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Abstract

Alcohol use continues to be a major risk behaviour among youth, with consequent physical and or mental health complications. The current study aimed to establish the prevalence and associated factors of alcohol usage among Babcock University students in Ilishan Remo, Ogun state. A sample of 251 youth comprises of 224 males and 27 females were randomly selected to participate in the study. The mean age was 18.7 and standard deviation of 9.71. The descriptive survey of ex-post-facto research design was employed. Two instruments namely Adolescent Behavioural Inventory (ABPI) and Alcohol Abstinence Self-Efficacy Scale (ABSS) were used to generate data for the study. All the hypotheses data were tested at 0.05 level of significance. Data was analysis with the use of One way Anova, Multiple Regression and Pearson product Moment Correlation. The results indicated that there is a significant difference in family background, peer influence and emotion towards the use of alcohol $F(3,246) = 35.564; P< .05$. Also, Peer influence was found to be the best factor influencing the use of alcohol, $(\beta = .518; t = 8.0345; p < .05)$, followed by family background as $(\beta = .344; t = 5.648; p < .05)$ and finally by emotion $(\beta = .231; t = 4.063; p <.05)$. Lastly, there is a significant relationship between the three independent variables and alcohol usage. On the basis of finding, appropriate recommendation were suggested.
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Introduction

Alcohol consumption has been identified as an important risk factor for illness, disability, and mortality (Rehm, Mathers & Popova 2009). In fact, in the last comparative risk assessment conducted by the World Health Organization (WHO), the detrimental impact of alcohol consumption on the global burden of disease and injury was surpassed only by unsafe sex and childhood underweight status but exceeded that of many classic risk factors, such as unsafe water and sanitation, hypertension, high cholesterol, or tobacco use (WHO, 2009). This risk assessment evaluated the net effect of all alcohol consumption—that is, it also took into account the beneficial effects that alcohol consumption (primarily moderate consumption) can have on ischemic diseases and diabetes (Baliunas, Rehm, Irving & Shuper, 2009; Corrao, Rubbiati & Bagnardi, 2000; Patra, Taylor & Irving, 2010; Rehm, Room, Monteiro, 2004). Drinkers experience a range of social harms because of their own drinking, including family disruption, problems at the workplace (including unemployment), criminal convictions, and financial problems (Casswell & Thamarangsi 2009; Klingemann & Gmel, 2001). Unfortunately, assessment of these problems is much less standardized than assessment of health problems, and many of these harms are not reported continuously. Social-cost studies provide irregular updates of alcohol-attributable consequences in selected countries (Thavorncharoensap, Teerawattananon & Yothasamut, 2009).

One of the pathways through which alcohol increases risk for these diseases is via the immune system, which is adversely affected by alcohol consumption, especially heavy drinking (Rehm, Samokhvalov & Neuman, 2009; Romeo, Warnberg & Marcos, 2010). As a result, although risk for infectious diseases does not differ greatly for people drinking less than 40 grams of pure alcohol per day compared with abstainers, this risk increases substantially for those who drink larger amounts or have been diagnosed with an AUD (Lönnroth et al. 2008; Samokhvalov et al. 2010). In addition, alcohol consumption is associated with poorer outcomes from infectious disease for heavy drinkers by way of social factors. Thus, people with alcohol dependence often are stigmatized and have a higher chance of becoming unemployed and destitute; as a result, they tend to live in more crowded quarters with higher chances for infection and lower chances of recovery (Lönnroth et al. 2009). Despite worldwide concern and education about use of alcohol, many adolescents have limited awareness of their adverse consequences.
Curiosity, social pressure and peer group influence are reported to be primary reasons for alcohol usage. (Peter & Greydanus, 1999; Norris, Stoner, Hessler, 2009) Traditional alcoholic beverages have been part of the social and religious life of Sub-Saharan Africa for many years. However it is thought that alcohol use became more problematic with the introduction of western beverages during the slave trade when rum was bartered for slaves (Obot, 1990). Other sub empirical studies on substance use in Nigeria have predominately focused on alcohol (Gureje et al., 1992; Obot, 1990). A face-to-face interview survey of ‘adult heads of households’ in the north-central part of Nigeria (n=1562) (the Middlebelt study) showed that 54.5% of the sample described themselves as alcohol drinkers with 10.4% describing themselves as ‘heavy drinkers’ (Obot 1990).

Many reasons had been established for alcohol usage. Religiously, Muslims were much less likely to use alcohol than persons of other faiths (Gureje et al., 2007). Another reason for the modest relationship between stress and drinking is that other motives and determinants of alcohol use can overshadow stress-reduction motives. Alcohol, for example can be used to enhance positive mood, a motive that has received recent research interest (Fatoye & Morakinyo, 2002). In both adolescents and adults, and in different racial/ethnic groups, data support a model in which individuals characterized by high levels of sensation seeking, and those who expect that alcohol use will enhance positive mood, will be more strongly motivated to drink for this effect. Such a model does not imply that using alcohol to reduce stress or enhance positive mood (including its use for celebratory reasons) are mutually exclusive motivations to drink, or that they cannot be observed in the same person.

Alcohol use plays a role in many social activities, from the “business lunch” and parties to special occasions. The benefits to those who drink during social occasions are greatly influenced by culture, the setting in which drinking occurs and expectations about alcohol’s effects (Anochie, Nkanginieme, Eke & Alikor, 1999). Alcohol-related problems include economic losses resulting from time off work owing to alcohol-related illness and injury, disruption of family and social relationships, emotional problem impact on perceived health, violence and aggression, and legal problems.
The problem of this study therefore, is to investigate the contributory influence of family background, peer influence and emotion on the use of alcohol. For this reason the following hypotheses are raised:

1. There is no significant difference in family background, peer influence and emotion towards the use of alcohol among Babcock University students.
2. There is no significant relative contribution of family background, peer influence and emotion towards the use of alcohol among Babcock University students.
3. There is no significant relationship of family background, peer influence and emotion towards the use of alcohol among Babcock University students.

Design

The research adopted the descriptive the ex-post-facto research survey for study because the researcher is interested in finding the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable without necessarily manipulating the independent variables.

Population and Sample

Purpose sampling techniques was adopted among youth at 18 – 25 years. A questionnaire was first drawn to coalesce those who drinks, before the instrument was administered. Samples of 251 youth were selected. The means age was 18.7 and standard deviation of 9.71.

Instrumentation

Adolescent behavioural problem inventory developed by Akinboye(1997) was used to elicit information weather a person use alcohol or not. Then, The Alcohol Abstinence Self efficacy Scale (ABSS) developed by DiClemente, Carbonari & Hughes (1994) was adapted to collect data for this study. The ABSS has been used in previous study including reported estimates of reliability.

The scale is a 21 items scale on 5 point scale ranging from (1) not at all (2) not very (3) moderately (4) very and (5) extremely. Example of the items in the scale includes. You may be tempted to drink “ when I am feeling angry inside”, “when I see other drinking at a bar or at a party” and when I am physically tired”.
The 21 items was divided into 3 subscales with 7 questions each measuring social, physical and emotional influences.

**Procedure**

The researchers personally administered the instruments on the participant before which they were told that their opinion will be treated with uttermost confidentiality. The data obtained was analyzed with using One Way Analysis of Variance, Multiple regressions and Pearson product moment correlation. Results were tested for significance at the 0.05 level of confidence.

**Results**

\( \text{H}_01 \): There is no significant difference in family background, peer influence and emotion towards the use of alcohol among Babcock University students.

**Table 1- Analysis of Variance (One-Way) between Family Background, Peer Influence and Emotion Towards The Use of Alcohol among Babcock University Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Regression</td>
<td>13663.210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13663.210</td>
<td>27.763</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>122050.069</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>492.137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135713.279</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regression</td>
<td>14444.370</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7222.185</td>
<td>32.491</td>
<td>0.000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>54903.810</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>222.283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69348.180</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Regression</td>
<td>14934.416</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4978.139</td>
<td>35.564</td>
<td>0.000&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>34434.321</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>139.976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49368.737</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. predictors: (constant) Peer influence
b. predictors (constant) Peer influence, Family background
c. predictors (constant) Peer influence, Family background, Emotion
d. Dependent variable: - Alcohol

Result above show the ANOVA (one-way) of peer influence, family background, emotion and alcohol.
It is seen that in Model 1, Peer influence \((F_{1, 248} = 27.763; p< 0.5)\) Model 2, is a combination of Peer influence, Family background \((F_{2, 247} = 32.491; p< 0.5)\) and Model 3, Peer influence, family background, emotion \((F_{3, 246} = 35.564; p< .05)\). Hence hypothesis of no significant difference is hereby discarded and the alternate is accepted.

\(H_0\): There is no significant relative contribution of peer influence, family background, emotion towards the use of alcohol.

**Table 2: Multiple Regression Analysis (Enter) Showing Significant Relative Contribution of Peer Influence, Family Background, Emotion Towards the Use of Alcohol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (Constant) Peer influence</td>
<td>10.574</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>5.519</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (Constant) Family background emotion</td>
<td>4.726</td>
<td>1.752</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>2.692</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (Constant) Peer influence family background emotion</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>1.389</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>1.416</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the predictor variables and the criterion in the model. The beta values and the significant values corresponding to each of the variables against the criterion variables (alcohol usage). Results reveal that the beta values, Peer Influence \((\beta = .519; t = 10.706; p < .05)\) and Family background \((\beta = .311; t = 6.784; p < .05)\) and emotion \((\beta = .231; t = 6.563; p < .05)\). therefore all are predictors of youth disposition towards alcohol usage.

\(H_3\): There is no significant relationship between peer influence, family background, emotion towards the use of alcohol.
Table 3: Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation Matrix between Peer Influence, Family Background, Emotion towards the use of Alcohol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Peer influence</th>
<th>Family background</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Alcohol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer influence</td>
<td>28.654</td>
<td>8.561</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.434**</td>
<td>.561**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family background</td>
<td>24.678</td>
<td>7.879</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.452**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>19.796</td>
<td>6.567</td>
<td>.434**</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.362**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>34.875</td>
<td>10.789</td>
<td>.561**</td>
<td>.452**</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Results indicated the mean, standard deviation and Pearson product moment correlation of the independent and dependent variables. It is seen that alcoholic usage is positively correlated to Peer influence (r) = .561; P<.0.5; and Family background (r) = .452; P<.05; lastly to Emotion(r) = .362; P<.05; Also, Peer influence is related to Family background as (r) = .454; P<.05; and is correlated to Emotion as (r) = .434; P<.05; and family background is not related to emotion (r) = .234; P>.05. Hence the hypothesis of no relationship is discarded.

Discussion

The finding in Table 1 revealed that there was a significant difference between peer influence, family background, emotion and alcohol usage among undergraduate students. Hence the hypothesis of no significant difference is discarded. These laid credence to researches around the globe on the influence of peer pressure on behavior. (Fogarty, 2006).
Peers are people of age group with a reasonable amount of influence either good or bad. Youths are prone to copy bad influence like drinking because of their age group. Also, the age of undergraduates are between 16-23 years. This is a critical period in which they tend to experiment on so many risky behavior like alcoholism and others. Family background also contribute to alcohol usage disposition. Youth who grew up in family structure in which alcohol usage is not forbidden has a great tendency of picking up excessive drinking when grown up. Finally, the mood of a youth can be a potent factor in youth engaging in drinking habit. Youth who continually experienced bad mood can look on to alcohol as a repressor of that mood. The result obtain from table 2 seems to be more revealing as all the three predictor variables (peer influence, family background, emotion) were found to contribute relatively to the prediction of disposition towards the usage alcohol. However peer influence was found to be best factors to youth usage of alcohol as the t-value and beta value was higher than the other two. This was followed by family background and emotion reasons respectively. This result is agreement with the works of Komro & Toomey, (2002); Johnston, O’Malley, Bachman & Schulenberg, (2010) who ascertain that peer influence is a strong determinant to alcoholic usage. Family background follows, this might be as a result of the pedigree of youth that were involved in the research. The youth are from affluent home in which drinking is allowed in such home. Emotion was the least predictors of alcohol usage as the beta and t-value of .231 and 6.563 respectively was found to be significant at an alpha level of .05.

The last hypothesis which state that there is no significant between peer influence, family background, emotion and alcohol usage among undergraduate students was discarded as the result revealed a positive significant relationship. This further buttress the fact that these three independent variables are contributors to alcohol usage among undergraduate students in Nigeria.

**Conclusion**

Taken together, the result demonstrates that peer influence, family background, emotion are predictors of alcohol usage among undergraduate students. But it is seen that both peer influence and family background are best predictors while emotion remain the least predictor. Finally all the three variables are statistically significant to the youth alcoholic usage.
Recommendation

In view of the discussion of findings of this study and subsequently conclusion, it is imperative to make some suggestions for consideration:

The Counsellors, Public Health Crusaders and Social Workers should look at this variables when assisting alcoholic clients. Positive peer influence can be used to correct the Youth involved in alcohol. Also Parents are also encouraged to lay good precedence to the upcoming youth as they can copy bad habits easily.
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