



Corcoran, E., Lewis, G., Heron, J. E., Hickman, M., & Lewis, G. H. (Accepted/In press). Cognitive Style and Drinking to Cope: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Addiction*.

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document

This is the accepted author manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Wiley at [insert hyperlink]. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available: <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

COGNITIVE STYLE AND DRINKING TO COPE: A PROSPECTIVE COHORT STUDY

Emma Corcoran (University College London)  
Gemma Lewis (University College London)  
Jon Heron (University of Bristol)  
Matthew Hickman (University of Bristol)  
Glyn Lewis (University College London)

Word Count: 3,687

Conflicts of interest: None

Clinical Trial Registration Details: N/A

## ABSTRACT

### Background and Aims

Having a negative cognitive style may lead someone to feel hopeless about his or her situation and be more likely to engage in coping-motivated drinking. We therefore aimed to investigate the association between cognitive style and drinking to cope.

### Design

Prospective cohort study.

### Setting

The former Avon Health Authority in South West England.

### Participants

1,681 participants of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children.

### Measurements

Participants completed cognitive style questions at age 17 and a subset of drinking to cope questions at age 24. We used linear regression to test the association between cognitive style and drinking to cope, controlling for confounders. Alcohol consumption and dependence scales were included in a secondary analysis.

### Findings

A 20 point increase (which was the standard deviation of the exposure variable) in cognitive style score at age 17 was associated with an increase of 0.24 in drinking to cope scores at age 24 after adjustment for confounding variables (95% confidence interval (CI)=0.08-0.41,  $p=.003$ ). We found no evidence of an association between cognitive style and alcohol consumption (coefficient=0.03, 95% CI=-0.08-0.14,  $p=.591$ ) before or after adjustment. There was evidence for an association with alcohol dependence but this was not present after adjusting for confounders (coefficient=0.01, 95% CI=-0.04-0.05,  $p=.769$ ).

### Conclusions

In young adults in England, there appears to be a positive association between negative cognitive style and subsequent drinking to cope.

**Keywords:** alcohol use, drinking to cope, cognitive style, negative attributions, learned helplessness, ALSPAC, longitudinal, birth cohort

## Introduction

Problematic alcohol use often starts during adolescence (1,2). Whilst long-term heavy drinking can lead to problems such as stroke (3), cancer (4) and heart disease (5), it is also linked to mental health problems, relationship breakdown, impaired social relationships and employment dismissal (6). Reducing hazardous alcohol use in early life is important, and may prevent later development of alcohol-related problems.

Different motivational factors for drinking can produce different patterns of use and health outcomes, so exploring the motivations to drink would inform interventions to support those most at-risk of alcohol-related problems (7). Research has found the association between alcohol use and mental health problems in young people is due to problematic use of alcohol as opposed to the quantity consumed (8). Using alcohol to cope with problems can increase the risk of long term alcohol-related problems compared to other drinking motivations such as to socialise (9,10), and this association is maintained even when controlling for alcohol consumption (11). Mental health problems such as depression and anxiety may increase the likelihood of drinking to cope, due to people using alcohol to deal with underlying negative emotions and problems. (12,13). It is possible that coping-motivated drinking provides short-term relief from symptoms of low mood, therefore negatively reinforcing the idea of drinking to cope. However whilst alcohol use may provide relief from depression in the short-term, research has found that those who use substances to cope, even at subclinical levels, are less likely to work on their difficulties, (14) meaning their depression may be less likely to improve. Moreover, people who use substances to cope with their difficulties are at higher risk of worsening depression over time (15). It is likely that this population may be stuck in a 'vicious cycle', where depression is causing higher alcohol use, which in turn is causing higher levels of depression. It is important to investigate risk factors for coping-motivated drinking so that interventions can be targeted to support people before their drinking becomes problematic.

Existing evidence from the depression literature has suggested that negative cognitive style can create an underlying vulnerability to environmental stressors and increases risk of later depression (16). Cognitive style is based on the hopelessness theory of depression and explores the causal attributions for negative life events. For example, if someone with a negative cognitive style fails a test, they may attribute this to internal factors (i.e. "I am stupid"), stable factors (i.e. "I will never pass") and global factors (i.e. "I fail at everything"). Negative cognitive styles are associated with later depressed mood (17,18) and anxiety (19,20). It is possible that someone with a negative cognitive style may engage in more negative coping strategies, such as alcohol misuse, due to the mechanism of learned helplessness (21). Learned helplessness is the idea that someone has no control over negative situations, and is largely linked to negative cognitive style (21). Making internal, global and stable attributions to events could result in a feeling of helplessness and inability to change, and therefore may make someone more likely to engage in negative coping behaviours. There is also a link between alcohol use and helplessness (22) and uncontrollable events (23). Therefore, it is possible that negative cognitive style increases likelihood of drinking through the mechanism of learned helplessness.

To our knowledge, only one study has examined the relationship between cognitive style and drinking to cope (24). An association was found between negative cognitive style and higher drinking to cope, however the study used a convenience sample of university students (N=182), and the study was cross-sectional so a temporal relationship could not be assessed. Longitudinal research is needed in a larger, more representative sample.

This study investigated the prospective association between cognitive style at age 17 and drinking to cope at age 24. To our knowledge this is the first cohort study examining whether negative cognitive style is associated with later drinking to cope. We also examined alcohol consumption and dependence, as secondary outcomes.

## **Method**

### ***Sample***

We used data from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) (28–30).

The children of pregnant women residing in Avon, UK, with expected dates of delivery 1<sup>st</sup> April 1991 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 1992 were invited to take part in the study. 14,449 participants were included in our core sample (50% male, 47% female, 3% sex not known; 92% white, 3% non-white, 5% ethnicity unknown).

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee and the Local Research Ethics Committees. Informed consent for the use of data collected via questionnaires and clinics was obtained from participants following the recommendations of the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee at the time. The study website (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/our-data/>) contains details of all the data that is available.

## **Measures**

### ***Drinking to Cope***

A subset from the Drinking Motives questionnaire (7) comprising of Drinking to Cope questions was administered at age 24 at the 'Focus@24 Clinic' ( $\alpha=0.85$ ). This consisted of 5 questions asking participants how often in the last two years they have used alcohol to relax, forget their worries, cheer up, cope with depression/nervousness and feel more self-confident. We modified the original questionnaire by splitting the depression/nervousness item into two separate questions, and also adding two items assessing how often the participant uses alcohol because their mood changes a lot and because they have nothing better to do. A preliminary polychoric correlation showed no evidence of the original items being more strongly associated with cognitive style or with the other items on the Drinking to Cope scale. A factor analysis also demonstrated that 97% of the variance of this scale can be explained using the single dimension. The participants each question on a 4-point Likert Scale, rating from 0 (almost never), 1 (sometimes), 2 (often) and 3 (almost always). The total scores could therefore range between 0 and 24. Non-drinkers were assigned a score of 0; high scores indicated a higher likelihood of drinking to cope. Mean scores and standard deviations for each item on the Drinking to Cope scale are shown in Table S1.

### ***Alcohol Consumption/Dependence***

The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) (31) consumption and dependence measures were administered to the participants at age 24 at the 10<sup>th</sup> Focus Clinic. The original questionnaire consists of 10 Likert scales that are split alcohol consumption, alcohol dependence and alcohol-related problems – we therefore explored the alcohol consumption and dependence measures separately. Both measures consisted of three questions where the participants scored between 0-4, meaning total scores for each measure ranged from 0-12. Non-drinkers were assigned a score of 0; higher scores indicated higher consumption/dependence levels.

The primary and secondary outcome measures were collected using the REDCap tool: <https://projectredcap.org/resources/citations/>.

### ***Cognitive Style Questionnaire Short-Form***

The Cognitive Style Questionnaire Short-Form (CSQ-SF) (32) was administered to participants at age 17 years. Participants to imagine themselves in 8 negative situations (i.e. “imagine you are getting along badly with your parents”), and rate whether the event was caused by internal vs. external, global vs. specific and stable vs. unstable factors, and the extent to which this reflects their self-worth. All factors were rated on a Likert scale from 1-5, meaning that total scores ranged from 72-360. Higher scores indicated a more negative cognitive style.

### ***Potential confounders***

We adjusted for the following potential confounders (18)(33): Sex, parental social class (based on the Registrar’s General classification and grouped into manual and non-manual; when the social class of each parent differed the higher level was taken), maternal education (measured by the mother’s highest qualification level when the child was born), maternal depression (measured using the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (34)) and maternal age (measured in years when the child was born). We also adjusted for depression and anxiety at 17 (both measured by the Revised Clinical Interview Schedule (35)), alcohol use at 17 (measured by the AUDIT-10 (31)) and Drinking to Cope score at 17. Depression, anxiety and alcohol use were added to the model as a separate set of adjustments because we cannot exclude the possibility that they were on the causal pathway from negative cognitive style to drinking to cope.

### ***Statistical analyses***

Statistical analysis was conducted on Stata Version 16. The analysis was not pre-registered and therefore these results should be considered exploratory.

## **Results**

### ***Descriptive statistics***

We divided the CSQ-SF scores by the median and reported sample characteristics for all variables according to CSQ-SF scores, using complete data. We repeated these descriptive statistics using all available data for all participants (regardless of whether they had complete data for the exposure, outcomes and confounders) to explore any differences for complete cases compared with all available cases.

### ***Primary outcome***

Linear regression models were used for the primary and secondary analysis. Although the Drinking to Cope score was positively skewed, parametric assumptions were assumed to be met due to the large sample size and the fact that the residuals were normally distributed. Histograms for the distribution of raw scores and residuals for the Drinking to Cope scale, AUDIT-Consumption and AUDIT-Dependence measures are shown in Figures S1-S6.

We first conducted a linear regression with the Drinking to Cope scale as a continuous outcome and CSQ-SF scores as a continuous exposure. We divided the CSQ-SF by 20, its standard deviation, to produce a larger coefficient. The analysis was carried out before and after adjustment for confounders. We calculated the effect sizes for each mode by dividing the mean difference of the outcome by the standard deviation of the outcome. Next, we split the CSQ-SF scores into tertiles, and completed a second analysis with the Drinking to Cope outcome and the CSQ-tertile variable, to allow for an inspection of non-linearity. We did not report p-values for the comparison of the tertiles as p-values from subgroups can be unreliable (36). Finally, we included a quadratic term into the

model for each outcome to explore the linearity of the relationship between our exposure and outcome.

Univariable models were ran unadjusted, and then were adjusted for: sex, parental social class, maternal education, maternal depression and maternal age. After this we included depression, anxiety, alcohol use and baseline drinking to cope score.

We also re-ran our analysis using the three subscales of the CSQ (internality, globality and stability) to explore any difference.

### ***Secondary outcomes***

For the secondary analysis, we repeated the above analyses, using the AUDIT-Consumption and AUDIT-Dependence scores in two separate models as our outcome measures. Whilst the AUDIT-Consumption measure was normally distributed, the AUDIT-Dependence measure was positively skewed. However it was decided that linear regressions would be used throughout the secondary analysis due to the large sample size and the normal distribution of the residuals.

### ***Sensitivity analyses***

We repeated our main analysis excluding any non-drinkers (people that scored 0 on the AUDIT-consumption scale) to ensure that this sample did not skew any associations found. We split all outcome measures firstly by a median split, and then by the top 20% compared to bottom 80% and re-ran our analysis using logistic regression, with the same adjustments as in the main analysis.

We also repeated our analysis using the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV) criteria (37) for alcohol dependence as our outcome measure using data from the complete case sample.

### ***Missing data***

To address the possibility that missing data biased our results, we re-ran our all our models using a sample based on everyone with complete exposure data and imputed missing data in the primary and secondary outcome and the confounder data, increasing the sample size to 3,881. We used multiple imputation by chained equations and imputed 50 data sets (38). Our imputation models included all variables used in the main analysis plus auxiliary variables. The auxiliary variables used were the Moods and Feeling Questionnaire scores (ages 10 years, 12 years, 13 years, 17 years, 18 years, 22 years, 22 years & 11 months & 23 years), (39), maternal smoking during pregnancy, maternal alcohol use (before pregnancy, during the 1<sup>st</sup> 3 months of pregnancy and during the final 2 months of pregnancy), young person's alcohol dependence and abuse levels (ages 20 & 22) (37), young person's age at first drink and young person's alcohol expectancies (age 24) (40).

## **Results**

### ***Descriptive Statistics***

Our final sample included 1,681 complete cases (those with data for exposure, outcomes and confounding variables) (Figure 1). Comparisons between the complete cases and the rest of the ALSPAC sample are shown in Table S2.

People with higher CSQ-SF scores had higher depression, anxiety, AUDIT and Drinking to Cope scores at 17 (Table 1). Descriptive data showing the association between CSQ-SF scores and each confounding variable for all available cases are shown in Table S3.

### ***Drinking to Cope***

Drinking to Cope scores ranged from 0-19, with a mean of 4.24 (SD=3.51).

In the unadjusted model, an increase in CSQ-SF score was associated with an increase in the Drinking to Cope score, with a small effect size (coefficient=0.64, 95% CI=0.47-0.80, effect size=0.15,  $p<.001$ ). After adjusting for all potential confounders, the magnitude of the association attenuated, but the evidence remained strong (coefficient=0.24, 95% CI=0.08-0.41, effect size=0.06  $p=.003$ ) (Table 2). Our findings were similar when the CSQ-SF was split into low, medium and high tertiles (Table 2).

When repeating the analysis using the three subscales of the CSQ, we found that stability had the largest association (coefficient=1.03, 95% CI=0.51-1.54,  $p<.001$ ), followed by globality (coefficient=0.60, 95% CI=0.04-1.16,  $p=.036$ ), and that internality did not appear to have an association on Drinking to Cope (coefficient=-0.10, 95% CI=-0.65-0.45,  $p=.720$ ) (Tables S4-S6).

### ***AUDIT-Consumption and AUDIT-Dependence***

We found no evidence for an association between CSQ-SF score and AUDIT-Consumption score in either the unadjusted model (coefficient=0.05, 95% CI=-0.06-0.16, effect size=0.01,  $p=.351$ ) and when adjusting for all confounders in the same model (coefficient=0.03, 95% CI=-0.08-0.14, effect size=0.01,  $p=.591$ ). (Table 3). There was also no evidence for an association when the CSQ was split into low, medium and high tertiles (Table 3).

We found some evidence of an association between an increase in CSQ-SF and an increase in AUDIT-dependence score, with a small effect size (coefficient=0.06, 95% CI=0.02-0.11, effect size=0.01,  $p=.006$ ). However, after adjusting for all potential confounders, this association attenuated (coefficient=0.01, 95% CI=-0.04-0.03, effect size=0.002,  $p=.769$ ). The main confounders to alter this association were depression, anxiety and AUDIT score at age 17 (Table 4). Our finding remained similar when examining the CSQ-SF in low, medium and high tertiles (Table 4).

When repeating the analysis using the DSM-dependence scale as our outcome measure, we found no evidence for a relationship between cognitive style and DSM alcohol dependence score (Table S7).

We repeated our findings excluding non-drinkers ( $n=163$ ) and did not find any differences in our findings. We also repeated the analysis using logistic regression, after creating binary outcomes for the Drinking to Cope, AUDIT-Consumption and AUDIT-Dependence. The results of the analysis showed no differences in findings depending on the statistical method used (Tables S8-S13). There was also no evidence for a non-linear relationship between the CSQ-SF and Drinking to Cope ( $p=.397$ ), AUDIT-Consumption ( $p=.666$ ) and AUDIT-Dependence ( $p=.240$ ).

Results based on the imputed sample were the same as to those found using the non-imputed data (Tables S14-S22).

### **Discussion**

We found that a more negative cognitive style at 17 was associated with higher Drinking to Cope scores at 24, with a small effect size, and this remained after adjusting for confounders. However, we did not find evidence of an association between cognitive style at 17 and alcohol consumption or dependence at 24.

### ***Strengths and Limitations***



To our knowledge, this is the first study examining the association between cognitive style and drinking to cope using a prospective cohort study. We adjusted for a wide range of confounders, and the use of multiple outcome measures, including the Drinking to Cope, AUDIT, and DSM-Dependence scale captures the different aspects of alcohol use, allows for a deeper understanding of the nature of the relationship with cognitive style.

A limitation of the study is that the sample may not fully represent the general population, as the Avon area has a high socioeconomic status. Although we controlled for social class throughout, it would be useful to replicate our research in a less affluent area, as alcohol use is related to lower socioeconomic status (41). The ALSPAC study is also subject to high attrition. Although we ran multiple imputation to replace missing data, which had little influence on the results, the imputed sample would still be less representative than the broader ALSPAC sample. However, within cohort associations should remain valid even when the sample is not truly representative of the population. Residual confounding can never be ruled out in an observational study so we cannot be sure of causality in this investigation (42).

The ALSPAC study measured our exposure and outcome measures at 17 and 24, and we therefore did not have data to explore any patterns in cognitive style or drinking to cope between these ages. Nonetheless, age 17 is a time when high alcohol use is common (43), and by age 24 people have most people have more responsibilities and therefore may be a time when heavy drinking first becomes problematic (44), meaning this is still an appropriate age group to use for this research.

One possibility is for a cyclical relationship between cognitive style and drinking to cope (i.e. drinking to cope could lead to social consequences that make people feel more out of control, leading them to make more negative attributions), and therefore the link between cognitive style and drinking to cope could be more complex than our findings suggest. Some other psychological processes, such as affect dysregulation, could also have been potential confounders (45,46). Additionally, we were not able to repeat our analysis using alternative measures of drinking motives aside from Drinking to Cope scores. Whilst our drinking to cope measure had good internal consistency, we did not have access to the individual data points for our exposure and secondary outcomes, so could not explore internal consistency for these measures.

Depression, anxiety and alcohol use could be on the causal pathway, so adjusting for these could result in over adjustment and attenuating the relationship between our exposure and outcomes (due to mediation rather than confounding) (47). Additionally, the difference in wording in the Drinking to Cope and AUDIT measures may have introduced measurement bias. The AUDIT questions are worded so that participants have to rate themselves on an objective timescale (i.e. never/less than monthly/monthly/weekly/daily or almost daily), whilst the Drinking to Cope scale asks participants to hypothetically score themselves on a Likert Scale (i.e. almost never/often/sometimes/almost always). Whilst both measures have a good evidence individually, the difference in wording may lead participants with a negative cognitive style to rate themselves higher on the subjective Drinking to Cope scale, but not on the objective AUDIT scales, causing differences in our outcome measures.

### ***Mechanisms***

The relationship between cognitive style and drinking to cope could be explained by the mechanism of learned helplessness (21). If someone has a negative cognitive style, this could foster a feeling of helplessness and inability to change, which could explain the decision to use alcohol over alternative coping methods. The fact that the stability subscale had the largest effect on Drinking to Cope could

lead someone to believe that negative events will always happen to them, further exacerbating the idea of learned helplessness. As drinking to cope is also associated with negative mental health outcomes (12,13), these higher rates of negative outcomes could reinforce learned helplessness and negative cognitive style, further increasing coping-motivated drinking.

Our finding that cognitive style did not appear to be related to alcohol consumption could be explained by the fact mental health problems are more strongly associated with problem-use of alcohol, but not necessarily the amount of alcohol consumed (8). It is important to emphasise that the AUDIT asks about frequency of alcohol use, whereas one can endorse items on the DMQ even if alcohol is used infrequently. Previous research has linked heavy alcohol use with extraversion (48). However extraverts are less likely to drink for coping motives (49), and are less likely to develop other mental health problems associated with cognitive style (50,51). Therefore, it is possible that many of the participants drink alcohol for various motives such as social motives, but would not be considered as having an alcohol-related problem or a vulnerability to depression.

Our finding that there did not appear to be an association between cognitive style and alcohol dependence once depression, anxiety and baseline alcohol use were adjusted for was surprising. One possible explanation is that alcohol dependence occurs later in life so an association may not be demonstrated at the age of 24. However, another possibility is that the questions asked (i.e. “were you able to stop drinking once you have started?”) may be too extreme. For example, a person who scores low on the AUDIT-dependence scale may experience other difficulties associated with alcohol dependence, such as problems with relationships or lowering their self-esteem, which would not have been captured by the AUDIT-dependence questions. Further research is needed in this area to establish whether cognitive style is related to alcohol dependence, and if so, what underlying mechanisms support this.

### ***Clinical Implications***

Our finding that negative cognitive style is associated with later drinking to cope has a number of implications. It may be useful to identify people with a negative cognitive style at a young age before they start using alcohol and provide alternatives ways of coping with difficulties and discourage them to engage in coping-motivated drinking. As cognitive style is associated with other mental health problems, such intervention could lead to broader benefits. There is evidence that cognitive style can be altered using cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT)(52,53), and that CBT for other mental disorders also reduces problem drinking (54,55). There is therefore scope for people seeking help for alcohol problems to target their negative cognitive style using CBT, so that they engage in healthier coping behaviours.

### ***Conclusions***

Our research found evidence for a relationship between cognitive style and drinking to cope. Our findings point towards changes that can be made to support those at risk of problematic drinking now and in the future, helping individuals lead a better quality of life, and relieving some of the financial burden of alcohol problems on the NHS.

### ***Acknowledgements***

We are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives for their help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers, receptionists and

nurses. We also acknowledge support from University College London Hospital Biomedical Research Centre.

### Funding information

The UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome Trust (Grant ref: 217065/Z/19/Z) and the University of Bristol provide core support for ALSPAC. This publication is the work of the authors and Emma Corcoran will serve as guarantor for the contents of this paper.

A comprehensive list of grants funding is available on the ALSPAC website (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-acknowledgements.pdf>); This research was specifically funded by MRC (Grant ref: MR/L022206/1) and Wellcome Trust (Grant ref: 08426812/Z/07/Z).

### References


1. Kuntsche E, Knibbe R, Gmel G, Engels R. Why do young people drink? A review of drinking motives. *Clin Psychol Rev.* 2005;25(7):841–61.
2. Fillmore KM, Hartka E, Johnstone BM, Leino EV, Motoyoshi M, Temple MT. A meta-analysis of life course variation in drinking. *Br J Addict.* 1991;86(10):1221–68.
3. Hansagi H, Romelsjo A, De Verdier MG, Andreasson S, Leifman A. Alcohol consumption and stroke mortality: 20-year follow-up of 15 077 men and women. *Stroke.* 1995;26(10):1768–73.
4. Pelucchi C, Tramacere I, Boffetta P, Negri E, Vecchia C La. Alcohol consumption and cancer risk. Vol. 63, *Nutrition and Cancer.* 2011. p. 983–90.
5. Heidelbaugh JJ, Bruderly M. Cirrhosis and chronic liver failure: Part I. Diagnosis and evaluation. Vol. 74, *American Family Physician.* 2006.
6. Österberg E. Alcohol-related adverse social consequences within the European Union. *Alcohol Misuse.* 1996;190.
7. Cooper ML, Russell M, Windle M. Development and Validation of a Three-Dimensional Measure of Drinking Motives. 1992;
8. Mason WA, Kosterm R, Haggerty KP, Hawkins JD, Redmond C, Spoth RL, et al. Dimensions of adolescent alcohol involvement as predictors of young-adult major depression. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs.* 2008;69(2):275–85.
9. Grant V V., Stewart SH, Mohr CD. Coping-Anxiety and Coping-Depression Motives Predict Different Daily Mood-Drinking Relationships. *Psychol Addict Behav.* 2009 Jun;23(2):226–37.
10. Holahan CJ, Moos RH, Holahan CK, Cronkite RC, Randall PK. Drinking to cope, emotional distress and alcohol use and abuse: A ten-year model. *J Stud Alcohol.* 2001;62(2):190–8.
11. DeMarce JM. Testing Theoretical Relationships among Alcohol Use, Drinking to Cope, Mood Regulation. 2006.
12. Holahan CJ, Moos RH, Holahan CK, Cronkite RC, Randall PK. Unipolar Depression, Life Context Vulnerabilities, and Drinking to Cope. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 2004;72(2):269–75.
13. Thomas SE, Randall CL, Carrigan MH. Drinking to Cope in Socially Anxious Individuals: A Controlled Study. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.* 2003 Dec;27(12):1937–43.
14. Heggeness LF, Bean C AI, Kalmbach DA, Ciesla JA. Cognitive risk, coping-oriented substance use, and increased avoidance tendencies among depressed outpatients: A prospective investigation. *J Clin Psychol.* 2020;76(12):2249–63.
15. Heggeness LF, Lechner W V., Ciesla JA. Coping via substance use, internal attribution bias, and their depressive interplay: Findings from a three-week daily diary study using a clinical sample. *Addict Behav.* 2019 Feb 1;89:70–7.
16. Abramson LY, Metalsky GI, Alloy LB. Hopelessness Depression: A Theory-Based Subtype of Depression. *Psychological Review.* 1989.
17. Sanjuán P, Magallares A. A longitudinal study of the negative explanatory style and attributions of uncontrollability as predictors of depressive symptoms. *Pers Individ Dif.* 2009

- May 1;46(7):714–8.
18. Pearson RM, Heron J, Button K, Bentall RP, Fernyhough C, Mahedy L, et al. Cognitive styles and future depressed mood in early adulthood: The importance of global attributions. *J Affect Disord*. 2015;171:60–7.
  19. Kaur R. Role of Attributional, Styles and Perceived Control in Control in Social Anxiety Among University Entrants. *Electron J Res Educ Psychol [Internet]*. 2017 [cited 2020 Oct 19];15(2):1696–2095. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14204/ejrep.42.16056>
  20. Luten AG, Ralph JA, Mineka S. Pessimistic attributional style: Is it specific to depression versus anxiety versus negative affect? *Behav Res Ther*. 1997 Aug 1;35(8):703–19.
  21. Abramson LY, Seligman MEP, Teasdale JD. Learned Helplessness in Humans: Critique and Reformulation. Vol. 87, *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 1978.
  22. Noel NE, Lisman SA. Alcohol consumption by college women following exposure to unsolvable problems: Learned helplessness or stress induced drinking? *Behav Res Ther*. 1980 Jan 1;18(5):429–40.
  23. VOLPICELLI JR. Uncontrollable Events and Alcohol Drinking. *Addiction [Internet]*. 1987 Apr 1 [cited 2020 Oct 19];82(4):381–92. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1360-0443.1987.tb01494.x>
  24. Heinz AJ, Veilleux JC, Kassel JD. The role of cognitive structure in college student problem drinking. *Addict Behav*. 2009;34(2):212–8.
  25. Edwards AC, Heron J, Dick DM, Hickman M, Lewis G, Macleod J, et al. Adolescent alcohol use is positively associated with later depression in a population-based U.K. cohort. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs*. 2014 Sep 1;75(5):758–65.
  26. Courtney KE, Polich J. Binge Drinking in Young Adults: Data, Definitions, and Determinants. *Psychol Bull*. 2009 Jan;135(1):142–56.
  27. Stallman HM. Psychological distress in university students: A comparison with general population data. *Aust Psychol*. 2010 Dec 1;45(4):249–57.
  28. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, Lawlor DA, Fraser A, Henderson J, et al. Cohort profile: The 'Children of the 90s'-The index offspring of the avon longitudinal study of parents and children. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2013;42(1):111–27.
  29. Fraser A, Macdonald-wallis C, Tilling K, Boyd A, Golding J, Davey smith G, et al. Cohort profile: The avon longitudinal study of parents and children: ALSPAC mothers cohort. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2013;42(1):97–110.
  30. Northstone K, Lewcock M, Groom A, Boyd A, Macleod J, Timpson N, et al. The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC): an update on the enrolled sample of index children in 2019 [version 1; peer review: 2 approved]. *Wellcome Open Res [Internet]*. 2019 [cited 2020 Jun 26];4. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6464058.1/>
  31. Saunders JB, Aasland OG, Babor TF, De La Fuente JR, Grant M. Development of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO Collaborative Project on Early Detection of Persons with Harmful Alcohol Consumption-II. *Addiction*. 1993;88(6):791–804.
  32. Meins E, McCarthy-Jones S, Fernyhough C, Lewis G, Bentall RP, Alloy LB. Assessing negative cognitive style: Development and validation of a Short-Form version of the Cognitive Style Questionnaire. *Pers Individ Dif*. 2012;52(5):581–5.
  33. Lewis G, Wen S, Pearson RM, Lewis G. The association between paternal depressogenic cognitive styles during pregnancy and offspring depressogenic cognitive styles: an 18-year prospective cohort study. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry [Internet]*. 2018 May 1 [cited 2020 Oct 19];59(5):604–14. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/jcpp.12847>
  34. Cox JL, Holdenand JM, Sagovsky R. Detection of Postnatal Depression Development of the 10-item Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale. Vol. 150, *British Journal of Psychiatry*. 1987.
  35. Lewis G, Pelosi AJ, Araya R, Dunn G. Measuring psychiatric disorder in the community: A standardized assessment for use by lay interviewers. *Psychol Med*. 1992;22(2):465–86.

36. Brookes ST, Whitely E, Egger M, Smith GD, Mulheran PA, Peters TJ. Subgroup analyses in randomized trials: Risks of subgroup-specific analyses; power and sample size for the interaction test. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2004;57(3):229–36.
37. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic criteria from DSM-IV. The Association; 1994. 358 p.
38. Sterne JAC, White IR, Carlin JB, Spratt M, Royston P, Kenward MG, et al. Multiple imputation for missing data in epidemiological and clinical research: Potential and pitfalls. *BMJ*. 2009;339(7713):157–60.
39. Angold A, Costello J, Van Kämmer W, Stouthamer-Loeber M. Development of a short questionnaire for use in epidemiological studies of depression in children and adolescents: factor composition and structure across development. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res*. 1996;5(4):251–62.
40. Brown SA, Christiansen BA, Goldman MS. The alcohol expectancy questionnaire: An instrument for the assessment of adolescent and adult alcohol expectancies. *J Stud Alcohol*. 1987;48(5):483–91.
41. Goodman E, Huang B. Socioeconomic status, depressive symptoms, and adolescent substance use. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* [Internet]. 2002 May 1 [cited 2020 Oct 19];156(5):448–53. Available from: <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/fullarticle/191853>
42. Fewell Z, Davey Smith G, Sterne JAC. The impact of residual and unmeasured confounding in epidemiologic studies: A simulation study. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2007;166(6):646–55.
43. Brown SA, McGue M, Maggs J, Schulenberg J, Hingson R, Swartzwelder S, et al. Underage alcohol use: Summary of developmental processes and mechanisms: Ages 16-20. *Alcohol Res Heal* [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2020 Oct 7];32(1):41–52. Available from: </pmc/articles/PMC3860496/?report=abstract>
44. Perkins HW. Stress-motivated drinking in collegiate and postcollegiate young adulthood: Life course and gender patterns. *J Stud Alcohol* [Internet]. 1999 Jan 4 [cited 2021 May 5];60(2):219–27. Available from: <https://www.jsad.com/doi/abs/10.15288/jsa.1999.60.219>
45. Bradley B, DeFife JA, Guarnaccia C, Phifer J, Fani N, Ressler KJ, et al. Emotion dysregulation and negative affect: Association with psychiatric symptoms. *J Clin Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2011 May 15 [cited 2021 May 5];72(5):685–91. Available from: <https://www.psychiatrist.com/jcp/medical/primary-care/emotion-dysregulation-negative-affect-association>
46. Chandley RB, Luebke AM, Messman-Moore TL, Rose MW. Anxiety sensitivity, coping motives, emotion dysregulation, and alcohol-related outcomes in college women: A moderated-mediation model. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs* [Internet]. 2014 Jan 21 [cited 2021 May 5];75(1):83–92. Available from: <https://www.jsad.com/doi/abs/10.15288/jsad.2014.75.83>
47. VanderWeele TJ. On the Relative Nature of Overadjustment and Unnecessary Adjustment. *Epidemiology*. 2009 Jul;20(4):496–9.
48. Martsh CT, Miller WR. Extraversion predicts heavy drinking in college students. *Pers Individ Dif*. 1997 Jul 1;23(1):153–5.
49. Kuntsche E, von Fischer M, Gmel G. Personality factors and alcohol use: A mediator analysis of drinking motives. *Pers Individ Dif*. 2008 Dec 1;45(8):796–800.
50. Lieberman L, Gorka SM, Huggins AA, Katz AC, Sarapas C, Shankman SA. Agreement between self- and informant-reported ratings of personality traits: The moderating effects of major depressive and/or panic disorder. *J Nerv Ment Dis*. 2016;204(4):306–13.
51. Hirschfeld RMA, Klerman GL, Clayton PJ, Keller MB. Personality and Depression: Empirical Findings. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* [Internet]. 1983 Sep 1 [cited 2020 Oct 19];40(9):993–8. Available from: <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapsychiatry/fullarticle/493136>
52. Bosnjak A, Boyle C, Chodkiewicz AR. An Intervention to Retrain Attributions Using CBT: A Pilot Study. *Educ Dev Psychol*. 2017 Jul 1;34(1):19–30.

53. Continuation cognitive-behavioural therapy maintains attributional style improvement in depressed patients responding acutely to fluoxetine.
54. Olthuis J V., Watt MC, Mackinnon SP, Stewart SH. CBT for high anxiety sensitivity: Alcohol outcomes. *Addict Behav.* 2015;46:19–24.
55. Watt M, Stewart S, Birch C, Bernier D. Brief CBT for high anxiety sensitivity decreases drinking problems, relief alcohol outcome expectancies, and conformity drinking motives: Evidence from a randomized controlled trial. *J Ment Heal.* 2006 Dec 1;15(6):683–95.

Figure 1: Flow of participants through the study.



**Table 1 – characteristics of the sample across high and low CSQ-SF scores for complete cases**

	<b>CSQ-SF score above median (range = 162-273) n=852</b>	<b>CSQ-SF score below median (range = 92-161) n=829</b>	<b>P Value<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>PARENT VARIABLES</b>			
Mean maternal age	30.0 (SD=4.5)	29.7 (SD=4.4)	0.197
Manual parental social class	315 (37%)	279 (34%)	0.155
Low maternal education <sup>2</sup>	374 (44%)	402 (49%)	0.059
High maternal depression <sup>3</sup>	121 (14%)	118 (14%)	0.985
<b>YOUNG PERSON VARIABLES</b>			
Female	551 (65%)	542 (62%)	0.256
High Drinking to Cope score at age 17 <sup>4</sup>	435 (51%)	314 (38%)	<.0001
High depression diagnosis score from CIS-R at age 17 <sup>4</sup>	546 (64%)	356 (43%)	<0.001
High anxiety score diagnosis from CIS-R at age 17 <sup>4</sup>	501 (59%)	346 (42%)	<.0001
Hazardous/harmful drinking at age 17 <sup>5</sup>	366 (43%)	297 (36%)	.003

<sup>1</sup> The p-value was calculated using a t-test for continuous data (maternal age). The p-value was calculated using a Chi-square test for all binary data (parental social class, maternal education, maternal depression, sex, Drinking to Cope at 17, depression at 17, anxiety at 17 and AUDIT score at 17.

<sup>2</sup>No A-Level or Degree qualification

<sup>3</sup>EPDS score >10

<sup>4</sup>Based on median split

<sup>5</sup>AUDIT Score >7



**Table 2: Change/mean difference (95% CI) in Drinking to Cope score according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6<sup>f</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety, alcohol use and Drinking to Cope at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	1,681	0.64 (0.47-0.80) p<.001	0.60 (0.44-0.77) p<.001	0.45 (0.28-0.63) p<.001	0.47 (0.30-0.64) p<.001	0.53 (0.37-0.69) p<.001	0.24 (0.08-0.41) p=.003
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	554 (32.96%)	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	564 (33.55%)	0.63 (0.23-1.03)	0.60 (0.19-1.00)	0.50 (0.10-0.90)	0.53 (0.13-0.93)	0.57 (0.18-0.96)	0.46 (0.10-0.83)
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	563 (33.49%)	1.49 (1.09-1.90)	1.43 (1.03-1.83)	1.13 (0.71-1.54)	1.17 (0.76-1.58)	1.28 (0.89-1.67)	0.79 (0.41-1.17)

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, Drinking to Cope at 17, depression at 17, anxiety at 17 and alcohol use at 17

**Table 3: Change/mean difference (95% CI) in in AUDIT-Consumption score according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6<sup>f</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety, alcohol use and Drinking to Cope at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	1,681	0.05 (-0.06-0.16) p=.351	0.04 (-0.07-0.15) p=.436	0.07 (-0.04-0.19) p=.213	0.08 (-0.04-0.19) p=.184	-0.03 (-0.13-0.07) p=.585	0.03 (-0.08-0.14) p=.591
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	554 (32.96%)	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	564 (33.55%)	0.20 (-0.07-0.47)	0.16 (-0.10-0.43)	0.18 (-0.08-0.45)	0.18 (-0.09-0.45)	0.14 (-0.11-0.39)	0.18 (-0.06-0.43)
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	563 (33.49%)	0.25 (-0.02-0.52)	0.23 (-0.04-0.50)	0.29 (-0.01-0.57)	0.29 (0.02-0.57)	0.09 (-0.16-0.34)	0.21 (-0.05-0.47)

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and AUDIT-Consumption Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and AUDIT-Consumption adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and AUDIT-Consumption adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and AUDIT-Consumption adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and AUDIT-Consumption adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and AUDIT-Consumption adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, Drinking to Cope at 17, depression at 17, anxiety at 17 and alcohol use at 17

**Table 4: Change/mean difference (95% CI) AUDIT-Dependence score according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6<sup>f</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety, alcohol use and Drinking to Cope at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	1,681	0.06 (0.02-0.11) p=.006	0.06 (0.01-0.10) p=.010	0.04 (-0.01-0.08) p=.115	0.04 (-0.01-0.08) p=.120	0.03 (-0.01-0.07) p=.132	0.01 (-0.04-0.05) p=.769
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	554 (32.96%)	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	564 (33.55%)	0.08 (-0.02-0.19)	0.07 (-0.04-0.18)	0.06 (-0.05-0.17)	0.06 (-0.05-0.17)	0.07 (-0.04-0.17)	0.06 (-0.05-0.16)
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	563 (33.49%)	0.16 (0.04-0.27)	0.16 (0.05-0.26)	0.11 (-0.00-0.23)	0.12 (0.01-0.23)	0.10 (0.00-0.21)	0.06 (-0.04-0.17)

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and AUDIT-Dependence unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and AUDIT-Dependence adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and AUDIT-Dependence adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and AUDIT-Dependence adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17


<sup>e</sup>CSQ and AUDIT-Dependence adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and AUDIT-Dependence adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, Drinking to Cope at 17, depression at 17, anxiety at 17 and alcohol use at 17




**Cognitive Style and Drinking to Cope: A Prospective Cohort Study**  
**SUPPLEMENTARY DATA**


**Figure S1: Histogram showing the distribution of Drinking to Cope raw scores**




**Figure S2: Histogram showing the distribution of Drinking to Cope residuals**




**Figure S3: Histogram showing the distribution of AUDIT-Consumption raw scores**




**Figure S4: Histogram showing the distribution of AUDIT-Consumption residuals**



**Figure S5: Histogram showing the distribution of AUDIT-Dependence raw scores**



**Figure S6: Histogram showing the distribution of AUDIT-Dependence residuals**



**Table S1 – Means and Standard Deviations for each item on the Drinking to Cope scale**

Question	Mean	SD
To forget your worries	0.45	0.61
To relax	1.17	0.78
To cheer up when you're in a bad mood	0.61	0.68
To help when you feel depressed	0.30	0.57
To help when you feel nervous	0.47	0.66
To help when your mood changes	0.15	0.42
To feel more self-confident and sure of yourself	0.73	0.75
Because there's nothing better to do	0.29	0.56

**Table S2 – Characteristics of analytic sample compared to the rest of the ALSPAC cohort.**

Characteristic	Remaining ALSPAC Sample <sup>a</sup> (N=12,696)	Complete cases (N=1762)	P Value <sup>b</sup>
CSQ <sup>c</sup>	160.95 (SD=20.24)	162.70 (SD=20.02)	.0071
Drinking to Cope at 24 <sup>d</sup>	4.19 (SD=3.77)	4.15 (SD=3.50)	.7642
AUDIT-Consumption at 24 <sup>e</sup>	5.02 (SD=2.62)	5.31 (SD=2.37)	.0004
AUDIT-Dependence at 24 <sup>f</sup>	0.53 (SD=1.14)	0.46 (SD=0.92)	.0630
Sex			
Male	6,568 (53.88%)	642 (36.44%)	<.0001
Female	5,621 (46.12%)	1,120 (63.56%)	
Social class			
Non-manual	4,672 (48.40%)	1,136 (64.47%)	<.0001
Manual	4,981 (51.60%)	626 (35.53%)	
Maternal education			
Compulsory	7,150 (67.75%)	816 (46.31%)	<.0001
Higher	3,403 (32.35%)	946 (53.69%)	
Maternal age	27.71 (SD=4.99)	29.86 (SD=4.42)	<.0001
Maternal depression	6.14 (SD=4.84)	5.58 (SD=4.43)	<.0001
Depression at 17	3.28 (SD=4.06)	3.15 (SD=3.83)	.2854
Anxiety at 17	1.37 (SD=2.34)	1.38 (SD=2.13)	.9065
AUDIT score at 17	7.21 (SD=5.14)	6.71 (SD=4.49)	.0016

<sup>a</sup>ALSPAC data not included in analytic sample. Rows for each characteristic do not always equal the total amount of participants (due to missing data)

<sup>b</sup>p-values obtained from independent t-tests for continuous variables (means and SDs) and chi-square tests for categorical variables (n %)

<sup>c</sup>N=3,882

<sup>d</sup>N= 3,374

<sup>e</sup>N= 3,521

<sup>f</sup>N= 3,510



**Table S3: Confounding variables across high and low CSQ-SF scores for all available cases**

	<b>High CSQ-SF score (range = 162-273) n=1915</b>	<b>Low CSQ-SF Score (range = 92-161) n=1967</b>	<b>P value</b>
<b>PARENT VARIABLES</b>			
Mean maternal age	29.6 (SD=4.7)	29.2 (SD=4.6)	0.009
Lower parental social class	700 (39%)	740 (41%)	0.265
Low maternal education <sup>2</sup>	909 (49%)	1,032 (54%)	<0.001
High maternal depression <sup>3</sup>	289 (16%)	277 (15%)	0.328
<b>YOUNG PERSON VARIABLES</b>			
Female	1,118 (58%)	1,112 (57%)	0.244
High depression diagnosis score from CIS-R at age 17 <sup>4</sup>	1,098 (62%)	806 (44%)	<0.001
High anxiety score diagnosis from CIS-R at age 17 <sup>4</sup>	977 (55%)	737 (40%)	<0.0001
Hazardous/harmful drinking at age 17 <sup>5</sup>	680 (42%)	641 (38%)	0.018

<sup>1</sup> The p-value was calculated using a t-test for continuous data (maternal age). The p-value was calculated using a Chi-square test for all binary data (parental social class, maternal education, depression, sex, depression at 17, anxiety at 17 and AUDIT score at 17).

<sup>2</sup>No A-Level or Degree qualification

<sup>3</sup>EPDS score >10

<sup>4</sup>Based on median split

<sup>5</sup>AUDIT Score >7

**Table S4: Odds ratios (95% CI) for Drinking to Cope score (split by the median), according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	1,762	1.34 (0.21-1.40) p<.001	1.31 (0.18-1.45) p<.001	1.24 (1.12-1.39) p<.001	1.23 (1.11-1.37) p<.001	1.30 (1.17-1.44) p<.001	1.23 (1.10-1.37) p<.001
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	576 (32.69%)	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	594 (33.71%)	1.24 (0.98-1.57) p=.071	1.22 (0.96-1.54) p=.097	1.17 (0.93-1.49) p=.183	1.17 (0.93-1.49) p=.177	1.23 (0.96-1.57) p=.095	1.19 (1.93-1.51) p=.171
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	592 (33.60%)	1.81 (1.42-2.30) p<.001	1.75 (1.37-2.23) p<.001	1.56 (1.22-2.00) p<.001	1.55 (1.21-1.98) p=.001	1.70 (1.32-2.19) p<.001	1.52 (1.17-1.97) p=.002

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17

**Table S5: Odds ratios (95% CI) for high Drinking to Cope score (split by the top 20% vs. bottom 80%) according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	1,762	1.45 (1.28-1.65) p<.001	1.43 (1.26-1.62) p<.001	1.30 (1.13-1.48) p<.001	1.31 (1.15-1.50) p<.001	1.37 (1.20-1.56) p<.001	1.24 (1.08-1.43) p=.002
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	576 (32.69%)	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	594 (33.71%)	1.67 (1.17-2.39) p=.005	1.62 (1.13-2.33) p=.008	1.53 (1.07-2.20) p=.021	1.57 (1.10-2.25) p=.014	1.62 (1.12-2.34) p=.010	1.15 (1.07-2.24) p=.020
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	592 (33.60%)	2.67 (1.90-3.74) p<.001	2.56 (1.82-3.60) p<.001	2.15 (1.51-3.05) p<.001	2.23 (1.57-3.16) p<.001	2.39 (1.68-3.39) p<.001	2.04 (1.42-2.92) p<.001

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17

**Table S6: Odds ratios (95% CI) for AUDIT-Consumption score (split by the median), according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	1,762	1.03 (0.94-1.13) p=.490	1.02 (0.93-1.13) p=.641	1.05 (0.95-1.16) p=.340	1.05 (0.95-1.16) p=.382	0.98 (0.88-1.08) p=.631	1.04 (0.94-1.16) p=.445
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	576 (32.69%)	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	594 (33.71%)	1.14 (0.90-1.43) p=.280	1.10 (0.87-1.39) p=.430	1.12 (0.88-1.41) p=.360	1.11 (0.88-1.40) p=.385	1.10 (0.86-1.41) p=.443	1.15 (0.90-1.47) p=.275
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	592 (33.60%)	1.12 (0.89-1.41) p=.335	1.10 (0.87-1.38) p=.446	1.15 (0.90-1.46) p=.262	1.14 (0.89-1.44) p=.298	1.01 (0.79-1.29) p=.963	1.14 (0.88-1.47) p=.324

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17

**Table S7: Odds ratios (95% CI) for high AUDIT-Consumption score (split by the top 20% vs. bottom 80%), according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	1,762	1.11 (0.99-1.25) p=.077	1.11 (0.98-1.25) p=.089	1.11 (0.98-1.26) p=.093	1.14 (1.00-1.29) p=.046	1.04 (0.92-1.18) p=.558	1.09 (0.96-1.25) p=.192
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	576 (32.69%)	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	594 (33.71%)	1.08 (0.80-1.45) p=.612	1.05 (0.78-1.42) p=.748	1.05 (0.78-1.42) p=.744	1.06 (0.78-1.43) p=.712	1.03 (0.75-1.40) p=.869	1.05 (0.76-1.43) p=.778
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	592 (33.60%)	1.27 (0.95-1.70) p=.108	1.26 (0.94-1.70) p=.122	1.27 (0.93-1.72) p=.130	1.31 (0.97-1.77) p=.083	1.11 (0.82-1.51) p=.502	1.21 (0.88-1.66) p=.242

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17

**Table S8: Odds ratios (95% CI) for AUDIT-Dependence score (split by the median), according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	1,762	1.15 (1.04-1.27) p=.008	1.14 (1.02-1.26) p=.018	1.09 (0.97-1.21) p=.140	1.08 (0.97-1.20) p=.175	1.08 (0.97-1.21) p=.150	1.05 (0.93-1.17) p=.442
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	576 (32.69%)	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	594 (33.71%)	1.28 (0.99-1.65) p=.065	1.24 (0.95-1.61) p=.111	1.21 (0.93-1.57) p=.164	1.21 (0.93-1.58) p=.151	1.23 (0.94-1.62) p=.128	1.22 (0.93-1.60) p=.155
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	592 (33.60%)	1.42 (1.10-1.84) p=.007	1.39 (1.07-1.81) p=.013	1.28 (0.98-1.68) p=.072	1.27 (0.97-1.66) p=.076	1.28 (0.97-1.68) p=.077	1.20 (0.91-1.60) p=.194

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17

**Table S9: Odds ratios (95% CI) for high AUDIT-Dependence score (split by the top 20% vs. bottom 80%), according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	1,762	1.11 (0.96-1.29) p=.169	1.10 (0.94-1.28) p=.236	1.01 (0.86-1.19) p=.915	1.01 (0.86-1.19) p=.864	1.00 (0.85-1.17) p=.987	0.93 (0.79-1.10) p=.422
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	576 (32.69%)	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	594 (33.71%)	1.16 (0.78-1.72) p=.462	1.21 (0.75-1.67) p=.574	1.07 (0.72-1.60) p=.732	1.09 (0.73-1.63) p=.662	1.09 (0.72-1.64) p=.693	1.06 (0.70-1.61) p=.776
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	592 (33.60%)	1.46 (1.00-2.13) p=.053	1.42 (0.97-2.09) p=.072	1.24 (0.83-1.85) p=.294	1.26 (0.85-1.87) p=.250	1.20 (0.81-1.80) p=.363	1.09 (0.72-1.65) p=.684

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17

**Table S10: Change/mean difference (95% CI) in Drinking to Cope score, according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles using imputed data**

	N	Model 1 <sup>a</sup> : univariable	Model 2 <sup>b</sup> : Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders	Model 3 <sup>c</sup> : Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17	Model 4 <sup>d</sup> : Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17	Model 5 <sup>e</sup> : Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17	Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	3,882	0.52 (0.39-0.66) p<.001	0.49 (0.35-0.63) p<.001	0.36 (0.22-0.50) p<.001	0.37 (0.23-0.51) p<.001	0.44 (0.31-0.57) p<.001	0.33 (0.20-0.47) p<.001
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	1,226 (31.58%)	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	1,332 (34.05%)	0.46 (0.13-0.78) p=.006	0.44 (0.12-0.76) p=.007	0.36 (0.03-0.68) p=.031	0.39 (0.07-0.71) p=.018	0.46 (0.15-0.78) p=.003	0.41 (0.10-0.72) p=.011
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	1,334 (34.36%)	1.21 (0.87-1.54) p<.001	1.14 (0.81-1.48) p<.001	0.86 (0.52-1.20) p<.001	0.91 (0.57-1.24) p<.001	1.04 (0.72-1.36) p<.001	0.82 (0.50-1.14) p<.001

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17



**Table S11: Change/mean difference (95% CI) in AUDIT-Consumption score, according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles using imputed data**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	3,882	0.05 (-0.05-0.15) p=.307	0.04 (-0.06-0.14) p=.404	0.06 (-0.04-0.16) p=.257	0.08 (-0.03-0.18) p=.144	-0.01 (-0.10-0.09) p=.882	0.07 (-0.03-0.17) p=.145
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	1,226 (31.58%)	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category	Reference Category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	1,332 (34.05%)	0.08 (-0.13-0.29) p=.445	0.06 (-0.15-0.27) p=.595	0.07 (-0.14-0.28) p=.527	0.07 (-0.14-0.28) p=.527	0.08 (-0.11-0.27) p=.425	0.12 (-0.07-0.32) p=.208
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	1,334 (34.36%)	0.19 (-0.05-0.43) p=.128	0.17 (-0.07-0.41) p=.169	0.21 (-0.04-0.45) p=.103	0.23 (-0.01-0.48) p=.063	0.07 (-0.15-0.30) p=.517	0.23 (0.00-0.47) p=.049

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17

**Table S12: Change/mean difference (95% CI) in AUDIT-Dependence score, according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles using imputed data**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	3,882	0.05 (0.01-0.09) p=.013	0.04 (0.01-0.08) p=.025	0.02 (-0.02-0.06) p=.303	0.03 (-0.01-0.07) p=.182	0.03 (-0.01-0.06) p=.144	0.02 (-0.02-0.06) p=.347
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	1,226 (31.58%)	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	1,332 (34.05%)	0.05 (-0.03-0.14) p=.227	0.05 (-0.04-0.13) p=.304	0.03 (-0.06-0.12) p=.478	0.04 (-0.05-0.12) p=.393	0.05 (-0.03-0.14) p=.217	0.05 (-0.04-0.13) p=.172
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	1,334 (34.36%)	0.12 (0.03-0.22) p=.011	0.11 (-0.04-0.13) p=.018	0.07 (-0.03-0.16) p=.168	0.08 (-0.01-0.18) p=.097	0.08 (-0.01-0.17) p=.076	0.06 (-0.03-0.16) p=.172

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17

**Table S13: Odds ratios (95% CI) for Drinking to Cope score (split by the median), according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles using imputed data**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	3,882	1.27 (1.17-1.37) p<.001	1.25 (1.16-1.35) p<.001	1.19 (1.09-1.29) p<.001	1.19 (1.10-1.30) p<.001	1.24 (1.14-1.35) p<.001	1.19 (1.09-1.30) p<.001
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	1,226 (31.58%)	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	1,332 (34.05%)	1.17 (0.98-1.40) p=.088	1.16 (0.97-1.39) p=.103	1.12 (1.07-1.34) p=.212	1.14 (0.95-1.36) p=.167	1.19 (0.98-1.43) p=.072	1.16 (0.96-1.40) p=.126
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	1,334 (34.36%)	1.68 (1.39-2.02) p<.001	1.64 (1.36-1.97) p<.001	1.46 (1.21-1.77) p<.001	1.49 (1.23-1.80) p<.001	1.62 (1.33-1.96) p<.001	1.47 (1.21-1.80) p<.001

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17

**Table S14: Odds ratios (95% CI) for high Drinking to Cope score (split by the top 20% vs. bottom 80%), according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles using imputed data**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	3,882	1.17 (1.08-1.28) p<.001	1.17 (1.07-1.27) p<.001	1.12 (1.02-1.22) p=.012	1.13 (1.04-1.23) p=.006	1.16 (1.06-1.27) p=.001	1.13 (1.03-1.24) p=.011
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	1,226 (31.58%)	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	1,332 (34.05%)	1.18 (0.96-1.45) p=.112	1.18 (0.96-1.45) p=.122	1.14 (0.93-1.41) p=.205	1.16 (0.94-1.43) p=.166	1.21 (0.98-1.49) p=.083	1.19 (0.96-1.47) p=.120
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	1,334 (34.36%)	1.43 (1.16-1.77) p=.001	1.42 (1.15-1.75) p=.001	1.29 (1.04-1.61) p=.020	1.32 (1.06-1.64) p=.012	1.40 (1.12-1.74) p=.003	1.31 (1.05-1.64) p=.019

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17

**Table S15: Odds ratios (95% CI) for AUDIT-Consumption score (split by the median), according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles using imputed data**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	3,882	1.04 (0.96-1.12) p=.364	1.03 (0.95-1.11) p=.492	1.04 (0.96-1.13) p=.308	1.05 (0.97-1.14) p=.209	1.00 (0.92-1.09) p=.957	1.07 (0.98-1.17) p=.157
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	1,226 (31.58%)	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	1,332 (34.05%)	1.04 (0.87-1.24) p=.662	1.02 (0.85-1.22) p=.824	1.03 (0.86-1.23) p=.752	1.03 (0.86-1.24) p=.734	1.05 (0.86-1.27) p=.633	1.09 (0.90-1.32) p=.398
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	1,334 (34.36%)	1.12 (1.09-1.35) p=.266	1.10 (0.90-1.34) p=.342	1.13 (0.93-1.38) p=.225	1.15 (0.94-1.41) p=.167	1.05 (0.85-1.30) p=.631	1.19 (0.96-1.48) p=.117

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17

**Table S16: Odds ratios (95% CI) for high AUDIT-Consumption score (split by the top 20% vs. bottom 80%), according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles using imputed data**

	N	Model 1 <sup>a</sup> : univariable	Model 2 <sup>b</sup> : Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders	Model 3 <sup>c</sup> : Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17	Model 4 <sup>d</sup> : Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17	Model 5 <sup>e</sup> : Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17	Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	3,882	1.00 (0.92-1.10) p=.940	1.01 (0.92-1.10) p=.877	1.01 (0.92-1.12) p=.760	1.03 (0.94-1.13) p=.566	0.99 (0.89-1.09) p=.805	1.04 (0.94-1.15) p=.436
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	1,226 (31.58%)	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	1,332 (34.05%)	1.02 (0.83-1.26) p=.820	1.01 (0.82-1.25) p=.911	1.02 (0.82-1.26) p=.873	1.02 (0.83-1.26) p=.845	1.04 (0.84-1.30) p=.709	1.08 (0.86-1.34) p=.521
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	1,334 (34.36%)	1.06 (0.84-1.33) p=.615	1.07 (0.85-1.34) p=.575	1.09 (0.86-1.38) p=.489	1.11 (0.88-1.40) p=.378	1.03 (0.81-1.32) p=.782	1.15 (0.89-1.48) p=.277

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17

**Table S17: Odds ratios (95% CI) for AUDIT-Dependence score (split by the median), according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles using imputed data**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Model 1<sup>a</sup>: univariable</b>	<b>Model 2<sup>b</sup>: Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders</b>	<b>Model 3<sup>c</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17</b>	<b>Model 4<sup>d</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17</b>	<b>Model 5<sup>e</sup>: Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17</b>	<b>Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17</b>
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	3,882	1.07 (0.99-1.16) p=.083	1.07 (0.99-1.16) p=.096	1.03 (0.95-1.12) p=.491	1.04 (0.96-1.13) p=.373	1.04 (0.96-1.13) p=.317	1.04 (0.96-1.13) p=.569
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	1,226 (31.58%)	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	1,332 (34.05%)	1.10 (0.91-1.33) p=.319	1.08 (0.90-1.31) p=.409	1.06 (0.87-1.28) p=.559	1.07 (0.88-1.29) p=.494	1.11 (0.90-1.36) p=.327	1.10 (0.90-1.35) p=.369
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	1,334 (34.36%)	1.19 (0.98-1.44) p=.077	1.19(0.98-1.44) p=.084	1.10 (0.90-1.34) p=.345	1.12 (0.92-1.37) p=.260	1.14 (0.92-1.40) p=.225	1.10 (0.89-1.36) p=.384

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17

**Table S18: Odds ratios (95% CI) for high AUDIT-Dependence score (split by the top 20% vs. bottom 80%) according to CSQ as a continuous variable and in tertiles using imputed data**

	N	Model 1 <sup>a</sup> : univariable	Model 2 <sup>b</sup> : Model 1 adjusted for potential confounders	Model 3 <sup>c</sup> : Model 2 further adjusted for depression at 17	Model 4 <sup>d</sup> : Model 2 further adjusted for anxiety at 17	Model 5 <sup>e</sup> : Model 2 further adjusted for alcohol use at 17	Model 6: Model 2 further adjusted for depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17
<b>CSQ increase of 20</b>	3,882	1.04 (0.94-1.14) p=.499	1.03 (0.94-1.14) p=.514	1.00 (0.90-1.11) p=.979	1.02 (0.91-1.13) p=.768	1.02 (0.92-1.13) p=.704	1.00 (0.90-1.12) p=.898
<b>CSQ tertiles</b>							
<b>CSQ (Low)</b>	1,226 (31.58%)	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category	Reference category
<b>CSQ (Medium)</b>	1,332 (34.05%)	0.98 (0.78-1.24) p=.883	0.98 (0.78-1.24) p=.874	0.96 (0.76-1.21) p=.703	0.97 (0.77-1.22) p=.776	0.99 (0.78-1.26) p=.926	0.98 (0.77-1.25) p=.874
<b>CSQ (High)</b>	1,334 (34.36%)	1.07 (0.83-1.38) p=.593	1.07 (0.83-1.38) p=.908	1.00 (0.77-1.30) p=.976	1.03 (0.80-1.34) p=.801	1.04 (0.80-1.35) p=.756	1.02 (0.78-1.33) p=.908

<sup>a</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope unadjusted

<sup>b</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education and maternal depression

<sup>c</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and depression at 17

<sup>d</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and anxiety at 17

<sup>e</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression and alcohol use at 17

<sup>f</sup>CSQ and Drinking to Cope adjusted for sex, parental social class, maternal age, maternal education, maternal depression, depression, anxiety and alcohol use at 17



