 'sometimes', 'usually'). Both scales were recoded into 'never', 'sometimes' (rarely and sometimes) and 'usually' (often and always). An exploratory principal component analysis was performed to reduce the data (data not shown). Four motivations (metavariables) were derived by adding items and estimating the mean score: social motives, enhancement motives, disinhibition motives and compensatory motives (see Appendix 1). Questions related to disinhibition motives were developed by GENACIS researchers to observe gender differences in alcohol drinking, for instance related to sexual practices. The other three motives are consistent with research in the field of alcohol.[17–19] These variables were recoded in two categories, 'rarely' (lower than 2) and 'usually' (2 and over).

Demographics. Age was derived from the month/year of birth and recoded into three categories corresponding to three generations (young adult, adult and senior) (18–25, 26–55, 56+ years). Education was used as a proxy variable of the economic status. The original 7-category variable ('What is the highest level of education you have completed?') was recoded into 4 categories: 1) less than high school level, 2) completed high school, 3) completed technical or community college, 4) completed bachelor's degree or higher.

Statistical analysis

Latent class analysis (LCA) was used to explore configurations in drinking practice. LCA allows for analysis of the interdependence of observed individual characteristics and inference of the homogeneous non-observed grouping of individuals (latent classes).[20] The analytical strategy seeks to simultaneously introduce drinking pattern, drinking context and drinking motivation variables, as they are all assumed to contribute to the defining of a drinking practice. In a first step, we tested the hypothesis of gender invariance by comparing non-constrained models (baseline models) with models with covariates (gender-constrained models) for between 2 and 10 classes. The G2 difference test was used to assess significant differences between these models.[21,22] Thus, we estimated the best fit model according to gender. As recommended by Nylund et al. (2007),[23] we used the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) to determine the number of relevant latent classes and evaluate the fit of each model. The lowest BIC value indicates the best fit model. In order to measure the best classification based on individual posterior class membership probabilities, we used the measure of entropy, where the nearest value to 1 represents the highest certainty in classification.

Following the latent class analysis, we performed multivariate multilogistic regressions in order to analyze the appurtenance of a drinking profile according to age and education, adjusted by province of residence.[24] The model is evaluated in function of the BIC fit test obtained in the classification first model.[20] A common latent class between men and women has been used as class reference. For each outcome in the analyses, the groups with an Odd Ratio of 1.00 served as reference categories. Estimation method for model parameters was the Maximum Likelihood (ML). LCAs and multilogistic regressions were performed with SAS version 4.11. Univariate descriptive statistics were computed with SPSS 20.0.

RESULTS

Drinking practice: A gendered class-model

Table 1 displays the distribution of the drinking and demographic characteristics by gender and includes a chi-square test. Overall, demographic characteristics indicated gender differences not

only in the drinking patterns but also in the drinking contexts, the drinking motivations and according to education.

Table 1. Distribution of drinking characteristics and demographic variables by gender

	Men (*N* = 871)	Women (*N* = 843)	*p*	Total (*N* = 1714)
Frequency of drinking			0.001	
1 to 3 times per month	29.9	45.0		37.3
1 or 2 times per week	40.4	36.4		38.4
3+ times per week	29.7	18.6		24.3
Number of drinks per drinking day			0.001	
1 or 2	49.7	70.1		59.7
3 or 4	29.2	21.4		25.3
5+	21.1	8.5		14.9
Contexts of drinking†				
Meal	64.4	64.3	ns	64.4
Party	56.5	50.4	0.05	53.5
Home	75.9	68.1	0.001	72.1
Friend's home	59.4	55.9	ns	57.6
Bar, disco or nightclub	42.4	28.0	0.001	35.3
Restaurant	45.9	40.3	0.01	43.2
Alone	33.4	18.6	0.001	26.1
Motivations to drink‡				
To socialize	75.7	67.1	0.001	71.5
To enhance	45.6	38.7	0.05	42.2
To become disinhibited	25.7	31.7	0.05	28.6
To compensate	20.7	19.7	ns	20.2
Social characteristics				
Age, years				
18–25	13.5	12.7		13.1
26–55	67.2	68.9		68.0
56+	19.3	18.4		18.8
Education			0.001	
Less than secondary school	13.2	7.5		10.4
High school	25.1	22.4		23.8
Technical, community college or some university	35.4	39.0		37.2
Bachelor, post graduate or professional degree	26.3	31.1		28.6

Note: † = More than once a month; ‡ = Usually.
ns = not significant.

To test the gender difference in drinking practice, latent class models were derived. We tested the difference in the G2 statistic between the baseline models and the gender-constrained models (data not shown). The difference has been significant for all models ($p < 0.001$), providing evidence of variance across gender. Therefore, stratified analyses by gender were performed.

Then, we evaluated the best fit model for men and women (data not shown). According to the BIC, the best fit is found in a six-class model for men (3757.20) and in a five-class model for women (3158.77). The entropy gave a better fit for men for six- to ten-class models (0.75 and 0.76) and for the eight-class model for women (0.77). Based on these test values, a six-class model for men and a five-class model for women have been selected.

Women's drinking practice

Table 2 presents the drinking characteristics by class for women. Latent classes can be described as follows:

Occasional – 19%: members drink one to three times a month, in moderation (usually one or two drinks) and display no context preference. Members of this class are neither likely to drink to accompany a meal nor to drink alone. They drink to socialize, and to a lesser extent, to become disinhibited.

Nutritional – 34%: members have one or two drinks once or twice a week, mainly to accompany a meal, in private settings (at their home or at friends' homes). Although their motivation to drink is to socialize, they are also likely to drink alone. This class is mostly represented by women.

Social – 17%: members consume one or two drinks, once or twice a week or less often, to socialize and to a lesser extent to enhance how they are feeling or to become disinhibited. For them, drinking is integrated in a large spectrum of contexts, from meals to festive contexts, in private as well as in public settings. Women social drinkers are not likely to drink alone.

Table 2. Latent classes marginal and conditional probabilities for drinking patterns, drinking contexts and drinking motivations, women (*N* = 843)

	Latent class				
	Occasional	Nutritional	Social	Instrumental	Festive
Marginal probability	0.19	0.34	0.17	0.16	0.14
Conditional probability					
Frequency of drinking					
1 to 3 times per month	0.85	0.38	0.40	0.03	0.61
1 to 2 times per week	0.14	0.40	0.47	0.47	0.34
3+ times per week	0.02	0.22	0.13	0.50	0.05
Number of drinks per drinking day					
1 or 2	0.82	0.85	0.81	0.58	0.20
3 or 4	0.15	0.14	0.19	0.28	0.41
5+	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.14	0.39
Contexts of drinking†					
Meal	0.12	0.88	0.83	0.95	0.22
Party	0.09	0.37	0.88	0.75	0.65
Home	0.21	0.83	0.80	0.97	0.51
Friend's home	0.14	0.46	0.92	0.86	0.59
Bar, disco or nightclub	0.11	0.04	0.55	0.46	0.56
Restaurant	0.06	0.32	0.79	0.78	0.19
Alone	0.03	0.21	0.07	0.54	0.07
Motivations‡					
To socialize	0.55	0.46	0.75	0.92	0.95
To enhance	0.13	0.18	0.21	0.92	0.82
To become disinhibited	0.21	0.16	0.23	0.62	0.57
To compensate	0.07	0.05	0.01	0.61	0.45
N	162	283	140	139	119

† = More than once a month; ‡ = Usually.

Table 3. Latent classes marginal and conditional probabilities for drinking patterns, drinking contexts and drinking motivations, men (*N* = 871)

	Latent class					
	Occasional	**Private**	**Nutritional**	**Social**	**Instrumental**	**Festive**
Marginal probability	0.17	0.12	0.18	0.18	0.20	0.16
Conditional probability						
Frequency of drinking						
1 to 3 times per month	0.66	0.46	0.16	0.19	0.01	0.44
1 to 2 times per week	0.30	0.41	0.38	0.53	0.38	0.41
3+ times per week	0.03	0.14	0.46	0.28	0.61	0.16
Number of drinks per drinking day						
1 or 2	0.65	0.45	0.88	0.57	0.28	0.13
3 or 4	0.26	0.36	0.11	0.33	0.38	0.32
5+	0.09	0.17	0.01	0.10	0.34	0.55
Contexts of drinking†						
Meal	0.27	0.28	0.88	0.90	0.96	0.36
Party	0.17	0.11	0.33	0.76	0.93	0.91
Home	0.34	0.58	0.96	0.91	0.98	0.66
Friend's home	0.18	0.15	0.42	0.92	0.91	0.78
Bar, disco or nightclub	0.15	0.17	0.04	0.61	0.75	0.72
Restaurant	0.15	0.13	0.37	0.81	0.77	0.33
Alone	0.09	0.30	0.43	0.34	0.63	0.15
Motivations‡						
To socialize	0.52	0.98	0.66	0.63	0.98	0.83
To enhance	0.05	0.73	0.17	0.19	0.89	0.81
To become disinhibited	0.10	0.38	0.06	0.09	0.45	0.51
To compensate	0.00	0.52	0.03	0.00	0.51	0.24
N	145	101	160	156	171	138

Note: † = More than once a month; ‡ = Usually.

Instrumental – 16%: members show similarities with social drinkers regarding the large variety of drinking contexts but differ from social drinkers in their drinking patterns and their drinking motivations. For them, drinking is likely to be integrated in their everyday life, even when alone, and they are likely to consume more than women in the previous classes. Besides socialization and enhancement functions, they also use alcohol to become disinhibited or to compensate.

Festive – 14%: members differ from other classes by an occasional (less than weekly for most members of this group) but heavier alcohol intake (39% reported a usual quantity of five drinks or more). They drink in contexts of parties, at bars, discos or nightclubs or in private homes, to socialize or to enhance but also to become disinhibited.

Men's drinking practice

Table 3 presents the drinking characteristics by class for men. The five classes observed for women were echoed for men, but with a few gender differences across all classes: men drink more and more often than women, men are less likely than women to put forward disinhibition motivations for drinking, and men are more likely to drink alone than women.

Our analysis also reveals a sixth class for men that we labelled private drinkers: Private drinkers (12%) mainly drink at home, mostly in moderation and rarely more than once or twice a week. However, they are not likely to drink to accompany a meal. For these drinkers, alcohol serves multiple functions. Besides drinking to socialize and enhance, they are also likely to drink to become disinhibited or to compensate.

Social status of women's and men's drinking practice

According to multivariate multilogistic regressions following the LCA and performed on women and men separately, compared to adult women between 26 and 55 years of age, young women are more likely to be festive drinkers, and less likely to be nutritional drinkers than occasional drinkers (see Table 4). Compared to women who did not finish high school, women who obtained a university degree are more likely to be nutritional drinkers, social drinkers or instrumental drinkers, and less likely to be festive drinkers than occasional drinkers. Among men (see Table 5), compared to the 26–55 year age group, young adults are more likely to be instrumental or festive drinkers than occasional drinkers, whereas those 56 years or older are more likely to be nutritional drinkers and less likely to be instrumental or festive drinkers. As for education, the likelihood of being nutritional drinkers increases with the level of education and those with highest education are less likely than those with lowest education to be festive drinkers.

DISCUSSION

The aim of this paper was to examine whether men and women present distinctive drinking practices in Canada defined according to patterns, contexts and motivations of drinking. Our multidimensional approach defining types of drinking based on group definition allow us to observe relationships between social dimensions of alcohol use and individual drinking behaviours.

The results of the current study confirm the hypothesis of gender variance in alcohol drinking practices. We confirmed that throughout all typological structures that we could have retained in this study, men and women were different enough in terms of drinking practice to consider a stratified approach based on gender.

The gender difference was first observed in distinctive numbers of types of drinking in each typology. While feminine typology presented five types, the masculine typology expressed a sixth unique profile, which is that of private drinkers. This type is

Table 4. Logistic regression model of women's drinking profiles by age and education

	Nutritional		Social		Instrumental		Festive	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Age, years								
18–25	0.20*	[0.07–0.57]	1.64	[0.68–3.95]	1.29	[0.58–2.87]	4.99*	[2.37–10.48]
26–55	1	–	1	–	1	–	1	–
56+	1.41	[0.82–2.45]	0.83	[0.40–1.75]	0.92	[0.48–1.76]	0.08*	[0.02–0.33]
Education								
Less than secondary school†	1	–	1	–	1	–	1	–
High school diploma	1.05	[0.45–2.46]	0.69	[0.21–2.21]	1.70	[0.51–5.72]	0.25*	[0.09–0.68]
Technical, community, college or some university	1.65	[0.72–3.78]	1.40	[0.47–4.16]	2.59	[0.78–8.57]	0.28*	[0.11–0.74]
Bachelor, post graduate or professional degree	3.42*	[1.37–8.51]	4.83*	[1.55–15.04]	8.97*	[2.58–31.20]	0.32*	[0.10–0.96]

Note: †Reference categories.
'Occasional' = reference profile.
*$p < 0.05$.

Table 5. Logistic regression model of men's drinking profiles by age and education

	Private		Nutritional		Social		Instrumental		Festive	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Age, years										
18–25	0.89	[0.22–3.58]	0.29	[0.04–2.05]	0.82	[0.27–2.52]	4.14*	[1.74–9.85]	8.58*	[3.58–20.55]
26–55†			1	–	1	–	1	–	1	–
56+	0.82	[0.36–1.85]	4.59*	[2.31-9.15]	0.71	[0.32–1.58]	0.51*	[0.24–1.06]	0.10*	[0.02–0.46]
Education										
Less than secondary school†			1	–	1	–	1	–	1	–
High school diploma	1.44	[0.52–4.04]	2.16	[0.78–6.00]	2.32	[0.93–5.76]	1.20	[0.52–277]	0.55	[0.23–1.32]
Technical, community, college or some university	1.56	[0.57–4.26]	3.64*	[1.31–10.13]	1.94	[0.77–4.85]	0.91	[0.40–2.10]	0.72	[0.32–1.66]
Bachelor, post graduate or professional degree	1.17	[0.42–3.31]	4.32*	[1.58–11.78]	2.24	[0.88–5.75]	1.51	[0.66–3.47]	0.16*	[0.04–0.53]

Note: †Reference categories.
'Occasional' = reference profile
*$p < 0.05$.

particularly distinguishable by consumption occurring solely at home. However, we did not find an association between private consumption and social status, preventing us from characterizing this subpopulation of drinkers. We recommend that future studies explore other social and professional statuses that could shed light on private consumption at home.

Conversely, it seems that the more alcohol is consumed daily, the more that men and women differ in terms of the timing and motivation to drink. This is especially true since men consume alcohol more frequently than women and in larger quantities. These results confirm previous findings in the literature.[24,25] Moreover, the more a man drinks, the more he will express drinking in different social contexts, including in a solitary context. However, we must also consider biological differences between men and women which affect the ways of drinking.[26]

On the other hand, an important association was observed between feminine consumption and motivation to drink, in particular when frequency and quantity are higher. Several motivators could account for the increase in alcohol use. It seems that women used alcohol as a tool, an outlet or a means much more frequently when consumption increased.

Social effects on drinking practice

In a second step, we examined how drinking practices are patterned by age and education. Associations were clearly established between young adults, a lower educational level and a festive consumption for both men and women. Several studies point out that teenagers and students consume larger quantities of alcohol, reflecting a practice commonly referred to as binge drinking.[27,28] Nowadays, because of the increase in the study period lasting beyond the age of 25 and the pushing back of a graduation date and of the time when one earns a decent revenue, young adults could have festive (and excessive) drinking practices similar to those observed in teenagers and young students. Drinking patterns of teenagers/students and young adults presenting potentially similar risky drinking behaviours demonstrate the need to adapt actions and prevention in alcohol use according to their similar contexts of drinking, as well as their social differences. However, our study also revealed two ways to express alcohol habits among young men. Indeed, young men present two typical expressions of drinking: the festive one discussed earlier, and the instrumental consumption. In that sense, young age in men could be associated with two risky profiles: binge drinking (festive profile) and a regular and solitary consumption characterized by instrumental consumption.

With regard to the education level, the number of years at school turned out to be an important factor in the establishment of three female drinking practices: the nutritional, the social and the instrumental. The association is even more

pronounced between an integrated consumption and a higher educational level. Previous findings have highlighted a link between a riskier drinking practice in women with a higher education level.[14] Instrumental consumption presents a moderate to regular consumption and an association with compensatory motivation not found in men. If we take into consideration alcohol use, drinking occasions and several reasons to drink that could establish a drinking habit, instrumental consumption by women could be viewed as a risky practice.

Finally, occasional and nutritional drinking practices are related to an older age for both men and women, and nutritional drinkers are significantly more educated than individuals in other profiles. As they grow older, adults trade their past excessive drinking habits observed in younger ages for a more regular and moderate consumption, which is in synch with their lifestyle and their daily responsibilities. But what we observed specifically in these profiles is the association of alcohol and social dimensions that express non-risky types of drinking, in particular by the intentionality to consume or to socialize around a meal.[29]

Limitations

There are a number of limitations in the study. First, the small spectrum of range of drinking context indicators does not allow us to fully explore the drinking circumstances in the Canadian drinking practices. Second, the relationships between alcohol intake, motivations to drink and drinking contexts were analytically derived rather than observed. To validate (or invalidate) the drinking profiles depicted in this study, further research must examine how people drink in specific contexts and according to specific motivations, as we did in other studies.[10] Finally, we must acknowledge the limitation associated with the under-reporting in data collection (e.g., quantity-frequency). The validity of self-reported alcohol intake in surveys has often been questioned.[30–35] Future research studies might solicit alcohol intake information at several time points, asking the specific context and specific reason to drink in each instance. This strategy would increase the report of alcohol use in order to best evaluate the multidimensional way of drinking.

CONCLUSION

While demonstrating both inter- and intra-variability in alcohol consumption among a population with heterogeneous drinking profiles according to gender, this study reinforces the idea of adapting promotion strategies and interventions in public health based on social environment and social status in order to make them more efficient and better suited to the target populations. Several studies already point out the efficiency of multidimensional and contextual framework in alcohol research and public health.[10–12,36] A broad contextualization of use, partly based on its underlying motivations, offers a track to better understand drinking practices between genders in contrast to traditional measures commonly used in alcohol study. Future research is needed in order to explore health and harmful outcomes associated with male and female drinking practices in order to evaluate the simultaneous effects of contexts and motivations on a drinker's health.

REFERENCES

1. Bird CE, Riecker PP. *Gender and Health: The Effect of Constrained Choices and Social Policies*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
2. Keyes KM, Grant BF, Hasin DS. Evidence for a closing gender gap in alcohol use, abuse, and dependence in the United States population. *Drug Alcohol Depend* 2008;93:21–29. PMID: 17980512.
3. Paradis C, Demers A, Nadeau L, Picard E. Parenthood, alcohol intake, and drinking contexts: Occasio Furem Facit. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs* 2011;72:259–69. PMID: 21388599.
4. Wilsnack RW, Vogeltanz ND, Wilsnack SC, Harris TR, Ahlström S, Bondy S, et al. Gender differences in alcohol consumption and adverse drinking consequences: Cross-cultural patterns. *Addiction* 2000;95:251–65. PMID: 10723854.
5. Bloomfield K, Grittner U, Kramer S, Gmel G. Social inequalities in alcohol consumption and alcohol-related problems in the study countries of the EU concerted action 'Gender, Culture and Alcohol Problems: A Multinational Study.'. *Alcohol and Alcoholism* 2006;41(Suppl. 1):i26–36. PMID: 17030500.
6. Graham K, Bernards S, Demers A. Gender differences by province in alcohol consumption and consequences: Results of the GENACIS Canada study. In: Poole N, Greaves L (Eds.), *Highs & Lows: Canadian Perspectives on Women and Substance Use*. Toronto, ON: Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, 2007.
7. McPherson M, Casswell S, Pledger M. Gender convergence in alcohol consumption and related problems: Issues and outcomes from comparisons of New Zealand survey data. *Addiction* 2004;99:738–48. PMID: 15139872.
8. Wilsnack RW, Wilsnack SC, Kristjanson AF, Vogeltanz-Holm ND, Gmel G. Gender and alcohol consumption: Patterns from the multinational GENACIS project. *Addiction* 2009;104:1487–500. PMID: 19686518. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02696.x.
9. Bailly RC, Carman RS, Forslund MA. Gender difference in drinking motivations and outcomes. *J Psychol* 1991;125(6):649–56. PMID: 1806665.
10. Demers A, Kairouz S, Adlaf EM, Gliksman L, Newton-Taylor B, Marchand A. Multilevel analysis of situational drinking among Canadian undergraduates. *Soc Sci Med* 2002;55(3):415–24. PMID: 12144149. doi: 10.1016/S0277-9536(01)00258-1.
11. Kairouz S, Gliksman L, Demers A, Adlaf E. For all these reasons, I do drink: A multilevel analysis of contextual reasons for drinking among Canadian undergraduates. *J Stud Alcohol* 2002;63:600–8. PMID: 12380857.
12. Kairouz S, Greenfield T. A comparative multi-level analysis of contextual drinking in American and Canadian adults. *Addiction* 2007;102:71–80. PMID: 17207125.
13. Adlaf E, Blackburn J, Demers A, Kellner F, Single E, Webster I. Social Determinants, Alcohol Consumption and Health: A Secondary Analysis of Canada's Alcohol and Other Drugs Survey 1994. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse, 1997.
14. Grittner U, Kuntsche S, Graham K, Bloomfield K. Social inequalities and gender differences in the experience of alcohol-related problems. *Alcohol and Alcoholism* 2013;47(5):597–605. PMID: 22542707. doi: 10.1093/alcalc/ags040.
15. GENACIS. The European Commission (contract QLG4-CT-2001-0196): "Gender & Alcohol – A Multinational Study", the U.S. National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (grants R01AA04610 and R21AA12941), the Swiss Federal Office of Education and Science (contract 01.0366) the German Ministry of Health and Social Security, and the World Health Organization (WHO), 2005. Available at: http://www.genacis.org/ (Accessed February 1, 2015).
16. CCSA. *Canadian Addiction Survey,* 2004: Microdata eGuide. Ottawa: CCSA, 2007.
17. Cooper ML, Russell M, Skinner JB, Windle M. Development and validation of a three-dimensional measure of drinking motives. *Psychol Assess* 1992;4:123–32. doi: 10.1037/1040-3590.4.2.123.
18. Cox WM, Klinger E. A motivational model of alcohol use. *J Abnorm Psychol* 1998;97:168–80. PMID: 3290306.
19. Kuntsche E, Knibbe R, Gmel G, Engels R. Why do young people drink? A review of drinking motives. *Clin Psychol Rev* 2005;25:841–61. PMID: 16095785.
20. Collins LM, Lanza ST. Latent Class and Latent Transition Analysis. With Applications in the Social, Behavioral, and Health Sciences. Wiley series in probability and statistics. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2010.
21. Lanza ST, Collins LM, Lemmon DR, Schafer JL. PROC LCA: A SAS procedure for latent class analysis. *Struct Equation Modeling* 2007;14(4):671–94. PMID: 19953201.
22. Agresti A, Yang M. An empirical investigation of some effects of sparseness in contingency tables. *Computational Statistics Data Anal* 1986;5:9–21. doi: 10.1016/0167-9473(87)90003-X.
23. Nylund KL, Asparouhov T, Muthén BO. Deciding on the number of classes in latent class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study. *Structural Equat Model: Multidisciplinary J* 2007;14(4):535–69.

24. Paradis C, Demers A, Picard E. Alcohol consumption: A different kind of Canadian mosaic. *Can J Public Health* 2010;101(4):275–80. PMID: 21033531.
25. Health Canada. Enquête de surveillance canadienne de la consommation d'alcool et de drogues. Faits saillants, 2011. Available at: http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hc-ps/drugs-drogues/stat/_2011/summary-sommaire-fra.php (Accessed June 28, 2012).
26. Cole-Harding S, Wilson JR. Ethanol metabolism in men and women. *J Stud Alcohol* 1987;48:380–87. PMID: 3613588.
27. Hugues SO, Power TG, Frances DJ. Defining patterns of drinking in adolescence: A cluster analytic approach. *J Stud Alcohol* 1992;52:40–47.
28. Cooper ML. Motivations for alcohol use among adolescents: Development and validation of a four-factor model. *Psychol Assess* 1994;6(2):117–28. doi: 10.1037/1040-3590.6.2.117.
29. Jayne M, Valentine G, Holloway SL. *Alcohol, Drinking, Drunkenness: (Dis) Orderly Spaces*. Surrey, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011.
30. Midanik LT. Perspectives on the validity of self-reported alcohol use. *Br J Addict* 1989;84:1419–23. PMID: 2692741.
31. Grønbæk M, Heitmann BL. Validity of self-reported intakes of beer, wine and spirits in population studies. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 1996;50:487–90. PMID: 8862487.
32. Sommers MS, Dyehouse JM, Howe SR, Lemmink J, Volz T, Manharth M. Validity of self-reported alcohol consumption in nondependent drinker with unintentional injuries. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 2000;24:1406–13. PMID: 11003207.
33. Gmel G, Graham K, Kuendig H, Kuntsche S. Measuring alcohol consumption – Should the 'graduated frequency' approach become the norm in survey research? *Addiction* 2006;101(1):16–30. PMID: 16393189. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2005.01224.x.
34. Greenfield TK, Kerr WC. Alcohol measurement methodology in epidemiology: Recent advances and opportunities. *Addiction* 2008;103(7):1082–99. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2008.02197.x.
35. Rehm J. Measuring quantity, frequency and volume of drinking. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 1998;22(Suppl. 2):4S–14S. doi: 10.1111/j.1530-0277.1998.tb04368.x.
36. Frohlich KL, Corin E, Potvin L. La relation entre contexte et maladie: une proposition théorique. In: Frohlich KL, De Koninck M, Demers A, Bernard P (Eds.), *Les inégalités sociales de santé au Québec*. Montréal, Québec: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2008.

Received: July 4, 2014
Accepted: December 26, 2014

Appendix 1. Reasons to drink according to each motive

Social motive	To be sociable
	Because that is what your friends do when they get together
	Because it is customary on special occasions
	Because it makes a social gathering more enjoyable
Enhancement motive	To celebrate
	I like the 'feeling'
	Drinking is exciting
	To get high
	Because it is fun
	Because drinking makes you feel good
Disinhibition motive	It is easier to be open with people
	Feeling less inhibited about sex
	Sexual activity is more pleasurable for you
	You feel more sexually attractive
Compensatory motive	To forget your worries
	To feel more self-confident
	Drinking helps when you feel depressed or nervous
	To cheer up when you're in a bad mood
	To relax

RÉSUMÉ

OBJECTIFS : L'objectif de cette étude est d'examiner la configuration typologique multidimensionnelle de la consommation d'alcool selon le genre au sein de la population canadienne ayant des pratiques de boire hétérogènes.

MÉTHODES : L'approche d'analyse par classe latente a été choisi afin d'analyser le degré de relation statistique entre les indicateurs de consommation d'alcool, soit l'usage – c.a.d. fréquence et quantité –, les contextes et les motivations à boire. Des analyses de régressions multilogistiques ont ensuite été réalisées afin d'explorer la composition de chacune des typologies selon l'âge et l'éducation. L'échantillon de 871 hommes et 843 femmes buveurs et buveuses réguliers ayant rapporté boire au moins une fois par mois et âgés entre 18 et 77 ans ($N = 1\,714$) provient de l'enquête GENACIS Canada (GENder, Alcohol, and Culture: an international study). Dans le questionnaire GENACIS, les répondants ont répondu à des questions d'usage d'alcool, de contextes et de raisons associées à leur usage, et rapporté certaines caractéristiques socio-économiques (âge et éducation). Les analyses ont été ajustées selon la province de résidence.

RÉSULTATS : Six profils de consommation d'alcool ont été identifiés chez les hommes et cinq chez les femmes. Hommes et femmes partagent quatres pratiques de consommation d'alcool mais présentent certaines caractéristiques distinctives associées au boire. Nous avons également observé une variabilité dans la relation entre les caractéristiques socio-économiques et les profils selon le genre.

CONCLUSION : Nos résultats confirment la complexité et la variabilité des pratiques de boire selon le genre et la nécessité de considérer le genre et les dimensions sociales dans les analyses afin d'optimiser notre compréhension des modes d'alcoolisation au Canada. Cette étude renforce l'idée d'adapter les stratégies de promotion et d'interventions en santé publique en fonction du genre et du statut social afin de les rendre plus efficaces.

MOTS CLÉS : profils de consommation d'alcool; typologie; genre; contexte; motivation; statut social