

Medical students' crisis-induced stress and the association with social support

Vera M.A. Broks MSc¹, Karen M. Stegers-Jager PhD¹, Jeroen van der Waal PhD², Walter W. Van den Broek MD PhD¹, & Andrea M. Woltman PhD^{1*}

¹Institute of Medical Education Research Rotterdam, Erasmus MC University Medical Centre Rotterdam, the Netherlands

²Department of Public Administration and Sociology, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

* Corresponding author

E-mail: a.woltman@erasmusmc.nl

Abstract

Background: Medical schools are challenged to guard student wellbeing due to the potential negative impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on top of the already high prevalence of mental distress. Whereas social support is generally associated with less crisis-induced stress, it is unknown whether this applies to medical students during the COVID-19 outbreak.

25 **Objectives:** The impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on perceived stress of medical students was assessed
26 by comparing their perceived stress levels during the outbreak to both their own baseline and the previous
27 cohort's pre-COVID-19 stress levels. Then, the association between social support and COVID-19 induced
28 stress was assessed.

29 **Methods:** Dutch Year-1 medical students of cohort 2019 ($n=99$) completed the 14-item Perceived Stress
30 Scale (PSS-14) at two time points: baseline (pre-COVID-19) and final measurement (COVID-19). Social
31 support - emotional-informational support and club membership - was assessed during the final
32 measurement. PSS and social support scores were compared to similar measurements of cohort 2018
33 ($n=196$). Students' baseline stress levels, gender and study performance were controlled for when
34 comparing two cohorts.

35 **Results:** Stress levels did not differ statistically significant between both pre-COVID-19 measurements of
36 cohort 2018 and baseline cohort 2019. During the COVID-19 outbreak, cohort 2019 showed significantly
37 higher stress levels compared to baseline (paired t-test: $t=6.07$, $p<.001$) and compared to cohort 2018
38 (linear regression: $B=4.186$, $p<.001$). Only during the COVID-19 outbreak, higher levels of social support -
39 i.e. emotional-informational support ($B=-0.75$, $p<.001$) and club membership ($B=-3.68$, $p<.01$) - were
40 associated with lower levels of stress.

41 **Conclusions:** During the COVID-19 outbreak, the perceived stress of medical students was higher -
42 especially for students with lower levels of social support. Our results suggest that medical schools should
43 optimize social support to minimize crisis-induced stress.

44

45 Key words: medical students, COVID-19, crisis, stress, social support

46 Introduction

47
48 The prevalence of mental distress, i.e. anxiety-, depression-, or burnout symptoms, in medical students is
49 high compared to their age-matched peers [1-3]. Approximately a quarter to one-third of medical
50 students shows symptoms of depression [4, 5], and roughly 40% shows burnout symptoms [6]. These
51 mental problems can be caused by stress [7]. A recent stressor in the shape of a crisis, is the COVID-19
52 outbreak. The outbreak's potential negative impact on mental wellbeing combined with the already high
53 prevalence of mental problems in medical students, exacerbates the challenge medical schools face to
54 guard their students' wellbeing [8]. Research regarding factors related to higher stress levels during a crisis
55 - or in other situations in which stressors increase - will enable medical schools to limit the negative impact
56 of such crises on student wellbeing. Social support is possibly one of the factors that is associated with
57 crisis induced stress [9-11]. Therefore, the present study has two objectives. The first objective is to
58 investigate whether the COVID-19 outbreak impacted perceived stress of medical students. The second
59 objective is to investigate the association between social support and COVID-19 induced stress for medical
60 students.

61
62 The COVID-19 outbreak has disrupted everyday life, which negatively impacted the mental wellbeing of
63 the general population [12-14]. Compared to the general population, especially students reported mental
64 health problems during the outbreak [15]. A possible explanation is that student life and its social aspects
65 were affected by measurements regarding social distancing, lockdown and if necessary quarantine [16],
66 including the transition to online education [17]. However, for medical students, studies show mixed
67 results regarding the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on wellbeing. A systematic review reports that
68 anxiety levels in medical students did not increase during the outbreak [18]. Whereas other studies report
69 higher levels of burnout symptoms and stress for medical students during the outbreak [19], especially

70 female students [20, 21]. However, these studies often consisted of self-reported increased stress levels
71 without a baseline measurement [20, 21], or did not correct for probable changes of stress levels
72 throughout the academic year regardless of the outbreak [19]. Finally, the role of academic performance
73 was not taken into account in previous studies while a negative relationship between study performance
74 and stress is known for medical students [22]. In summary, previous studies with respect to the impact of
75 the COVID-19 outbreak often lack controls for baseline measurements and student performance.

76
77 According to the stress-buffering model, the negative impact of a stressful event on wellbeing is stronger
78 for individuals with less social support [10, 11]. Firstly, because social support can prevent that someone
79 appraises an event as highly stressful. Secondly, because social support alleviates the impact of the
80 appraised stress by, for example, offering a solution or reducing the importance. Social support refers to
81 people who someone can turn to in times of crisis – such as family, friends, colleagues or neighbours. A
82 literature review shows that after a hurricane, tsunami or terrorist attack, social support is associated with
83 more resilience [23]. During the COVID-19 outbreak, literature with respect to the general population
84 indicates that social support is associated with a decreased sense of loneliness [24], and more resilience
85 [25]. For adolescents and college students, social support in times of COVID-19 is associated with less
86 depression and anxiety symptoms [26], and less stress symptoms [27]. For medical students, social
87 support has been shown to be positively linked to mental wellbeing [28-34]. However, to the best of our
88 knowledge, it is not yet known whether social support is associated with crisis-induced stress among
89 medical students, especially in a crisis that strains social contacts by all kinds of social distancing measures.

90 The COVID-19 outbreak offered the unique opportunity to assess crisis-induced stress on a large scale for
91 medical students. Existing studies cannot provide solid evidence of shifted stress levels during the COVID-
92 19 outbreak due to lack of required baseline measurements and controls for study performance. Even
93 though medical schools are unable to resolve the present COVID-19 crisis or any future crisis, they might

94 be able to help limit the negative consequences on – the already relatively low - student wellbeing. In
95 order to get more insights in how medical schools can provide the right support to their students in times
96 of crisis, we examined the following research questions:

- 97 1. What is the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on medical students' perceived stress compared to
98 both their own baseline stress level and compared to the stress level of the previous cohort, while
99 controlling for gender and study performance?
- 100 2. Does social support moderate the effect of the COVID-19 outbreak on the perceived stress of
101 medical students?

102 **Methods**

103

104 **Context**

105 The present study was conducted with Year-1 Bachelor students of Erasmus MC Medical School in the
106 Netherlands. Dutch medical schools consist of a 3-year Bachelor's- and 3-year Master's program. At
107 Erasmus MC Medical School, the Bachelor curriculum is composed of preclinical training in thematic
108 blocks and competence-based learning lines. Each year, 60 credits under the European Credit Transfer
109 System (ECTS) can be obtained, resulting in 180 credits for the complete Bachelor program. Grades are
110 based on a 10-point scale from 1 to 10 (maximum) where 5.5 is the minimum to pass. In March 2020, the
111 COVID-19 outbreak started to impact everyday life in the Netherlands. For the Bachelor students of
112 Erasmus MC Medical School, this entailed that all classes were dismissed and online education became
113 the new standard.

114 **Participants and procedure**

115 All Year-1 Bachelor students from Erasmus MC Medical School, who enrolled in cohorts 2018 (409
116 students) and 2019 (408 students) were invited to participate by completing a questionnaire regarding

117 perceived stress in December/January (baseline measurement – online questionnaire) and May (final
118 measurement – cohort 2018 on paper and online possible, cohort 2019 online) of their first academic
119 year. During the final measurement, social support was measured beside perceived stress. The sample in
120 the present study consisted of students who completed both questionnaires. Only the final measurement
121 of cohort 2019 took place during the COVID-19 outbreak (see Fig 1A). Students provided informed consent
122 for the data collected by questionnaires. They also agreed to link questionnaire results to relevant data
123 from the student administration. The university student administration provided data regarding gender
124 and study performance up to the final measurement. Since these data only were reported on an
125 aggregated level for the complete cohorts, no individual consent was required. The study was carried out
126 in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and was deemed exempt from review after evaluation by
127 the Medical Ethics Committee of Erasmus MC Rotterdam (MEC-2019-0448).

Fig 1A





Fig 1B



128

129 **Fig 1. Timeline of data collection and mean perceived stress level for each measurement.**

130 **Fig 1A. Timeline of data collection.** The COVID-19 pandemic started to impact everyday life and medical
 131 school during Year-1 of cohort 2019 (March 2020).

132 **Fig 1B. Mean perceived stress levels including error bars.** Mean stress-levels are shown for the baseline
 133 measurement (mean=25.38, SE=0.51) and the final measurement (mean=26.00, SE=0.54) for cohort 2018
 134 and baseline measurement (mean=26.05, SE=0.79) and the final measurement (mean=30.65, SE=0.99) for
 135 cohort 2019. Differences are assessed within a cohort with a paired t-test. The difference between the
 136 final measurement of cohort 2018 and cohort 2019 is assessed in a linear regression model while
 137 controlling for baseline measurement, gender and study performance (Table 2 – Model 1). Significant
 138 differences between measurements are shown: *** p<.001.

139

140 **Measurements**

141

142 **Student characteristics**

143 Student characteristics taken into account in the present study are gender and study performance.

144 Gender is categorized as male or female. Student performance is operationalized by measuring whether

145 students obtained all possible credits up until the final measurement in May of Year-1 (yes/no). The

146 maximum number of obtainable credits up until the final measurement was equal to 38 credits for cohort

147 2018 and equal to 25 credits for cohort 2019. This difference in credits was due to the fact that for cohort

148 2019, some exams were postponed due to the COVID-19 outbreak along with the transition to online

149 education.

150 **Perceived stress (PSS-14)**

151 Perceived stress was measured with a Dutch version of the 14-item perceived stress scale (PSS-14) [35,

152 36]. As recently described, this questionnaire is appropriate to measure stress responses [37], and

153 measures general distress and someone's ability to cope with this stress. The questionnaire focuses on

154 feelings during the last month, therefore, every item starts with "In the last month...", for example "In the

155 last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?". The

156 items are scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 4 (very often). The maximum score on

157 the PSS-14 is 56.

158

159 **Social support**

160 Social support was assessed with questions regarding emotional-informational support and club

161 membership to cover different types of social support that are relevant to students in the Netherlands

162 [38]. To measure emotional-informational support, four items of the MOS social support scale were

163 selected from the subscale emotional-informational support [39] (S1 Table). For the selection of the items,

164 the following was taken into account: an equal distribution of both emotional and informational items,
165 item-scale correlations and applicability to our sample of medical students. The selected items focus on
166 the availability of different forms of social support: for example, having someone to listen to you, to offer
167 you advice or to share your thoughts with. The items are scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0
168 (never) to 4 (always). The maximum score on emotional-informational support is 16. Alpha reliability
169 measures were computed in order to assess internal consistency for this adjusted scale (S1 Table). The
170 second operationalization of social support was club membership. Club membership was measured with
171 the closed yes/no question “Are you member of a hobby club, sports club or a leisure club?”.

172

173 **Statistical analysis**

174 Analyses were performed on results of students that completed both the baseline questionnaire and final
175 questionnaire during Year-1. First, the samples of the two included cohorts were compared regarding
176 response rates, gender, study performance, social support and stress levels. T-tests and Wilcoxon rank-
177 sum tests were used for the comparison on normally and non-normally distributed continuous variables
178 respectively. Dichotomous variables were compared between cohorts with chi-square tests. Then, to
179 study the impact of COVID-19 on perceived stress, paired t-tests were performed on baseline stress levels
180 and related final measurement stress levels of both cohort 2018 and cohort 2019. In addition, stress levels
181 during the final measurement of cohort 2018 (pre-COVID-19) and cohort 2019 (COVID-19) were compared
182 in a linear regression model while controlling for baseline stress level, gender and study performance. The
183 effect of social support on perceived stress was assessed by adding emotional-informational support and
184 club membership to the linear regression model. Finally, the interaction terms of social support and cohort
185 were added to the linear regression model to investigate whether the relation between social support
186 and perceived stress was different during the COVID-19 outbreak. Post-hoc linear regression analysis was
187 performed for both cohorts to study whether emotional-informational support and club membership

188 were complementary to each other in relation to stress levels. To this end, groups based on social support
189 were formed by crossing the presence of club membership (yes/no) with emotional-informational support
190 (high/low). Emotional-informational support was considered low when students' scores were in the 25th
191 percentile of the complete sample.

192 Results

193

194 Cohort characteristics

195 The response rate was lower in cohort 2019 compared to cohort 2018 (24% vs. 48%, Table 1). Proportions
 196 of female students and of students who acquired all obtainable credits until the final measurement were
 197 comparable between cohorts (see Table 1). Though emotional-informational support scores remained the
 198 same (Table 1), a chi-square test showed that the percentage of students that was member of a club was
 199 significantly lower in cohort 2019: 56% in cohort 2019 compared to 68% in cohort 2018 ($\chi^2=4.150$, $df=1$,
 200 $p<0.05$). The mean baseline stress level was comparable between cohorts, but the mean stress level
 201 during the final measurement was significantly higher for cohort 2019 than for cohort 2018 ($t=4.134$,
 202 $df=158.69$, $p<.001$).

203 **Table 1. Descriptive statistics of variables included in the analyses.**

	Cohort 2018		Cohort 2019		Comparison of cohorts (samples)
	Total	Sample	Total	Sample	
Number of students (% of total)	409 (100)	196 (48)	408 (100)	99 (24)	$\chi^2= 48.529$, $df=1$, $p<.001$
Female students: %	74	79	68	74	$\chi^2= 0.787$, $df=1$, $p=0.375$
Students with all credits obtained until final measurement: %	66	71	65	67	$\chi^2= 0.378$, $df=1$, $p=0.539$
<u>Social support</u>					
Median emotional-informational support: median/total (range)^a	-	14/16 (3-16)	-	14/16 (2-16)	$W=10250$, $p=0.419$
Club member: % yes	-	68	-	56	$\chi^2= 4.150$, $df=1$, $p<.05$
<u>Stress level (PSS-14)</u>					
Mean baseline measurement	-	25.38	-	26.05	$t=-0.710$, $df=181.62$, $p=0.479$
Mean final measurement	-	26.00	-	30.65	$t=4.134$, $df=158.69$, $p<.001$

204 ^a Data are not normally distributed, non-parametric Wilcoxon rank-sum test is used to compare cohorts

205

206

207 **Perceived stress levels**

208 A paired t-test showed that the perceived stress levels of cohort 2019 significantly increased from 26.05
209 to 30.65 ($t=6.07$, $df=98$, $p<.001$), whereas the stress levels of cohort 2018 did not significantly differ
210 between the baseline and final measurement (Fig 1B). This indicates that the perceived stress levels of
211 students significantly increased during the COVID-19 outbreak.

212 To assess the effect of the COVID-19 outbreak, we not only compared stress levels *within* cohorts, we also
213 compared the stress levels during the final measurement *between* two cohorts of medical students. With
214 respect to the control variables, a higher baseline stress level and not having obtained all obtainable
215 credits were related to higher stress levels during the final measurement (Table 2 – Model 1). When
216 controlling for baseline stress level, gender and study performance, a significantly higher perceived stress
217 level was visible for cohort 2019 (COVID-19) compared to cohort 2018 (Pre-COVID-19; $B_{\text{cohort}}=4.186$, 95%-
218 CI: 2.608 – 5.764, $p<.001$, Table 2 – Model 1 and Fig 1B). Compared to cohort 2018, the perceived stress
219 levels for students of cohort 2019 – during the COVID-19 outbreak – were on average approximately 4
220 units higher on the Perceived Stress Scale (ranging from 0 to 56).

221 **Table 2. Results linear regression model with outcome variable stress level (PSS-14) in the final measurement.**


	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	B [95% CI]	sig.	B [95% CI]	sig.	B [95% CI]	sig.
<i>Intercept</i>	11.353 [8.000 – 14.707]	-	19.004 [14.022 – 23.985]	-	15.370 [9.740 – 20.999]	-
PSS (first measurement)	0.616 [0.511 – 0.721]	***	0.567 [0.461 – 0.672]	***	0.579 [0.474 – 0.684]	***
Gender (female) ^a	1.766 [-0.061 – 3.594]	.	2.231 [0.433 – 4.030]	*	2.163 [0.384 – 3.943]	*
All credits obtained ^b	-3.372 [-5.025 – -1.718]	***	-3.637 [-5.260 – -2.016]	***	-3.427 [-5.041 – -1.813]	***
Cohort (2019; COVID-19) ^c	4.186 [2.608 – 5.764]	***	3.894 [2.341 – 5.446]	***	12.442 [5.775 – 19.109]	***
Emotional-informational (E-I) support Club member (yes) ^d			-0.417 [-0.659 – -0.177]	***	-0.230 [-0.532 – 0.0714]	
			-1.636 [-3.197 – -0.077]	*	-0.501 [-2.429 – 1.428]	
Cohort (2019) * E-I support Cohort (2019) * Club member (yes)					-0.516 [-1.004 – -0.027]	*
					-3.180 [-6.333 – -0.028]	*
Adjusted R²	0.436		0.462		0.474	

222 Note: Dependent variable: stress level during the final measurement: score on the PSS-14 (min=0, max=56). “B” refers to the unstandardized
 223 regression coefficient together with the 95% confidence interval (95% CI). For each regression coefficient, the table shows whether it significantly
 224 deviates from 0 (H₀: B=0, H_A: B≠0) in the column “sig.” using the following codes: *** p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05, . p<.1. ^aReference category: male
 225 gender. ^bReference category: *not all possible credits obtained*. ^cReference category: *cohort 2018 (pre-COVID-19)*. ^dReference category: *no club*
 226 *membership*.

227 **Social support**

228 After including social support, the difference in perceived stress levels between cohorts remained present
229 ($B_{\text{cohort}}=3.894$, 95%-CI: 2.341 – 5.446, $p<.001$, Table 2 – Model 2). This means that when taking into account
230 social support, perceived stress levels were still significantly higher during the COVID-19 outbreak. In
231 addition, when a student experienced more emotional-informational support, perceived stress levels
232 were lower ($B_{\text{E-I support}}=-0.417$, 95%-CI: -0.659 – -0.177, $p<.001$, Table 2 – Model 2). Also, students who were
233 member of a club had significant lower stress levels compared to their fellow students who were not
234 member of a club ($B_{\text{club member}}=-1.636$, 95%-CI: -3.197 – -0.077, $p<.05$, Table 2 – Model 2).

235 Finally, to investigate whether social support is associated with the effect of the COVID-19 outbreak on
236 perceived stress levels, the moderating effects of emotional-informational support and club membership
237 with cohort were included. Both the effects of emotional-informational support ($B_{\text{E-I support*cohort}}=-0.516$,
238 95%-CI: -1.004 – -0.027, $p<.05$) and club membership ($B_{\text{club member*cohort}}=-3.180$, 95%-CI: -6.333 – -0.028,
239 $p<.05$; Table 2 – Model 3) were significantly different for cohort 2019 (COVID-19) compared to cohort
240 2018 (pre-COVID-19). For cohort 2019, a significant decrease in stress levels was visible as emotional-
241 informational support increased (Fig 2A). For cohort 2018 a slight decrease in stress level was visible too,
242 however, this decrease was not statistically significant. Regarding club membership, only cohort 2019
243 demonstrated a significant difference in stress level between students who were a club member or not
244 (Fig 2B). The results indicate that for cohort 2019, emotional-informational support and club membership
245 were complementary to each other in relation to stress levels since the effects exist beside each other. In
246 line, post-hoc analysis showed that for cohort 2019, emotional-informational support and club
247 membership were complementary to each other in relation to stress levels. Students with only one of the
248 two types of social support – i.e. club membership *or* high emotional-informational support - showed
249 significantly higher stress levels compared to students with both types of social support (Fig 3). For cohort
250 2018, differences in stress levels based on social support were not present.



251


252 **Fig 2. Social support and perceived stress level during the final measurement per cohort.**

253 **Fig 2A. Emotional-informational support.** Each dot represents an observation and demonstrates the
254 perceived stress level and the level of emotional-informational support of an individual student. The slope
255 of the regression line represents the effect of emotional-informational support on stress level. The slope
256 of the regression line in grey for cohort 2018 is equal to -0.23 (non-significant, Table 2 – Model 3). The
257 slope of the regression line in black for cohort 2019 is -0.75 ($p < .001$; p-value is based on a post-hoc
258 analysis), which equals the sum of the regression coefficients for emotional-informational support and
259 emotional-informational support*cohort 2019= -0.23-0.52=-0.75 (Table 2 – Model 3).

260 **Fig 2B. Club membership.** Observed mean perceived stress levels including error bars ($M \pm SE$) for students
261 without and with club membership. In the linear regression model, for cohort 2018, no significant effect
262 is present for club membership (coefficient club member = -0.50, non-significant, Table 2 – Model 3). For
263 cohort 2019, the linear regression model shows a difference of -3.68 ($p < .01$; p-value is based on a post-
264 hoc analysis), which is the sum of the regression coefficients for club member and club member*cohort
265 2019: $-0.50 - 3.18 = -3.68$ (Table 2 – Model 3).

266

267



268
 269 **Fig 3. Perceived stress level of groups during the final measurement based on club membership and**
 270 **emotional-informational support.**

271 Mean perceived stress level for groups based on club membership and emotional-informational support
 272 for cohort 2018 and cohort 2019 including error bars. Emotional-informational support is unchecked if
 273 the score is ≤ 25 th percentile of the complete sample (score ≤ 11). For each cohort separately, the stress
 274 level of groups 2 to 4 are compared to the stress level of group 1 in a post-hoc linear regression analysis
 275 (reference group=Ref.). For cohort 2018, group 2 to 4 do not differ significantly from group 1 regarding
 276 stress level. For cohort 2019, group 2 to 4 do differ significantly from group 1 regarding stress level:
 277 * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, respectively.

278 Discussion

279
280 The present study demonstrates that the perceived stress levels of medical students were significantly
281 higher during the COVID-19 outbreak – compared to their own pre-COVID-19 baseline stress levels as well
282 as to stress levels of the previous cohort. During the outbreak, students experiencing less emotional-
283 informational support or not being member of a club, showed higher perceived stress levels compared to
284 their fellow students with more emotional-informational support or who were member of a club. The
285 results indicate that during times of crisis, social support is associated with less perceived stress of medical
286 students.

287 Our finding that stress levels of medical students during the COVID-19 outbreak were higher compared to
288 pre-COVID-19 stress levels, corresponds with previous studies reporting higher stress levels during the
289 outbreak [19-21]. We found that students' stress levels increased compared to both their own baseline
290 stress levels as well as compared to the stress levels of a previous cohort, including controls for gender
291 and study performance. Also, we could take into account potential fluctuations during the academic year
292 regardless of the pandemic, as reported in a previous study [40]. The mean stress level reported in the
293 present study during the outbreak was higher than the mean stress level of Dutch medical students after
294 increased performance standards [36]. Yet, the currently reported stress levels did not exceed stress levels
295 of medical students in the US after the implementation of a new curriculum [41]. The reason why the
296 COVID-19 outbreak elevated stress levels goes beyond the scope of the present study, but one might
297 speculate about a mix of academic uncertainty [8, 17], online education [20], blurred study-home
298 boundaries and social isolation [42]. Students' stress levels are subjected to a variety of factors and
299 thereby context-specific. This context-specificity of students' stress levels illustrates the importance of
300 baseline measurements to make valid comparisons. Such baseline measurements could also serve future
301 research on the long-term effects of this COVID-19 induced stress.

302 In line with the stress-buffering model [10, 11], we found that only during the COVID-19 outbreak, higher
303 levels of social support were associated with lower stress levels for medical students. This shows that also
304 during a crisis in which social contacts are strained by social distancing measures, social support is
305 associated with lower stress levels. This mechanism is also corroborated by a recent study in which
306 medical students report that their own most effective strategies to lower the negative impact of stress
307 include de-stress through friends and family [43]. Studies report that in times of the COVID-19 outbreak,
308 social support is positively associated to wellbeing in adolescents [26], college students[27], and the
309 general population [24]. These present study adds to these findings in two ways. First, by providing
310 evidence that this also applies to medical students; a group that already experiences higher levels of
311 mental distress compared to their peers [1-3]. Second, by showing that the association between social
312 support and stress level also applies in times of crisis where social support is strained due to social
313 distancing measurements [12, 13]. Even though the present study did not reveal lower levels of
314 emotional-information support during the COVID-19 outbreak, the number of students who reported
315 being member of a club did decrease from 68% to 56%. This decrease is possibly the result of measures
316 taken to limit the spread of the coronavirus, thereby making it impossible for clubs to gather with their
317 members. A potential explanation why emotional-informational support did not decrease is that students
318 moved back home to their parents' house where emotional-informational support was still available to
319 them since close family is a source of social support for Dutch students [38].

320 The present study illustrates how two forms of social support – emotional-informational support and club
321 membership - are complementary to each other in relation to reported stress levels during the COVID-19
322 outbreak. A possible explanation for this finding can be found in a theoretical model for mechanisms
323 linking social support to health, where primary and secondary social resources are distinguished,
324 described as *intimates* and *knowledgeable others* respectively [44]. According to this model, the two
325 sources of social support each have their own attributions to buffering the impact of stressors. *Intimates*

326 buffer the stress by companionate presence, offering care and instrumental assistance whereas
327 *knowledgeable others* buffer stress by enabling ventilation and by role modelling. Emotional-
328 informational support can be considered a primary source – i.e., intimates - whereas club membership
329 can be considered a secondary source of social support – i.e., knowledgeable others. This possibly explains
330 the added value of both emotional-informational and club membership towards each other. Yet, it should
331 be noted that club membership reflects more than the level of social support, as previous research also
332 showed its link to socioeconomic status. For example, it was shown that adolescent girls with lower
333 socioeconomic status were less likely to participate in a sports club [45]. Therefore, it is possible that a
334 lack of club membership also reflects a lower socioeconomic status, which in turn negatively affects self-
335 reported health [46]. In line, during the COVID-19 outbreak it was found that university workers living in
336 smaller homes reported higher levels of anxiety- depression- and stress symptoms [47]. Also, for college
337 students during the COVID-19 outbreak, economic disadvantage was associated with higher stress levels
338 [48]. Perhaps, the higher levels of stress found in the present study for students without club membership
339 are also partially explained by their socioeconomic status, but more research is needed.

340 A strength of the current study is that two measurements within two cohorts are included, enabling
341 controls for baseline measurements and potential fluctuations throughout the academic year described
342 in the literature [40]. Moreover, gender and study performance were controlled for, which are known to
343 be correlated with stress levels [20, 22, 36]. Even though study performance was taken into account, the
344 meaning of having obtained all possible credits up until the final measurement differed between cohorts.
345 Due to the outbreak, exams were postponed which resulted in a higher number of exams that still had to
346 be completed in the last part of the academic year. Therefore, the present study controlled for study
347 performance of students regardless of the COVID-19 outbreak, in order to rule out potential effects of
348 differences in performance level between students of different cohorts. However, this does not exclude
349 the potential stress caused by postponed exams during the outbreak as described in a previous study [49].

350 Further, a limitation of the present study is the lower response-rate for cohort 2019. This was possibly
351 due to the COVID-19 outbreak, which resulted in a fully online data collection instead of a combination of
352 data collection in class and online. Even though we were able to control for student characteristics in the
353 analyses, a bias may still be present due to this lower response-rate. The present study focused on Year-
354 1 students, and this appears to be a relevant group since students in early stages of medical and dental
355 school seem susceptible to the negative impact of the COVID-19 outbreak [19, 50]. Whether the results
356 described in the present study will be similar for students in advanced stages of medical school needs to
357 be further investigated. This also applies to the generalizability of the results to students from other
358 schools, since the relation between social support and perceived stress may be different for medical
359 students compared to students from other schools due to the higher prevalence of mental distress in
360 medical students compared to their age-matched peers [1, 2].

361 Even though medical schools are not able to change the current COVID-19 crisis or any future crisis, they
362 can help students get through it. Our findings suggest that in times of crisis medical students' wellbeing
363 can benefit from social support. With the COVID-19 pandemic still not being over and potential new
364 lockdowns are possible, medical schools could play a more active role themselves by further exploring the
365 (digital) options to provide different kinds of social support to its students. The first type of social support
366 entails companionate care and instrumental assistance, which can be provided through one-on-one
367 (online) mentoring with a faculty member [51], or a peer [52, 53]. The second type of social support has
368 more to do with enabling ventilation with peers and role modelling, some sort of social embeddedness.
369 Medical schools can achieve this by for example creating online communication platforms [54], or by
370 stimulating peer relationships by promoting cooperation amongst students in the medical school program
371 [55, 56]. All in all, when implementing (online) education, medical schools should not only focus on
372 qualification but also on the social functions of education.

373 To conclude, the present study provides solid evidence of COVID-19 induced stress in medical students,
374 especially among those with less social support. Findings of the present study are in line with an existing
375 model describing the buffering effect of social support on crisis-induced stress and therefore go beyond
376 the current COVID-19 pandemic. Medical schools can optimize social support for its students by offering
377 social support on different levels in order to minimize the negative impact of future global, national or
378 individual crises.

379

380 **Acknowledgements**

381 We thank Daphne Pol, who helped with data collection and data entry of cohort 2018 for our study. We
382 also wish to thank David van Klaveren for helping us with our statistical analyses.

383

384 References

- 385 1. Dyrbye LN, Thomas MR, Shanafelt TD. Systematic review of depression, anxiety, and other
386 indicators of psychological distress among US and Canadian medical students. *Acad Med.*
387 2006;81(4):354-73. doi: 10.1097/00001888-200604000-00009.
- 388 2. Hope V, Henderson M. Medical student depression, anxiety and distress outside North A
389 merica: a systematic review. *Med Educ.* 2014;48(10):963-79. doi: 10.1111/medu.12512.
- 390 3. Dyrbye L, Shanafelt T. A narrative review on burnout experienced by medical students and
391 residents. *Med Educ.* 2016;50(1):132-49. doi: 10.1111/medu.12927.
- 392 4. Rotenstein LS, Ramos MA, Torre M, Segal JB, Peluso MJ, Guille C, et al. Prevalence of depression,
393 depressive symptoms, and suicidal ideation among medical students: a systematic review and meta-
394 analysis. *JAMA.* 2016;316(21):2214-36. doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.17324.
- 395 5. Puthran R, Zhang MWB, Tam WW, Ho RC. Prevalence of depression amongst medical students:
396 A meta-analysis. *Med Educ.* 2016;50(4):456-68. doi: 10.1111/medu.12962.
- 397 6. Frajerman A, Morvan Y, Krebs M-O, Gorwood P, Chaumette B. Burnout in medical students
398 before residency: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Psychiatry.* 2019;55:36-42. doi:
399 10.1016/j.eurpsy.2018.08.006.
- 400 7. Epel ES, Crosswell AD, Mayer SE, Prather AA, Slavich GM, Puterman E, et al. More than a feeling:
401 A unified view of stress measurement for population science. *Front Neuroendocrinol.* 2018;49:146-69.
402 doi: 10.1016/j.yfrne.2018.03.001.
- 403 8. Slavin S. *Mental Health from Medical School to Medical Practice: Finding a Path Forward.* *Mo*
404 *Med.* 2021;118(1):7.
- 405 9. Cobb S. Social support as a moderator of life stress. *Psychosom Med.* 1976. doi:
406 10.1097/00006842-197609000-00003.
- 407 10. Cohen S. Social relationships and health. *Am Psychol.* 2004;59(8):676.
- 408 11. Cohen S, Wills TA. Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychol Bull.*
409 1985;98(2):310. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310.
- 410 12. Galea S, Merchant RM, Lurie N. The Mental Health Consequences of COVID-19 and Physical
411 Distancing: The Need for Prevention and Early Intervention. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2020;180(6):817-8. doi:
412 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.156201.
- 413 13. Marroquín B, Vine V, Morgan R. Mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic: Effects of stay-
414 at-home policies, social distancing behavior, and social resources. *Psychiatry Res.* 2020;293:113419. doi:
415 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113419.
- 416 14. Xiong J, Lipsitz O, Nasri F, Lui LMW, Gill H, Phan L, et al. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental
417 health in the general population: A systematic review. *J Affect Disord.* 2020;277:55-64. doi:
418 10.1016/j.jad.2020.08.001.
- 419 15. Kar N, Kar B, Kar S. Stress and coping during COVID-19 pandemic: Result of an online survey.
420 *Psychiatry Res.* 2020;295:113598. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113598.
- 421 16. Dubey S, Biswas P, Ghosh R, Chatterjee S, Dubey MJ, Chatterjee S, et al. Psychosocial impact of
422 COVID-19. *Diabetes Metab Syndr.* 2020;14(5):779-88. doi: 10.1016/j.dsx.2020.05.035.
- 423 17. Liu CH, Pinder-Amaker S, Hahm HC, Chen JA. Priorities for addressing the impact of the COVID-
424 19 pandemic on college student mental health. *J Am Coll Health.* 2020:1-3. doi:
425 10.1080/07448481.2020.1803882.
- 426 18. Lasheras I, Gracia-García P, Lipnicki DM, Bueno-Notivol J, López-Antón R, De La Cámara C, et al.
427 Prevalence of anxiety in medical students during the COVID-19 pandemic: a rapid systematic review
428 with meta-analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;17(18):6603. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17186603

- 429 19. Zis P, Artemiadis A, Bargiotas P, Nteveros A, Hadjigeorgiou GM. Medical Studies during the
430 COVID-19 Pandemic: The Impact of Digital Learning on Medical Students' Burnout and Mental Health.
431 *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(1):349. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18010349.
- 432 20. Abdulghani HM, Sattar K, Ahmad T, Akram A. Association of COVID-19 Pandemic with
433 undergraduate Medical Students' Perceived Stress and Coping. *Psychol Res Behav Manag*. 2020;13:871.
434 doi: 10.2147/PRBM.S276938.
- 435 21. O'Byrne L, Gavin B, Adamis D, Lim YX, McNicholas F. Levels of stress in medical students due to
436 COVID-19. *J Med Ethics*. 2021;47(6):383-8. doi: 10.1136/medethics-2020-107155.
- 437 22. LeBlanc VR. The effects of acute stress on performance: implications for health professions
438 education. *Acad Med*. 2009;84(10):S25-S33. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0b013e3181b37b8f.
- 439 23. Rodriguez-Llanes JM, Vos F, Guha-Sapir D. Measuring psychological resilience to disasters: are
440 evidence-based indicators an achievable goal? *Environ Health*. 2013;12(1):1-10. doi: 10.1186/1476-
441 069X-12-115.
- 442 24. Groarke JM, Berry E, Graham-Wisener L, McKenna-Plumley PE, McGlinchey E, Armour C.
443 Loneliness in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic: Cross-sectional results from the COVID-19
444 Psychological Wellbeing Study. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(9):e0239698. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0239698.
- 445 25. Polizzi C, Lynn SJ, Perry A. Stress and coping in the time of COVID-19: Pathways to resilience and
446 recovery. *Clin Neuropsychiatry*. 2020;17(2). doi: 10.36131/CN20200204.
- 447 26. Qi M, Zhou S-J, Guo Z-C, Zhang L-G, Min H-J, Li X-M, et al. The effect of social support on mental
448 health in Chinese adolescents during the outbreak of COVID-19. *J Adolesc Health*. 2020;67(4):514-8. doi:
449 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.07.001.
- 450 27. Ye Z, Yang X, Zeng C, Wang Y, Shen Z, Li X, et al. Resilience, social support, and coping as
451 mediators between COVID-19-related stressful experiences and acute stress disorder among college
452 students in China. *Appl Psychol Health Well-Being*. 2020;12(4):1074-94. doi: 10.1111/aphw.12211.
- 453 28. Dyrbye LN, Power DV, Massie FS, Eacker A, Harper W, Thomas MR, et al. Factors associated with
454 resilience to and recovery from burnout: a prospective, multi-institutional study of US medical students.
455 *Med Educ*. 2010;44(10):1016-26. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2010.03754.x.
- 456 29. Choi AMK, Moon JE, Friedman RA. Meeting the challenges of medical student mental health and
457 well-being today. *Med Educ*. 2020;54(3):183-5. doi: 10.1111/medu.14064.
- 458 30. Jeong Y, Kim JY, Ryu JS, eun Lee K, Ha EH, Park H. The associations between social support,
459 health-related behaviors, socioeconomic status and depression in medical students. *Epidemiol Health*.
460 2010;32. doi: 10.4178/epih/e2010009.
- 461 31. Thompson G, McBride RB, Hosford CC, Halaas G. Resilience among medical students: the role of
462 coping style and social support. *Teach Learn Med*. 2016;28(2):174-82. doi:
463 10.1080/10401334.2016.1146611.
- 464 32. Cheng J, Zhao YY, Wang J, Sun YH. Academic burnout and depression of Chinese medical
465 students in the pre-clinical years: the buffering hypothesis of resilience and social support. *Psychol*
466 *Health Med*. 2020;25(9):1094-105. doi: 10.1080/13548506.2019.1709651.
- 467 33. Chunming WM, Harrison R, MacIntyre R, Travaglia J, Balasooriya C. Burnout in medical students:
468 a systematic review of experiences in Chinese medical schools. *BMC Med Educ*. 2017;17(1):217. doi:
469 10.1186/s12909-017-1064-3.
- 470 34. Peng L, Zhang J, Li M, Li P, Zhang Y, Zuo X, et al. Negative life events and mental health of
471 Chinese medical students: the effect of resilience, personality and social support. *Psychiatry Res*.
472 2012;196(1):138-41. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2011.12.006.
- 473 35. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A global measure of perceived stress. *J Health Soc Behav*.
474 1983;385-96. doi: 10.2307/2136404.

- 475 36. Stegers-Jager KM, Savas M, van der Waal J, van Rossum EFC, Woltman AM. Gender-specific
476 effects of raising Year-1 standards on medical students' academic performance and stress levels. *Med*
477 *Educ.* 2020;54(6):538-46. doi: 10.1111/medu.14068.
- 478 37. Crosswell AD, Lockwood KG. Best practices for stress measurement: How to measure
479 psychological stress in health research. *Health psychology open.* 2020;7(2):2055102920933072. doi:
480 10.1177/2055102920933072.
- 481 38. Dopmeijer JM, Nuijen J, Busch MCM, Tak NI. Monitor Mentale gezondheid en Middelengebruik
482 Studenten hoger onderwijs. Deelrapport I. Mentale gezondheid van studenten in het hoger onderwijs
483 (English: Monitor Mental Health and Substance Use Students in Higher Education. Sub-report I. Mental
484 health of students in higher education). 2021 2021-0194. doi: 10.21945/RIVM-2021-0194.
- 485 39. Sherbourne CD, Stewart AL. The MOS social support survey. *Soc Sci Med.* 1991;32(6):705-14.
486 doi: 10.1016/0277-9536(91)90150-B.
- 487 40. Rizzolo D, Massey S. Fluctuations in Stress Over Time During the First Year of Health Science
488 Programs. *J Allied Health.* 2020;49(2):120-4.
- 489 41. Tucker P, Jeon-Slaughter H, Sener U, Arvidson M, Khalafian A. Do medical student stress, health,
490 or quality of life foretell step 1 scores? A comparison of students in traditional and revised preclinical
491 curricula. *Teach Learn Med.* 2015;27(1):63-70. doi: 10.1080/10401334.2014.979178.
- 492 42. Rose S. Medical Student Education in the Time of COVID-19. *JAMA.* 2020;323(21):2131-2. doi:
493 10.1001/jama.2020.5227.
- 494 43. Donohoe J, O'Rourke M, Hammond S, Stoyanov S, O'Tuathaigh C. Strategies for enhancing
495 resilience in medical students: a group concept mapping analysis. *Acad Psychiatry.* 2020;44(4):427-31.
496 doi: 10.1007/s40596-020-01208-x.
- 497 44. Thoits PA. Mechanisms linking social ties and support to physical and mental health. *J Health Soc*
498 *Behav.* 2011;52(2):145-61. doi: 10.1177/0022146510395592.
- 499 45. Eime RM, Harvey JT, Craike MJ, Symons CM, Payne WR. Family support and ease of access link
500 socio-economic status and sports club membership in adolescent girls: a mediation study. *Int J Behav*
501 *Nutr Phys Act.* 2013;10(1):50. doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-10-50.
- 502 46. Poortinga W. Social relations or social capital? Individual and community health effects of
503 bonding social capital. *Soc Sci Med.* 2006;63(1):255-70. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.11.039.
- 504 47. Salazar A, Palomo-Osuna J, de Sola H, Moral-Munoz JA, Dueñas M, Failde I. Psychological Impact
505 of the Lockdown Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic in University Workers: Factors Related to Stress,
506 Anxiety, and Depression. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021;18(8):4367. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18084367.
- 507 48. Moriarty T, Bourbeau K, Fontana F, McNamara S, Pereira da Silva M. The Relationship between
508 Psychological Stress and Healthy Lifestyle Behaviors during COVID-19 among Students in a US Midwest
509 University. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021;18(9):4752. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18094752.
- 510 49. Guo AA, Crum MA, Fowler LA. Assessing the psychological impacts of CoViD-19 in undergraduate
511 medical students. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021;18(6):2952. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18062952.
- 512 50. Hakami Z, Khanagar SB, Vishwanathaiah S, Hakami A, Bokhari AM, Jabali AH, et al. Psychological
513 impact of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic on dental students: A nationwide study. *J*
514 *Dent Educ.* 2020. doi: 10.1002/jdd.12470.
- 515 51. Browne J. "Excuse the cat..." Reflections on online mentoring during the COVID-19 pandemic.
516 *Med Educ.* 2020;55(6):673-5. doi: 10.1111/medu.14445.
- 517 52. Harrison HF, Kinsella EA, DeLuca S, Loftus S. "We know what they're struggling with": student
518 peer mentors' embodied perceptions of teaching in a health professional education mentorship
519 program. *Adv Health Sci Educ.* 2021:1-24. doi: 10.1007/s10459-021-10072-9.
- 520 53. Rastegar Kazerooni A, Amini M, Tabari P, Moosavi M. Peer mentoring for medical students
521 during COVID-19 pandemic via a social media platform. *Med Educ.* 2020. doi: 10.1111/medu.14206.

- 522 54. Tabari P, Amini M. Educational and psychological support for medical students during the
523 COVID-19 outbreak. *Med Educ*. 2020. doi: 10.1111/medu.14376.
- 524 55. Yamada Y, Klugar M, Ivanova K, Oborna I. Psychological distress and academic self-perception
525 among international medical students: the role of peer social support. *BMC Med Educ*. 2014;14(1):1-8.
526 doi: 10.1186/s12909-014-0256-3.
- 527 56. Roseth CJ, Johnson DW, Johnson RT. Promoting early adolescents' achievement and peer
528 relationships: the effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures. *Psychol Bull*.
529 2008;134(2):223. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.134.2.223.

530

531

532 **S1 Table. Measurement emotional-informational support.**
 533

	None of the time <i>Nooit</i>	A little of the time <i>Weinig</i>	Some of the time <i>Soms</i>	Most of the time <i>Meestal</i>	All of the time <i>Altijd</i>
How often are the following forms of support available to you when you need it? <i>Hoe vaak zijn de volgende vormen van steun voor jou beschikbaar als je het nodig hebt?</i>					
Someone you can count on to listen to you when you need to talk <i>Iemand op wie je kunt rekenen en die naar je luistert als je wilt praten</i>	0	1	2	3	4
Someone whose advice you really want <i>Iemand wiens advies je graag wilt</i>	0	1	2	3	4
Someone to share your most private worries and fears with <i>Iemand waarmee je persoonlijke zorgen en angsten kunt delen</i>	0	1	2	3	4
Someone to turn to for suggestions about how to deal with a personal problem <i>Iemand die je suggesties kan geven over hoe je met een persoonlijk probleem om moet gaan</i>	0	1	2	3	4

534 *Note:* Questions and scoring emotional-informational support in English, with in italic-grey the Dutch
 535 version used for the data-collection. Minimum score: 0, maximum score: 16.

536 Alpha reliability cohort 2018 = 0.895

537 Alpha reliability cohort 2019 = 0.907

538

539