

Supplementary Material

Supplement to:

Poor inhibitory control and stress as risk-factors for alcohol (mis)use during the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK: a national cross-sectional study utilising data from four birth cohorts

James M. Clay, Lorenzo D. Stafford, Matthew O. Parker

SUPPLEMENTARY METHODS.....	2
ALCOHOL USE BEHAVIOUR	2
STRESS	2
INHIBITORY CONTROL	2
COVARIATES	3
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES.....	4
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 1. LINEAR REGRESSION MODELS USED TO ASSESS THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN STRESS AND PHQ-4 SCORE.	4
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 2. ASSOCIATIONS BETWEEN SINGLE-ITEM ASSESSMENTS, AND BEHAVIOURAL ASSESSMENTS OF INHIBITORY CONTROL.	5
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 3. PERCENTAGE OF MISSING DATA BY VARIABLE.	5
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 4. ORDINAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS IN THE MILLENNIUM COHORT STUDY WITH CHANGE IN ALCOHOL USE AS THE OUTCOME.	6
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 5. ORDINAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS IN THE MILLENNIUM COHORT STUDY WITH ALCOHOL MISUSE AS THE OUTCOME.	7
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 6. ORDINAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS IN THE NEXT STEPS COHORT WITH CHANGE IN ALCOHOL USE AS THE OUTCOME.....	8
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 7. ORDINAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS IN THE NEXT STEPS COHORT WITH CHANGE IN WITH ALCOHOL MISUSE AS THE OUTCOME.	9
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 8. ORDINAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS IN THE 1970 BRITISH COHORT STUDY WITH CHANGE IN ALCOHOL USE AS THE OUTCOME.	10
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 9. ORDINAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS IN THE 1970 BRITISH COHORT STUDY WITH CHANGE IN WITH ALCOHOL MISUSE AS THE OUTCOME.	11
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 10. ORDINAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS IN THE NATIONAL CHILD DEVELOPMENT STUDY WITH CHANGE IN ALCOHOL USE AS THE OUTCOME.	12
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 11. ORDINAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS IN THE NATIONAL CHILD DEVELOPMENT STUDY WITH CHANGE IN WITH ALCOHOL MISUSE AS THE OUTCOME.	13
REFERENCES	14

Supplementary Methods

Alcohol use behaviour

Alcohol use behaviour was assessed using five questions taken from the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT; Babor et al., 2001, 1992). The original AUDIT comprises a ten-item scale scored from 0 – 40. It was developed by the World Health Organisation as a brief assessment of alcohol misuse, and has been shown to have excellent psychometric properties when used to assess alcohol use disorders in a variety of settings including both college students (Fleming et al., 1991) and during routine health examinations (Claussen and Aasland, 1993). Subsequently, several short versions of the AUDIT have been developed and shown to perform similarly to the original instrument (Gual, 2002; Kim et al., 2013). See main text for questions.

The questions administered during the survey were: (1) “How often have you had a drink containing alcohol?”; (2) “How many standard alcoholic drinks have you had on a typical day when you were drinking?”; (3) “How often have you found you were not able to stop drinking once you had started?”; (4) How often have you failed to do what was expected of you because of drinking?; and (5) “Has a relative, friend, doctor, or health worker been concerned about your drinking or advised you to cut down?”. Questions one and two were repeated, prefaced by either “in the month before the Coronavirus outbreak”, or “since the start of the Coronavirus outbreak”. This provided an assessment of alcohol use prior to, and during, the pandemic. Questions one to five were posed in the context of the pandemic, thus were worded using the latter phrasing, offering an assessment of alcohol misuse during the outbreak.

All questions were recoded to reflect the original AUDIT scoring. Alcohol use prior to and during the pandemic was derived by summing questions one and two. Next, a change variable was calculated by subtracting the alcohol use score before the pandemic from the score reflecting alcohol use during the pandemic. Therefore, a score less than zero reflected drinking less during the pandemic than before, a score equal to zero denoted no change, and a score greater than zero represented increased alcohol use during the pandemic. A score reflecting hazardous drinking during the pandemic was calculated by summing all of the AUDIT questions which used the latter working (i.e., “since the start of the Coronavirus outbreak”). The hazardous drinking score was categorised proportionally to the original AUDIT. Whereby, a score between zero and three was coded as “Low risk”; a score between four and six was classified as “Increasing risk”; scores between seven and eight were labelled “Higher risk”; and scores of nine or greater were classed as “Highest risk”.

Stress

Stress was assessed using a single question: “Since the Coronavirus outbreak, please indicate how the following have changed... The amount of stress I’ve been feeling”. The possible responses included “More than before”, “Same – no change”, and “Less than before”. While the psychometric properties of various single-item assessments of stress have been validated in the literature already (e.g., Eddy et al., 2019; Elo et al., 2003), the specific wording used in the present study has not.

The PHQ-4 is an ultra-brief tool, with good psychometric properties, designed to screen for anxiety and depression in both clinical and non-clinical settings (Kroenke et al., 2009). Anxiety and depression are among the most common mental health disorders worldwide, and often co-occur (e.g., Ruscio et al., 2017; Wittchen et al., 2002). It is well known that experiencing symptoms from either disorder is associated with increased psychological stress (Crawford and Henry, 2003). Therefore, to assess the validity of the single-item used to measure stress in the present study, separate linear regression models were fit for each cohort, regressing PHQ-4 score on the stress item. Results are shown in Supplementary Table 1.

In all models – including those which adjusted for sex, ethnicity, economic activity during the pandemic, and social class prior to the pandemic – individuals who said they were feeling more stressed than before the outbreak of Coronavirus scored approximately two points higher (range = 1.95 – 2.45, all $p_s < 0.0001$) than those who said they felt the same.

Inhibitory control

Two measures of inhibitory control were used in this survey: patience and risk-taking. Each was measured using a single ten-point Likert scale item. The risk-taking question said “On a scale from 0 – 10, where 0 is 'never' and 10 is 'always', how willing to take risks would say you are?”. The patience item was phrased “On a scale from 0 – 10, where 0 is 'never' and 10 is 'always', how patient would you say you are?”. A similar single-item scale of risk preference, known as the General Risk Question (Dohmen et al., 2011), has been used extensively and has

been included in several widely analysed surveys, such as the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey (Watson and Wooden, 2012) and the Understanding Society Survey (University of Essex, Institute for Social and Economic Research, 2018). Recent research carried out by Arslan et al. (2019) suggests that the self-report (e.g., the General Risk Question) assessment of risk-taking oftentimes outperform behavioural assessments (e.g., laboratory lotteries) due to self-report assessment taking subjective internal states, such as regret or need, into account. Moreover, during the development of the Global Preferences Survey (Falk et al., 2018) – which was conducted to investigate risk and time (patience) preferences, positive and negative reciprocity, altruism, and trust in a globally representative sample – Falk et al. (2016) experimentally validated their measures by (among other things) assessing the association between single-item assessments and behavioural measures of the same constructs through Spearman’s correlations and linear regression models. Results associated with risk-taking and patience are shown in Supplementary Table 2. Their analysis shows that the single-item assessments were moderately correlated with the behavioural measures ($r_s = .35 - .40$).

Covariates

Potential confounding variables were chosen based on the author’s substantive knowledge of the literature. For instance, there are several sociocultural factors that should be accounted for when researching alcohol misuse using human participants (Room, 2013). Historical data suggests that binge drinking is highest among younger individuals and declines with age (Office for National Statistics, 2018). However, recently emerging evidence suggests a devaluation of alcohol among Generation Z (born between 1996 and 2015; Kraus et al., 2020). Similarly, in Western cultures men tend to drink more than woman, yet data from the US suggests a shift in the pattern, whereby rates of AUD have increased by around 85% among women (White et al., 2015). One explanation for this may be sex differences in susceptibility to stress (Peltier et al., 2019). In terms of ethnicity, binge drinking tends to be more prevalent among white people (Twigg & Moon, 2013). This is thought to be partly attributable to the way alcohol consumption is often stigmatised among ethnic minorities (Room, 2005; Zapolski et al., 2014). Nevertheless, due to this stigmatisation, individuals that belong to these cultural groups tend to be disproportionately affected by alcohol-related harm (Zapolski et al., 2014). Further, having a lower SES has been previously reported as being associated with lower total alcohol consumption, yet being at the greatest risk of hazardous drinking and alcohol-related harm, perhaps due to higher levels of heavy episodic (binge) drinking among more deprived groups (Mackenbach et al., 2008; Probst et al., 2020). Covariates in this study included: respondent’s sex, ethnicity, socio-economic status (assessed using the National Statistics Socioeconomic Classification [NS-SEC]; Office for National Statistics, 2016) prior to the pandemic, and economic activity during the pandemic.

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1. Linear regression models used to assess the association between stress and PHQ-4 score.

Variable	MCS			Next Steps			BCS70			NCDS		
	Coef (95% CI)	SE	p	Coef (95% CI)	SE	p	Coef (95% CI)	SE	p	Coef (95% CI)	SE	p
Unadjusted model												
Stress												
Same - no change	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Less than before	-0.95 (-1.40, -0.51)	0.23	< 0.0001	-0.4 (-0.8, -0.01)	0.2	0.05	0.20 (-0.16, 0.56)	0.19	0.28	0.00 ^a (-0.28, 0.29)	0.15	0.98
More than before	2.45 (2.02, 2.88)	0.22	< 0.0001	2.60 (2.17, 3.04)	0.22	< 0.0001	2.16 (1.78, 2.54)	0.19	< 0.0001	2.16 (1.89, 2.44)	0.14	< 0.0001
Adjusted model												
Stress												
Same - no change	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Less than before	-0.41 (-0.95, 0.12)	0.27	0.13	-0.19 (-0.6, 0.21)	0.21	0.35	0.28 (-0.03, 0.59)	0.16	0.08	0.04 (-0.22, 0.31)	0.13	0.74
More than before	2.59 (1.87, 3.30)	0.36	< 0.0001	2.49 (2.07, 2.91)	0.21	< 0.0001	1.95 (1.72, 2.19)	0.12	< 0.0001	1.95 (1.67, 2.22)	0.14	< 0.0001
Ethnicity												
White	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Black	-1.06 (-2.14, 0.03)	0.55	0.06	-0.55 (-1.44, 0.33)	0.45	0.22	-0.36 (-0.88, 0.17)	0.27	0.18	-0.11 (-0.67, 0.45)	0.28	0.70
Indian - Pakistani	-0.08 (-1.16, 1.00)	0.55	0.88	-0.07 (-0.65, 0.51)	0.3	0.82	-0.15 (-0.85, 0.55)	0.36	0.67	1.07 (-0.22, 2.36)	0.66	0.10
Mixed	2.37 (1.27, 3.47)	0.56	< 0.0001	0.19 (-0.52, 0.90)	0.36	0.60	-0.13 (-0.89, 0.64)	0.39	0.75	-0.28 (-1.27, 0.72)	0.51	0.58
Other/Unsure	-0.84 (-2.14, 0.47)	0.66	0.21	0.42 (-0.44, 1.27)	0.44	0.341	0.09 (-0.37, 0.55)	0.23	0.70	-0.32 (-1.56, 0.91)	0.63	0.61
Sex												
Male	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Female	0.75 (0.14, 1.36)	0.31	0.02	0.49 (0.09, 0.90)	0.21	0.02	0.01 (-0.22, 0.24)	0.12	0.94	0.28 (0.03, 0.53)	0.13	0.03
NS-SEC 2010 analytical classes												
Higher managerial	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Lower managerial	-0.05 (-1.79, 1.68)	0.88	0.95	-0.17 (-0.72, 0.38)	0.28	0.54	0.00 ^b (-0.25, 0.26)	0.13	0.97	0.10 (-0.17, 0.36)	0.13	0.47
Intermediate occupations	0.28 (-1.21, 1.78)	0.76	0.71	0.53 (-0.23, 1.30)	0.39	0.17	0.31 (0.02, 0.61)	0.15	0.04	0.21 (-0.07, 0.48)	0.14	0.15
Small employer and self-employed	0.42 (-1.79, 2.63)	1.12	0.71	0.44 (-0.56, 1.45)	0.51	0.38	-0.17 (-0.52, 0.18)	0.18	0.34	0.19 (-0.18, 0.56)	0.19	0.31
Lower supervisory and technical	0.04 (-1.71, 1.79)	0.89	0.97	-0.37 (-0.95, 0.21)	0.29	0.21	0.57 (-0.02, 1.17)	0.30	0.06	-0.06 (-0.55, 0.42)	0.25	0.80
Semi-routine occupations	0.41 (-1.19, 2.01)	0.81	0.62	0.59 (-0.23, 1.41)	0.42	0.16	0.53 (0.1, 0.96)	0.22	0.02	0.51 (0.06, 0.95)	0.23	0.03
Routine occupations	1.03 (-0.66, 2.73)	0.86	0.23	0.00 ^c (-1.11, 1.11)	0.56	0.99	0.40 (-0.07, 0.87)	0.24	0.10	0.42 (-0.09, 0.93)	0.26	0.10
Not classified	1.28 (-0.36, 2.92)	0.83	0.13	0.51 (-0.62, 1.63)	0.58	0.38	0.47 (0.04, 0.89)	0.22	0.03	0.36 (-0.12, 0.85)	0.25	0.14
Economic activity												
Employed	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Self-employed	-0.91 (-2.93, 1.10)	1.02	0.37	-0.41 (-1.17, 0.36)	0.39	0.29	-0.22 (-0.47, 0.03)	0.13	0.08	0.06 (-0.3, 0.42)	0.18	0.75
Unpaid/voluntary work	2.21 (-0.33, 4.75)	1.29	0.09	-0.35 (-2.74, 2.04)	1.22	0.77	-1.39 (-1.95, -0.84)	0.28	< 0.0001	-0.06 (-1.19, 1.08)	0.58	0.92
Unemployed	0.27 (-0.60, 1.15)	0.44	0.54	1.39 (-0.01, 2.8)	0.71	0.05	0.67 (-0.22, 1.56)	0.46	0.14	0.28 (-0.33, 0.89)	0.31	0.40
Apprenticeship	-0.33 (-1.51, 0.86)	0.6	0.59	0.44 (-1.07, 1.95)	0.77	0.57
In education	0.41 (-1.18, 2.01)	0.81	0.61
Retired	-0.61 (-1.16, -0.06)	0.28	0.03	-0.22 (-0.72, 0.28)	0.25	0.39
Permanently sick or disabled	2.86 (-2.27, 8.00)	2.61	0.27	4.31 (1.65, 6.96)	1.35	< 0.0001	3.64 (2.29, 4.99)	0.69	< 0.0001	3.35 (1.90, 4.80)	0.74	< 0.0001
Looking after home or family	-1.21 (-2.59, 0.18)	0.71	0.09	0.94 (-0.54, 2.43)	0.76	0.21	-0.04 (-0.53, 0.46)	0.25	0.88	-0.27 (-0.86, 0.33)	0.30	0.38
Doing something else	-0.97 (-2.23, 0.29)	0.64	0.13	0.01 (-1.25, 1.27)	0.76	0.21	0.06 (-1.36, 1.49)	0.73	0.93	0.45 (-0.69, 1.58)	0.58	0.44

Note: a = 3.10e⁻⁰³, b = 4.94e⁻⁰², c = 5.63e⁻⁰⁴

Supplementary Table 2. Associations between single-item assessments, and behavioural assessments of inhibitory control.

	Spearman's Correlation	OLS Coeff
Risk-taking item	0.35	0.20
Patience item	-0.40	-0.17

Note: Values represent the association between the single-item measures, and behavioural assessments, of risk-taking, and patience utilised in Falk et al., 2018. The Spearman's correlations were calculated using raw data, while the linear regression coefficients were calculated using standardised scores. N = 409. Adapted from Falk et al., 2016. OLS = ordinary least squares.

Supplementary Table 3. Percentage of missing data by variable.

Variable	Percent Missing
Sex	0.00%
Ethnicity	13.29%
Relationship status	2.70%
COVID-19 status	0.01%
Economic activity at time of survey	5.07%
Key worker	5.29%
NS-SEC 2010 analytical classes	0.00%
Change in drinking	7.87%
Alcohol misuse at time of survey	8.55%
Change in stress	8.07%
Risk-taking	7.83%
Impatience	8.02%
PHQ-4	0.00%

Note: Percentage of missing data was calculated across all cohorts combined. NS-SEC = National Statistics Socio-economic Class; PHQ-4 = Patient Health Questionnaire – 4. The overall percentage of missing data was 23.43%.

Supplementary Table 4. Ordinal logistic regression analysis in the Millennium Cohort Study with change in alcohol use as the outcome.

Variable	Unadjusted Model			Adjusted Model		
	OR (95% CI)	SE	<i>p</i>	OR (95% CI)	SE	<i>p</i>
Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	0.67 (0.18, 2.56)	0.46	0.56	0.20 (0.02, 1.94)	0.23	0.17
More	0.71 (0.27, 1.88)	0.35	0.49	1.02 (0.28, 3.70)	0.67	0.98
Risk-taking	0.93 (0.87, 1.01)	0.04	0.07	0.98 (0.88, 1.10)	0.06	0.77
Risk-taking x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	1.03 (0.87, 1.22)	0.09	0.73	1.21 (0.92, 1.59)	0.17	0.17
More	1.06 (0.93, 1.20)	0.07	0.39	1.08 (0.89, 1.30)	0.10	0.45
Patience	1.09 (1.03, 1.14)	0.03	< 0.01	1.14 (1.05, 1.23)	0.05	< 0.01
Patience x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	0.94 (0.83, 1.07)	0.06	0.32	0.92 (0.75, 1.12)	0.09	0.41
More	0.96 (0.87, 1.05)	0.05	0.34	0.89 (0.79, 1.00)	0.05	0.06
Sex						
Male				Ref.		
Female				0.89 (0.6, 1.32)	0.18	0.57
Ethnicity						
White				Ref.		
Black				0.65 (0.23, 1.8)	0.34	0.40
Indian/Pakistani				1.13 (0.62, 2.04)	0.34	0.70
Mixed Race				21.36 (2.08, 219.11)	25.3	0.01
Other/Unsure				1.72 (0.88, 3.33)	0.58	0.11
NS-SEC analytical classes						
Higher managerial				Ref.		
Lower managerial				2.15 (0.71, 6.49)	1.21	0.17
Intermediate occupations				1.89 (0.68, 5.25)	0.98	0.22
Small employers and self employed				1.30 (0.3, 5.57)	0.96	0.72
Lower supervisory and technical				0.55 (0.17, 1.8)	0.33	0.32
Semi-routine occupations				2.17 (0.78, 6.03)	1.13	0.14
Routine occupations				1.63 (0.55, 4.86)	0.91	0.38
Not classified				2.08 (0.65, 6.62)	1.22	0.22
Economic activity						
Employed				Ref.		
Self-employed				0.59 (0.17, 2.08)	0.38	0.41
Unpaid/voluntary work				0.18 (0.01, 2.61)	0.25	0.21
Unemployed				0.77 (0.4, 1.5)	0.26	0.44
Apprenticeship				1.45 (0.72, 2.91)	0.51	0.30
In education				0.12 (0.03, 0.49)	0.09	< 0.01
Retired			
Permanently sick or disabled				0.56 (0.13, 2.47)	0.42	0.44
Looking after home or family				0.49 (0.17, 1.44)	0.27	0.12
Doing something else				1.02 (0.5, 2.09)	0.37	0.95

Supplementary Table 5. Ordinal logistic regression analysis in the Millennium Cohort Study with alcohol misuse as the outcome.

Variable	Unadjusted Model			Adjusted Model		
	OR (95% CI)	SE	p	OR (95% CI)	SE	p
Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	0.15 (0.02, 1.11)	0.15	0.06	0.27 (0.01, 6.39)	0.43	0.42
More	0.53 (0.15, 1.94)	0.35	0.34	0.42 (0.08, 2.24)	0.36	0.31
Risk-taking	0.99 (0.85, 1.14)	0.07	0.86	0.98 (0.80, 1.20)	0.10	0.83
Risk-taking x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	1.30 (1.02, 1.67)	0.16	0.03	1.32 (0.88, 1.99)	0.28	0.18
More	1.18 (1.00, 1.39)	0.10	0.06	1.20 (0.95, 1.52)	0.14	0.12
Patience	1.14 (1.04, 1.25)	0.06	< 0.01	1.21 (1.05, 1.41)	0.09	0.01
Patience x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	0.93 (0.79, 1.08)	0.07	0.34	0.89 (0.71, 1.11)	0.10	0.30
More	0.96 (0.85, 1.09)	0.06	0.52	0.89 (0.6, 1.32)	0.09	0.81
Sex						
Male				Ref.		
Female				0.65 (0.38, 1.11)	0.18	0.12
Ethnicity						
White				Ref.		
Black				0.36 (0.11, 1.2)	0.22	0.10
Indian/Pakistani				0.00 ^a (0.00 ^b , 0.00 ^c)	0.00 ^d	< 0.0001
Mixed Race				6.26 (2.61, 15.03)	2.79	< 0.0001
Other/Unsure				0.03 (0.00 ^e , 0.36)	0.04	< 0.0001
NS-SEC analytical classes						
Higher managerial				Ref.		
Lower managerial				0.77 (0.15, 3.97)	0.64	0.76
Intermediate occupations				0.76 (0.17, 3.46)	0.59	0.72
Small employers and self employed				1.07 (0.21, 5.58)	0.9	0.93
Lower supervisory and technical				0.28 (0.05, 1.51)	0.24	0.14
Semi-routine occupations				0.73 (0.14, 3.72)	0.60	0.70
Routine occupations				0.56 (0.11, 2.81)	0.46	0.48
Not classified				1.32 (0.27, 6.32)	1.05	0.73
Economic activity						
Employed				Ref.		
Self-employed				0.74 (0.22, 2.49)	0.46	0.62
Unpaid/voluntary work				0.00 ^f (0.00 ^g , 0.00 ^h)	0.00 ⁱ	< 0.0001
Unemployed				0.86 (0.44, 1.68)	0.29	0.65
Apprenticeship				0.28 (0.09, 0.88)	0.16	0.03
In education				2.43 (1.06, 5.58)	1.03	0.04
Retired			
Permanently sick or disabled				0.07 (0.01, 0.66)	0.08	0.02
Looking after home or family				0.00 ^j (0.00 ^k , 0.00 ^l)	0.00 ^m	< 0.0001
Doing something else				0.12 (0.03, 0.52)	0.09	0.01

Note: a = 2.90×10^{-07} , b = 1.33×10^{-07} , c = 6.31×10^{-07} , d = 1.15×10^{-07} , e = 4.08×10^{-02} , f = 1.44×10^{-07} , g = 1.92×10^{-08} , h = 1.07×10^{-06} , i = 1.47×10^{-07} , j = 1.24×10^{-07} , k = 1.99×10^{-08} , l = 7.70×10^{-07} , m = 1.15×10^{-07}

Supplementary Table 6. Ordinal logistic regression analysis in the Next Steps cohort with change in alcohol use as the outcome.

Variable	Unadjusted Model			Adjusted Model		
	OR (95% CI)	SE	<i>p</i>	OR (95% CI)	SE	<i>p</i>
Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	0.66 (0.11, 3.84)	0.59	0.64	0.61 (0.1, 3.87)	0.58	0.60
More	2.07 (0.95, 4.51)	0.82	0.07	2.18 (0.97, 4.89)	0.90	0.06
Risk-taking	1.03 (0.95, 1.12)	0.04	0.48	1.03 (0.94, 1.13)	0.05	0.49
Risk-taking x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	0.95 (0.75, 1.21)	0.12	0.69	0.96 (0.74, 1.24)	0.13	0.73
More	0.99 (0.89, 1.1)	0.05	0.81	0.98 (0.88, 1.09)	0.06	0.70
Patience	1.05 (0.96, 1.14)	0.04	0.28	1.05 (0.97, 1.14)	0.04	0.20
Patience x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	1.21 (1.01, 1.46)	0.12	0.04	1.22 (1.00, 1.48)	0.12	0.04
More	0.88 (0.8, 0.98)	0.05	0.02	0.88 (0.8, 0.98)	0.05	0.02
Sex						
Male				Ref.		
Female				1.17 (0.86, 1.59)	0.18	0.33
Ethnicity						
White				Ref.		
Black				0.66 (0.27, 1.61)	0.30	0.36
Indian/Pakistani				0.71 (0.53, 0.94)	0.10	0.02
Mixed Race				1.05 (0.54, 2.04)	0.36	0.89
Other/Unsure				0.55 (0.36, 0.85)	0.12	0.01
NS-SEC analytical classes						
Higher managerial				Ref.		
Lower managerial				0.9 (0.61, 1.33)	0.18	0.60
Intermediate occupations				0.64 (0.39, 1.04)	0.16	0.07
Small employers and self employed				0.85 (0.34, 2.16)	0.40	0.74
Lower supervisory and technical				0.9 (0.32, 2.47)	0.46	0.83
Semi-routine occupations				1.14 (0.62, 2.09)	0.35	0.68
Routine occupations				1.12 (0.51, 2.49)	0.46	0.77
Not classified				1.36 (0.69, 2.70)	0.47	0.38
Economic activity						
Employed				Ref.		
Self-employed				1.25 (0.74, 2.11)	0.33	0.41
Unpaid/voluntary work				0.47 (0.06, 3.64)	0.49	0.47
Unemployed				0.51 (0.20, 1.30)	0.24	0.16
Apprenticeship				0.82 (0.54, 1.24)	0.17	0.34
In education			
Retired			
Permanently sick or disabled				0.44 (0.12, 1.54)	0.28	0.20
Looking after home or family				0.57 (0.17, 1.91)	0.35	0.37
Doing something else				0.45 (0.18, 1.10)	0.20	0.08

Supplementary Table 7. Ordinal logistic regression analysis in the Next Steps cohort with change in with alcohol misuse as the outcome.

Variable	Unadjusted Model			Adjusted Model		
	OR (95% CI)	SE	p	OR (95% CI)	SE	p
Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	0.37 (0.06, 2.42)	0.36	0.30	0.37 (0.06, 2.31)	0.35	0.29
More	3.51 (1.07, 11.56)	2.13	0.04	3.92 (1.17, 13.15)	2.41	0.03
Risk-taking	1.19 (1.07, 1.34)	0.07	< 0.01	1.18 (1.05, 1.33)	0.07	< 0.01
Risk-taking x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	0.98 (0.78, 1.24)	0.12	0.88	0.96 (0.76, 1.21)	0.11	0.76
More	0.88 (0.76, 1.02)	0.07	0.08	0.88 (0.76, 1.02)	0.07	0.09
Patience	0.98 (0.9, 1.08)	0.04	0.74	0.97 (0.89, 1.06)	0.04	0.56
Patience x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	1.30 (1.07, 1.59)	0.13	0.01	1.31 (1.09, 1.57)	0.12	< 0.01
More	0.95 (0.84, 1.08)	0.06	0.41	0.94 (0.83, 1.07)	0.06	0.34
Sex						
Male				Ref.		
Female				0.54 (0.36, 0.79)	0.11	<.001
Ethnicity						
White				Ref.		
Black				0.44 (0.13, 1.47)	0.27	0.18
Indian/Pakistani				0.15 (0.06, 0.35)	0.07	<.001
Mixed Race				2.75 (1.35, 5.64)	1.00	0.01
Other/Unsure				0.16 (0.05, 0.50)	0.09	<.001
NS-SEC analytical classes						
Higher managerial				Ref.		
Lower managerial				1.01 (0.64, 1.61)	0.24	0.95
Intermediate occupations				0.59 (0.35, 0.99)	0.16	0.05
Small employers and self employed				1.07 (0.36, 3.2)	0.60	0.90
Lower supervisory and technical				0.97 (0.33, 2.81)	0.52	0.95
Semi-routine occupations				0.82 (0.38, 1.76)	0.32	0.60
Routine occupations				0.61 (0.23, 1.59)	0.30	0.31
Not classified				0.58 (0.22, 1.57)	0.29	0.28
Economic activity						
Employed				Ref.		
Self-employed				1.12 (0.57, 2.20)	0.38	0.74
Unpaid/voluntary work				0.70 (0.02, 28.86)	1.32	0.85
Unemployed				2.36 (0.78, 7.09)	1.32	0.13
Apprenticeship				1.89 (0.27, 13.37)	1.88	0.52
In education			
Retired			
Permanently sick or disabled				0.92 (0.11, 7.60)	0.99	0.93
Looking after home or family				2.54 (0.48, 13.48)	2.16	0.27
Doing something else				0.66 (0.13, 3.41)	0.55	0.62

Supplementary Table 8. Ordinal logistic regression analysis in the 1970 British Cohort Study with change in alcohol use as the outcome.

Variable	Unadjusted Model			Adjusted Model		
	OR (95% CI)	SE	p	OR (95% CI)	SE	p
Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	0.88 (0.3, 2.61)	0.49	0.82	1.41 (0.58, 3.43)	0.64	0.45
More	0.95 (0.49, 1.84)	0.32	0.87	0.88 (0.52, 1.49)	0.24	0.63
Risk-taking	0.99 (0.94, 1.04)	0.02	0.67	0.99 (0.94, 1.03)	0.02	0.55
Risk-taking x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	1.00 (0.87, 1.15)	0.07	0.97	0.96 (0.85, 1.08)	0.06	0.47
More	1.13 (1.02, 1.24)	0.06	0.02	1.06 (0.98, 1.15)	0.04	0.16
Patience	0.99 (0.94, 1.04)	0.02	0.62	0.98 (0.93, 1.03)	0.02	0.38
Patience x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	1.06 (0.92, 1.21)	0.07	0.43	1.01 (0.9, 1.14)	0.06	0.87
More	0.95 (0.86, 1.05)	0.05	0.32	1.05 (0.97, 1.13)	0.04	0.22
Sex						
Male				Ref.		
Female				1.20 (1.01, 1.43)	0.10	0.04
Ethnicity						
White				Ref.		
Black				0.84 (0.41, 1.68)	0.30	0.61
Indian/Pakistani				0.98 (0.5, 1.92)	0.34	0.94
Mixed Race				0.32 (0.12, 0.84)	0.16	0.02
Other/Unsure				0.83 (0.49, 1.39)	0.22	0.48
NS-SEC analytical classes						
Higher managerial				Ref.		
Lower managerial				0.95 (0.75, 1.21)	0.12	0.69
Intermediate occupations				0.70 (0.53, 0.91)	0.10	0.01
Small employers and self employed				0.83 (0.52, 1.34)	0.20	0.45
Lower supervisory and technical				1.02 (0.65, 1.58)	0.23	0.94
Semi-routine occupations				0.59 (0.43, 0.81)	0.10	<0.0001
Routine occupations				0.57 (0.37, 0.87)	0.13	0.01
Not classified				1.16 (0.79, 1.7)	0.23	0.46
Economic activity						
Employed				Ref.		
Self-employed				0.97 (0.76, 1.24)	0.12	0.81
Unpaid/voluntary work				1.37 (0.31, 5.94)	1.02	0.68
Unemployed				0.66 (0.38, 1.15)	0.19	0.15
Apprenticeship			
In education			
Retired				0.91 (0.49, 1.71)	0.29	0.78
Permanently sick or disabled				0.34 (0.21, 0.57)	0.09	<0.0001
Looking after home or family				0.97 (0.61, 1.54)	0.23	0.89
Doing something else				0.33 (0.12, 0.91)	0.17	0.03

Supplementary Table 9. Ordinal logistic regression analysis in the 1970 British Cohort Study with change in with alcohol misuse as the outcome.

Variable	Unadjusted Model			Adjusted Model		
	OR (95% CI)	SE	p	OR (95% CI)	SE	p
Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	1.26 (0.36, 4.39)	0.80	0.72	0.97 (0.34, 2.81)	0.53	0.96
More	1.22 (0.6, 2.47)	0.44	0.58	1.25 (0.71, 2.2)	0.36	0.43
Risk-taking	1.09 (1.03, 1.16)	0.03	< 0.01	1.06 (1.01, 1.12)	0.03	0.02
Risk-taking x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	0.98 (0.83, 1.16)	0.08	0.79	0.96 (0.82, 1.11)	0.07	0.56
More	1.04 (0.95, 1.14)	0.05	0.36	1.01 (0.94, 1.09)	0.04	0.78
Patience	1.03 (0.96, 1.11)	0.04	0.42	0.99 (0.95, 1.04)	0.02	0.82
Patience x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	1.08 (0.95, 1.24)	0.07	0.25	1.17 (1.04, 1.31)	0.07	<0.001
More	0.95 (0.86, 1.04)	0.05	0.27	1.01 (0.94, 1.08)	0.04	0.86
Sex						
Male				Ref.		
Female				0.64 (0.53, 0.77)	0.06	<0.001
Ethnicity						
White				Ref.		
Black				0.69 (0.26, 1.81)	0.34	0.45
Indian/Pakistani				0.23 (0.07, 0.69)	0.13	0.01
Mixed Race				0.40 (0.08, 2.02)	0.33	0.27
Other/Unsure				0.16 (0.02, 1.28)	0.17	0.08
NS-SEC analytical classes						
Higher managerial				Ref.		
Lower managerial				1.02 (0.81, 1.29)	0.12	0.84
Intermediate occupations				0.81 (0.61, 1.07)	0.12	0.14
Small employers and self employed				0.87 (0.55, 1.36)	0.2	0.53
Lower supervisory and technical				0.75 (0.45, 1.26)	0.2	0.28
Semi-routine occupations				0.83 (0.59, 1.17)	0.14	0.29
Routine occupations				0.65 (0.44, 0.96)	0.13	0.03
Not classified				1.00 (0.66, 1.5)	0.21	0.99
Economic activity						
Employed				Ref.		
Self-employed				1.01 (0.77, 1.33)	0.14	0.92
Unpaid/voluntary work				1.13 (0.25, 5.15)	0.87	0.88
Unemployed				0.78 (0.42, 1.46)	0.25	0.44
Apprenticeship			
In education			
Retired				0.73 (0.28, 1.88)	0.35	0.51
Permanently sick or disabled				0.22 (0.09, 0.54)	0.10	<0.001
Looking after home or family				0.82 (0.5, 1.37)	0.21	0.46
Doing something else				0.70 (0.27, 1.79)	0.34	0.46

Supplementary Table 10. Ordinal logistic regression analysis in the National Child Development Study with change in alcohol use as the outcome.

Variable	Unadjusted Model			Adjusted Model		
	OR (95% CI)	SE	<i>p</i>	OR (95% CI)	SE	<i>p</i>
Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	1.54 (0.66, 3.57)	0.66	0.32	1.38 (0.42, 4.48)	0.83	0.60
More	0.96 (0.61, 1.51)	0.22	0.86	0.89 (0.54, 1.48)	0.23	0.66
Risk-taking	0.99 (0.95, 1.02)	0.02	0.43	0.98 (0.94, 1.03)	0.02	0.47
Risk-taking x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	0.95 (0.84, 1.08)	0.06	0.43	0.97 (0.82, 1.13)	0.08	0.66
More	1.04 (0.97, 1.11)	0.04	0.26	1.07 (0.98, 1.16)	0.04	0.12
Patience	0.97 (0.94, 1.01)	0.02	0.13	0.99 (0.95, 1.03)	0.02	0.51
Patience x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	1.05 (0.94, 1.16)	0.06	0.39	1.01 (0.89, 1.15)	0.07	0.85
More	1.03 (0.96, 1.10)	0.04	0.48	0.99 (0.93, 1.06)	0.04	0.85
Sex						
Male				Ref.		
Female				1.19 (0.98, 1.45)	0.12	0.08
Ethnicity						
White				Ref.		
Black				0.44 (0.1, 1.98)	0.34	0.29
Indian/Pakistani				0.7 (0.43, 1.14)	0.18	0.16
Mixed Race				0.44 (0.12, 1.58)	0.29	0.21
Other/Unsure				0.5 (0.17, 1.47)	0.28	0.21
NS-SEC analytical classes						
Higher managerial				Ref.		
Lower managerial				0.88 (0.62, 1.26)	0.16	0.49
Intermediate occupations				0.91 (0.63, 1.33)	0.18	0.63
Small employers and self employed				0.82 (0.5, 1.35)	0.21	0.43
Lower supervisory and technical				0.46 (0.26, 0.84)	0.14	0.01
Semi-routine occupations				1.04 (0.64, 1.71)	0.26	0.87
Routine occupations				0.79 (0.49, 1.28)	0.19	0.35
Not classified				0.71 (0.39, 1.28)	0.21	0.25
Economic activity						
Employed				Ref.		
Self-employed				0.92 (0.68, 1.24)	0.14	0.58
Unpaid/voluntary work				1.51 (0.42, 5.47)	0.99	0.53
Unemployed				0.65 (0.21, 2)	0.37	0.45
Apprenticeship			
In education			
Retired				1.02 (0.58, 1.77)	0.29	0.95
Permanently sick or disabled				1.14 (0.6, 2.15)	0.37	0.69
Looking after home or family				1.05 (0.53, 2.05)	0.36	0.90
Doing something else				1.03 (0.27, 3.88)	0.70	0.97

Supplementary Table 11. Ordinal logistic regression analysis in the National Child Development Study with change in with alcohol misuse as the outcome.

Variable	Unadjusted Model			Adjusted Model		
	OR (95% CI)	SE	<i>p</i>	OR (95% CI)	SE	<i>p</i>
Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	1.13 (0.49, 2.62)	0.48	0.78	0.74 (0.25, 2.14)	0.40	0.57
More	0.87 (0.49, 1.54)	0.25	0.63	0.88 (0.49, 1.59)	0.27	0.67
Risk-taking	1.03 (0.98, 1.08)	0.03	0.26	1.00 (0.95, 1.05)	0.03	0.97
Risk-taking x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	0.96 (0.85, 1.09)	0.06	0.54	1.04 (0.89, 1.22)	0.08	0.62
More	1.04 (0.96, 1.12)	0.04	0.33	1.08 (0.99, 1.18)	0.05	0.09
Patience	0.99 (0.94, 1.03)	0.02	0.58	1.02 (0.97, 1.06)	0.02	0.48
Patience x Stress						
Same	Ref.			Ref.		
Less	1.06 (0.96, 1.17)	0.05	0.22	1.04 (0.94, 1.16)	0.06	0.43
More	1.01 (0.93, 1.09)	0.04	0.86	1.00 (0.92, 1.09)	0.04	0.98
Sex						
Male				Ref.		
Female				0.62 (0.5, 0.76)	0.07	<0.0001
Ethnicity						
White				Ref.		
Black				0.15 (0.04, 0.55)	0.10	<0.0001
Indian/Pakistani				0.24 (0.05, 1.24)	0.20	0.09
Mixed Race				0.58 (0.16, 2.08)	0.38	0.40
Other/Unsure				0.51 (0.15, 1.78)	0.33	0.29
NS-SEC analytical classes						
Higher managerial				Ref.		
Lower managerial				0.82 (0.56, 1.19)	0.16	0.29
Intermediate occupations				0.75 (0.51, 1.1)	0.15	0.14
Small employers and self employed				0.75 (0.42, 1.32)	0.22	0.31
Lower supervisory and technical				0.72 (0.42, 1.24)	0.20	0.24
Semi-routine occupations				0.84 (0.5, 1.42)	0.23	0.52
Routine occupations				0.55 (0.32, 0.96)	0.16	0.03
Not classified				0.93 (0.57, 1.52)	0.23	0.77
Economic activity						
Employed				Ref.		
Self-employed				0.67 (0.46, 0.97)	0.13	0.03
Unpaid/voluntary work				1.33 (0.64, 2.74)	0.49	0.45
Unemployed				0.77 (0.32, 1.82)	0.34	0.55
Apprenticeship			
In education			
Retired				0.95 (0.62, 1.44)	0.20	0.80
Permanently sick or disabled				0.46 (0.20, 1.02)	0.19	0.06
Looking after home or family				0.66 (0.37, 1.15)	0.19	0.14
Doing something else				0.89 (0.40, 1.94)	0.36	0.76

References

- Arslan RC, Brümmer M, Dohmen T, Drewelies J, Hertwig R, Wagner GG** (2020) How people know their risk preference. *Scientific Reports* **10**, 15365.
- Babor TF, Higgins-biddle JC, Saunders JB, Monteiro MG** (2001) AUDIT: The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test: Guidelines for Use in Primary Health Care, 2nd ed. World Health Organisation: Geneva.
- Babor, TF, de la Fuente JR, Saunders J, Grant M** (1992) AUDIT: The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test. Guidelines for use in primary health care. World Health Organization: Geneva.
- Claussen B, Aasland OG** (1993) The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) in a routine health examination of long-term unemployed. *Addiction* **88**, 363–368.
- Crawford JR, Henry JD** (2003) The Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS): Normative data and latent structure in a large non-clinical sample. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* **42**, 111–131.
- Eddy CL, Herman KC, Reinke WM** (2019) Single-item teacher stress and coping measures: Concurrent and predictive validity and sensitivity to change. *Journal of School Psychology* **76**, 17–32.
- Elo AL, Leppänen A, Jahkola A** (2003) Validity of a single-item measure of stress symptoms. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health* **29**, 444–451.
- Falk A, Becker A, Dohmen T, Enke B, Huffman D, Sunde U** (2018) Global Evidence on Economic Preferences. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **133**, 1645–1692.
- Falk A, Becker A, Dohmen T, Huffman D, Sunde U** (2016) An experimentally-validated survey module of economic preferences. *IZA Discussion Paper Series* [Preprint] No. 9674.
- Fleming MF, Barry KL, Macdonald R** (1991) The alcohol use disorders identification test (AUDIT) in a college sample. *International Journal of the Addictions* **26**, 1173–1185
- Gual A** (2002) AUDIT-3 and AUDIT-4: Effectiveness of two short forms of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test. *Alcohol and Alcoholism* **37**, 591–596.
- Kim JW, Lee BC, Lee DY, Seo CH, Kim S, Kang TC, Choi IG** (2013) The 5-item Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT-5): An Effective Brief Screening Test for Problem Drinking, Alcohol Use Disorders and Alcohol Dependence. *Alcohol and Alcoholism* **48**, 68–73.
- Kraus L, Room R, Livingston M, Pennay A, Holmes J, Törrönen J** (2020) Long waves of consumption or a unique social generation? Exploring recent declines in youth drinking. *Addiction Research & Theory* **28**, 183–193.
- Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW, Löwe B** (2009). An Ultra-Brief Screening Scale for Anxiety and Depression: The PHQ-4. *Psychosomatics* **50**, 613–621.
- Mackenbach JP, Stirbu I, Roskam AJR, Schaap MM, Menvielle G, Leinsalu M, Kunst AE** (2008) Socioeconomic Inequalities in Health in 22 European Countries. *New England Journal of Medicine* **358**, 2468–2481.
- Office for National Statistics.** (2016). The National Statistics Socio-economic classification (NS-SEC). (<https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/otherclassifications/thenationalstatistics/socioeconomicclassification/nssecbasedonsoc2010>). Accessed 11 August 2020.
- Office for National Statistics** (2018). Adult drinking habits in Great Britain. (<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/drugusealcoholandsmoking/datasets/adultdrinkinghabits>). Accessed 20 September 2020.
- Peltier MR, Verplaetse TL, Mineur YS, Petrakis IL, Cosgrove KP, Picciotto MR, McKee SA** (2019) Sex differences in stress-related alcohol use. *Neurobiology of Stress*. **10**, 100149.
- Probst C, Kilian C, Sanchez S, Lange, S, Rehm J** (2020) The role of alcohol use and drinking patterns in socioeconomic inequalities in mortality: a systematic review. *The Lancet Public Health* **5**, e324–e332.
- Room, R** (2005) Stigma, social inequality and alcohol and drug use. *Drug and Alcohol Review* **24**, 143–155.

- Room, R** (2013) Sociocultural aspects of alcohol consumption. In *Alcohol: Science, Policy, and Public Health* (eds. P Boyle, P Boffetta, AB Lowenfeld, H Burns, O Brawley, W Zatonski, J. Rehm) pp. 38–46. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Ruscio AM, Hallion LS, Lim CCW, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, Al-Hamzawi A, Alonso J, Andrade LH, Borges G, Bromet EJ, Bunting B, Caldas de Almeida JM, Demyttenaere K, Florescu S, de Girolamo G, Gureje O, Haro JM, He, Y, Hinkov H, Hu C, de Jonge P, Karam EG, Lee S, Lepine JP, Levinson D, Mneimneh Z, Navarro-Mateu F, Posada-Villa J, Slade T, Stein DJ, Torres Y, Uda H, Wojtyniak B, Kessler RC, Chatterji S, Scott, KM** (2017) Cross-sectional Comparison of the Epidemiology of DSM-5 Generalized Anxiety Disorder Across the Globe. *JAMA Psychiatry* **74**, 465–475.
- Twigg L, Moon G** (2013) The spatial and temporal development of binge drinking in England 2001–2009: An observational study. *Social Science & Medicine*, **91**, 162–167.
- University of Essex, Institute for Social and Economic Research** (2018) Understanding Society: Waves 1–8, 2009–2017 and Harmonised BHPS: Waves 1–18, 1991–2009. UK Data Service. SN: 6614 (<https://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-6614-12>).
- Watson N, Wooden M** (2012) The HILDA Survey: A case study in the design and development of a successful Household Panel Survey. *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies* **3**, 369–381.
- White A, Castle IP, Chen CM, Shirley M, Roach D, Hingson R** (2015) Converging patterns of alcohol use and related outcomes among females and males in the United States, 2002 to 2012. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* **39**, 1712–1726.
- Wittchen HU, Kessler RC, Beesdo K, Krause P, Höfler M, Hoyer J** (2002) Generalized anxiety and depression in primary care: prevalence, recognition, and management. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* **63**, 24–34
- Zapolski TCB, Pedersen SL, McCarthy DM, Smith GT** (2014) Less drinking, yet more problems: Understanding African American drinking and related problems. *Psychological Bulletin* **140**, 188–223.