

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

**Stress, coping, and quality of life in the United States during the COVID-19 pandemic**

Fathima Wakeel<sup>1</sup>, Jacelyn Hannah<sup>1</sup>, & Leah Gorfinkel<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Community and Population Health, College of Health, Lehigh University, 234  
East Morton Street, Bethlehem PA 18015, USA

**Corresponding author:** Fathima Wakeel, College of Health, Lehigh University, 124 East  
Morton Street, HST 234, Bethlehem, PA 18015, USA; Phone: 610-758-2625; Email:  
[faw319@lehigh.edu](mailto:faw319@lehigh.edu)

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

24 **Abstract**

25 While research has widely explored stress, coping, and quality of life (QOL) individually and the  
26 potential links between them, there is a critical dearth in the literature regarding these constructs  
27 in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Our study aims to identify the salient stressors  
28 experienced, describe the coping strategies used, and examine the relationships between stress,  
29 coping, and current QOL among individuals during the pandemic. Data are from a nationally  
30 representative sample of 1,004 respondents who completed an online survey. Key measures  
31 included stressful life events (SLEs), coping strategies, and the physical and psychological health  
32 domains of QOL. Staged multivariate linear regression analyses examined the relationships  
33 between the two QOL domains and SLEs, controlling for sociodemographic and pre-existing  
34 health conditions and testing for the effects of coping strategies on these relationships. The most  
35 common SLEs experienced during the pandemic were a decrease in financial status, personal  
36 injury or illness, and change in living conditions. Problem-focused coping and emotion-focused  
37 coping were significantly related to higher levels of QOL, whereas avoidant coping was  
38 associated with lower QOL. Avoidant coping partially mediated the relationship between  
39 experiencing SLEs and reduced physical and psychological QOL. Our study informs clinical  
40 interventions to help individuals adopt healthy behaviors to effectively manage stressors,  
41 especially large-scale traumatic events like the pandemic. Our findings also call for public health  
42 and clinical interventions to address the long-term impacts of the most prevalent stressors  
43 experienced during the pandemic among vulnerable groups.

44

45 **Keywords:** Stressful life events; coping; quality of life; COVID-19 pandemic

46

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

### 47 **Introduction**

48 The COVID-19 pandemic has led to a prolonged period of stress due to its extensive adverse  
49 impacts, including increased mortality and morbidity, substantial economic challenges,  
50 heightened levels of uncertainty, and social isolation. Exposure to chronic stressors can  
51 significantly impact one's health directly through the neuroendocrine system (i.e., recurring  
52 activation of neuroendocrine responses and consequent increases in cholesterol, blood sugar,  
53 triglycerides, and blood pressure) or immune system (i.e., impairment of the immune system and  
54 resulting risk of infection) pathways, as well as indirectly through unhealthy behaviors such as  
55 poor diet, smoking, substance misuse, and risky sexual behaviors [1–9]. Experiencing stressful  
56 life events (SLEs) has also been significantly associated with reduced quality of life (QOL) in a  
57 wide range of vulnerable populations, including racial and ethnic minorities [10], elderly persons  
58 [11,12], chronically ill patients [13], and children [14,15].

59

60 The World Health Organization [16] defines the quality of life (QOL) as “individuals' perception  
61 of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live, and in  
62 relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns” (p.1405). Some research has  
63 indicated that individuals have experienced decreased QOL during the pandemic. For example,  
64 stressors, such as loss of income, personal health effects, social isolation, and COVID-19  
65 diagnosis, were negatively correlated with QOL during the pandemic [17]. Further, a study [18]  
66 in Germany found that the pandemic did not affect the QOL of individuals equally, with women,  
67 job seekers, and younger people reporting a significantly lower QOL. This study also indicated  
68 an overall decline in reported physical and psychological QOL during the pandemic [18].

69

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

70 Individuals cope with stressors in various ways. Three coping strategies widely investigated in  
71 the literature include problem-focused coping, emotion-focused focusing, and avoidant coping.  
72 Each of these strategies entails different methods for dealing with SLEs. Problem-focused coping  
73 involves stress-reducing tactics such as problem-solving, obtaining instrumental support, and  
74 planning [19,20]. Emotion-focused coping strategies include the use of emotional support,  
75 humor, religion, and positive reframing [19,20]. Avoidant coping involves behaviors such as  
76 substance use, distractions, and behavioral disengagement [21]. The literature has demonstrated  
77 that problem-focused coping is the most effective in stressful situations because it entails taking  
78 control of the stressor and using proactive methods to address it [20]. On the other hand,  
79 emotion-focused coping has been shown to be most effective when the stressor, such as a death  
80 of a loved one, is outside of one's control [20,22]. Avoidant coping is the least effective and  
81 most harmful because it not only does not remove the stressor but also likely worsens existing  
82 stress, anxiety, and depression [23–25].

83

84 How one utilizes the different coping strategies can impact their QOL. Though several studies  
85 have captured how frequently various coping strategies were used during the COVID-19  
86 pandemic, there is limited research on the relationships between coping strategies and QOL  
87 during this time period. A large-scale study [26] in the United Kingdom found that emotion-  
88 focused coping strategies were more likely to be used when individuals experienced financial  
89 stressors (i.e., their or their partner's loss of employment or inability to work, decrease in  
90 household income) or worries about contracting or becoming severely sick from COVID-19 and  
91 that both problem-focused coping and avoidant coping strategies were likely to be employed  
92 when respondents reported adverse financial events as well as worries about finances, basic

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

93 needs, or getting COVID-19. In terms of potential links between coping and QOL during the  
94 pandemic, research [27] has shown that for patients hospitalized with COVID-19, the use of  
95 problem-focused coping mechanisms had a direct and positive correlation with their QOL.  
96 Additionally, Quiroga-Garza et al. [28] found that problem-focused and emotion-focused coping  
97 were marginally, but significantly, correlated with well-being. Further, Shamblaw et al. [25]  
98 found that approach coping, which entails more proactive aspects of problem-focused and  
99 emotion-focused coping (e.g., planning, positive reframing, and use of emotional support), was  
100 associated with higher QOL, whereas avoidant coping was related to significantly reduced QOL  
101 during the pandemic.

102

103 While researchers have widely explored stress, coping, and QOL individually as well as potential  
104 links between them, there is a critical dearth in the literature regarding these constructs in the  
105 context of the COVID-19 pandemic. As the pandemic has had far-reaching and multidimensional  
106 health impacts on the population, it provides a unique opportunity to investigate how individuals  
107 cope with stressors during a relatively brief period of time and how different coping strategies  
108 may have differential impacts on individuals' QOL. Our study uses a nationally representative  
109 sample of over 1000 U.S. adults to 1) Identify the salient stressors reported by individuals during  
110 the pandemic; 2) Describe the types of coping strategies used by individuals during the  
111 pandemic; and 3) Examine the relationships between stress, coping, and QOL among individuals  
112 during the pandemic.

113

## 114 **Materials and Methods**

### 115 Sample and Procedures

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

116 Data for this study are from a nationally representative sample of 1,004 respondents who  
117 completed our 25-30-minute online survey on *Prolific*, a web-based survey recruitment platform,  
118 in August 2021. *Prolific* creates nationally representative samples based on age, sex, and  
119 ethnicity data from the US Census Bureau. Survey questions were grouped into three main  
120 categories: 1) Well-being topics, including QOL, social relationship factors, and stress and  
121 coping; 2) Information topics, including sources of health information, telehealth services, and  
122 consumption behavior; and 3) Science and vaccines topics, including vaccine intentions and  
123 behaviors, attitudes and beliefs about scientific and medical research, and political and religious  
124 preferences. To reduce the potential respondent burden, respondents were randomly assigned  
125 two out of the three categories of questions. Therefore, though 1,500 respondents completed the  
126 overall survey, only 1,004 individuals completed the questions relevant to this study. This study  
127 was approved by the Lehigh University Institutional Review Board, and respondents provided  
128 informed consent before participating in the study.

129

### 130 Measures

#### 131 *Quality of life*

132 QOL was measured using the World Health Organization Quality of Life Abbreviated Version  
133 (WHOQOL-BREF) instrument [29]. This 26-item measure asks the respondent to reflect on  
134 various dimensions of their life, including general QOL, physical health, psychological health,  
135 social relationships, and environmental health, in the past four weeks using 5-point Likert scale  
136 responses. Scores for each QOL dimension were then rescaled to range from 0-100, per the  
137 instrument's scoring instructions. In this analysis, we focused on the dimensions of physical  
138 health (7 items) and psychological health (6 items), as these dimensions measured perceptions

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

139 regarding more internal experiences of health, as opposed to experiences with external factors  
140 such as social relationships and environmental situations. The physical and psychological health  
141 measures ( $\alpha=0.82$  for both) had good internal consistency (Table 1).

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162 **Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations between Study Measures**

	<b>Cronbach's alpha</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
1. Stressful life events	N/A	1.7	2.2	0-18	1.00	0.21*	0.20*	0.31*	-0.23*	-0.18*
2. Problem-focused coping	0.78	13.8	5.4	0-24		1.00	0.57*	0.26*	0.07*	0.12*
3. Emotion-focused coping	0.67	11.1	5.1	0-24			1.00	0.33*	0.03	0.14*
4. Avoidant coping	0.75	9.1	4.9	0-24				1.00	-0.24*	-0.33*
5. Quality of life (physical health)	0.82	70.4	19.7	0-100					1.00	0.61*
6. Quality of life (psychological health)	0.82	64.1	21.3	0-100						1.00

163 \*p<0.05



164 *Stress*

165 Stress was measured using a modified version of the Holmes and Rahe Rating Scale [30], in  
166 which we asked respondents if they experienced any of the following 21 stressful life events  
167 (SLEs) during the pandemic: Death of spouse/partner, child, close family member, or close  
168 friend; personal injury or illness; domestic violence in the home; injury or illness in a child or  
169 other family member(s); divorce; separation from partner; imprisonment; loss of employment;  
170 loss of employment of spouse/partner; loss of educational opportunity; pregnancy; pregnancy of  
171 spouse/partner; childbirth; childbirth by spouse/partner; decrease in financial status; need to cut  
172 the size meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food; homelessness;  
173 foreclosure of mortgage or loan; eviction; change in living conditions; and increase in the  
174 frequency of arguments at home or work. Respondents were asked to mark all that applied, and  
175 we used the following categories of responses in our analyses: 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4+ SLEs. We also  
176 examined the individual effects of each SLE in our multivariate regression models. SLEs were  
177 not operationalized as a composite score because over half of the respondents reported not  
178 experiencing any SLEs during the pandemic, and the distribution of the composite measure was  
179 wide.

180

181 *Coping*

182 Coping style was measured using a 16-item version of Carver's Brief COPE measure [21]. Dias  
183 et al. [31] grouped the Brief COPE items into three coping styles: problem-focused coping,  
184 emotion-focused coping, and avoidant coping. In our survey, individuals were asked to indicate,  
185 using 5-point Likert scale responses, how they coped with stressors over the past year. Problem-  
186 focused coping included four items relating to active coping and the use of informational

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

187 support. Emotion-focused coping included six items pertaining to emotional support, humor, and  
188 religion. Avoidant coping had six items relating to self-distraction, substance use, and  
189 behavioral disengagement. We rescaled the problem-focused coping scores to be out of 24 points  
190 to compare our findings more easily regarding different coping styles. The problem-focused,  
191 emotion-focused, and avoidant coping measures had acceptable internal consistencies with  
192 Cronbach alphas of 0.78, 0.67, and 0.75, respectively (Table 1).

193

194 *Sociodemographic variables*

195 The following sociodemographic variables were included in the analyses: race/ethnicity, gender  
196 identity, annual household income, age, and marital status.

197

198 Race/ethnicity categories included American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; Black or African  
199 American; Hispanic, Latino or Spanish Origin; Middle Eastern or North African; Native  
200 Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; White; other; and prefer not to say. Due to their low  
201 frequencies in our sample, we categorized American Indian or Alaska Native, Middle Eastern or  
202 North African, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and Other as “Other Race/ethnicity”  
203 for the analyses.

204

205 We included the following gender identity categories in the survey: cisgender male; cisgender  
206 female; transgender male; transgender female; non-binary/gender non-conforming; do not  
207 identify as female, male, or transgender; and prefer not to say. Our analysis grouped transgender,  
208 non-binary/gender non-conforming, and non-identifying individuals as “other gender identity”  
209 due to their low frequencies in the sample.

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

210

211 Annual household income was operationalized as the following categories: Less than  
212 \$25,000; \$25,000-\$34,999; \$35,000- \$49,999; \$50,000-\$74,999; \$75,000-\$99,999; \$100,000-  
213 \$149,999; \$150,000-\$199,999; greater than or equal to \$200,000; and prefer not to say. The  
214 analysis grouped individuals with annual household incomes of \$150,000 to \$199,999 and  
215 \$200,000 or more due to their smaller frequencies.

216

217 Age was a continuous variable that was provided as an open-ended response.

218

219 Marital status categories included: single/never married; married; not married, but in a  
220 relationship and living with your partner; not married, but in a relationship and not living with  
221 your partner; separated; divorced; widowed; and other.

222

*223 Pre-existing health conditions*

224 Pre-existing health conditions that were included in the analyses were having a chronic physical  
225 condition, mental health condition, or disability.

226

227 Chronic physical health condition was operationalized as a dichotomous variable (i.e., any versus  
228 none) indicating whether the respondent reported being diagnosed with at least one of the  
229 following chronic illnesses: Multiple sclerosis; high blood pressure; COPD; diabetes; heart  
230 disease (heart failure, aFib, etc.); cancer; autoimmune (Psoriatic disease, Crohn's/Ulcerative  
231 Colitis, etc.); asthma; rheumatoid arthritis; and other.

232

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

233 Mental health condition was a dichotomous variable (any versus none); conditions included the  
234 following: Mood disorder (e.g., depression, bipolar disorder, etc.); anxiety disorder (e.g.,  
235 obsessive-compulsive disorder, panic disorder, phobias, etc.); eating disorder (e.g., anorexia,  
236 bulimia, etc.); Post-traumatic Stress Disorder; and other.

237

238 Disability was operationalized as a dichotomous variable (any versus none) indicating if the  
239 respondent reported being diagnosed with any of the following disabilities: Sensory impairment  
240 (vision or hearing); mobility impairment; learning disability (e.g., ADHD, dyslexia); and other.

241

### 242 Analytical Approach

243 The analyses were conducted using RStudio, version 4.1.2 [32]. Frequency distributions of SLEs  
244 were obtained (Figure 1). The internal consistency (i.e., Cronbach's alphas) of the study  
245 measures, as well as correlations (i.e., Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients) between  
246 the measures, were calculated (Table 1). Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to compare the  
247 means of QOL, SLEs, and coping strategy measures by sociodemographic and health-related  
248 characteristics (Table 2). Staged multivariate linear regression analyses were then conducted to  
249 examine the relationships between each of the two QOL dimensions (i.e., psychological health  
250 and physical health) and SLEs, controlling for sociodemographic and pre-existing health  
251 conditions and testing for the effects of coping strategies on these relationships. The following  
252 covariates were included in the six models: 1) Model 1: SLE categories (i.e., 4+ events, three  
253 events, two events, one event); 2) Model 2: Model 1 covariates and sociodemographic variables;  
254 3) Model 3: Model 2 covariates and pre-existing health conditions; 4) Model 4: Model 3  
255 covariates and problem-focused coping; 5) Model 5: Model 4 covariates and emotion-focused

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

256 coping; and 6) Model 6: Model 5 covariates and avoidant coping (Tables 3 and 4). Overall, the  
257 number of missing values (i.e., three in total) in the data were minimal and were imputed using  
258 the average of existing responses.

259

260 **Fig. 1: Frequency of Stressful Life Events during COVID-19 Pandemic**

261

262 **Table 2: Means of Quality of Life, Stress, and Coping Strategies Scores by Sociodemographic and Health Characteristics**

	Quality of Life Physical Health		Quality of Life Psychological Health		Stressful Life Events		Problem-focused coping		Emotion-focused coping		Avoidant coping	
	(Range 0-100)		(Range 0-100)		(Range 0-21)		(Range 0-24)		(Range 0-24)		(Range 0-24)	
	Mean	<i>p</i>	Mean	<i>p</i>	Mean	<i>p</i>	Mean	<i>p</i>	Mean	<i>p</i>	Mean	<i>p</i>
	(SD)		(SD)		(SD)		(SD)		(SD)		(SD)	
n=1,004	70.44		64.13		1.68		13.79		11.07		9.13	
	(19.67)		(21.26)		(2.16)		(5.35)		(5.11)		(4.89)	
<b>Sociodemographic variables (%)</b>												
<u>Race/ethnicity</u>		0.87		<0.001		0.19		0.15		0.02		0.29
Asian (6.0%)	70.8		60.3		1.5		13.4		10.1		9.6	
	(16.5)		(20.7)		(1.7)		(4.7)		(5.1)		(4.8)	
Black or African American (11.7%)	73.3		66.3		1.4		14.8		12.4		9.4	
	(18.7)		(24.9)		(1.4)		(6.0)		(5.2)		(5.1)	
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin (3.6%)	70.8		53.8		1.9		14.0		12.0		9.6	
	(19.8)		(22.4)		(1.6)		(4.5)		(4.1)		(3.2)	
Multiracial (4.5%)	70.9		58.2		2.1		14.9		11.3		10.2	
	(18.1)		(21.8)		(2.1)		(4.3)		(5.2)		(4.1)	
White (73.1%)	70.1	ref	65.2	ref	1.7	ref	13.6	ref	10.9	ref	8.9	ref
	(20.0)		(20.4)		(2.3)		(5.4)		(5.1)		(5.0)	
Other/Prefer not to say (1.2%)	54.2		51.4		2.0		13.6		10.5		9.4	
	(20.6)		(21.3)		(1.6)		(3.1)		(5.4)		(3.5)	
<u>Annual household income</u>		0.03		<0.001		0.13		0.02		<0.001		<0.001
Less than \$25,000 (16.0%)	64.8		57.7		1.7		13.6		10.9		9.4	
	(22.5)		(22.2)		(1.8)		(6.0)		(5.5)		(5.0)	
\$25,000 to \$34,999 (8.4%)	63.4		59.7		1.9		12.8		9.4		7.6	
	(23.4)		(21.7)		(1.9)		(5.6)		(4.9)		(4.8)	

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

	Quality of Life Physical Health		Quality of Life Psychological Health		Stressful Life Events		Problem- focused coping		Emotion- focused coping		Avoidant coping	
	(Range 0-100)		(Range 0-100)		(Range 0-21)		(Range 0-24)		(Range 0-24)		(Range 0-24)	
	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>
\$35,000 to \$49,999 (14.5%)	69.2 (18.9)		59.0 (21.8)		1.5 (1.7)		13.2 (4.8)		10.9 (4.8)		9.0 (4.3)	
\$50,000 to \$74,999 (17.1%)	71.2 (20.5)		66.3 (19.4)		1.7 (1.7)		14.1 (5.5)		11.2 (5.3)		8.9 (4.8)	
\$75,000 to \$99,999 (14.0%)	75.7 (17.5)		67.2 (19.5)		1.5 (2.1)		13.4 (5.1)		10.8 (4.8)		8.4 (3.6)	
\$100,000 to \$149,999 (16.0%)	72.9 (14.4)		70.3 (19.4)		2.1 (3.5)		14.8 (5.2)		12.6 (5.0)		10.7 (5.4)	
\$150,000 or more (11.1%)	75.6 (17.1)	ref	69.1 (21.4)	ref	1.3 (1.4)	ref	13.7 (5.4)	ref	10.8 (5.0)	ref	9.0 (5.0)	ref
Prefer not to say (2.6%)	64.4 (20.0)		56.6 (22.7)		2.2 (2.1)		14.9 (3.5)		10.7 (4.6)		9.2 (3.4)	
<u>Gender identity</u>		0.11		<b>&lt;0.001</b>		0.09		0.17		0.38		0.17
Cisgender female (47.0%)	70.2 (19.7)		61.3 (20.5)		1.6 (1.7)		14.1 (5.1)		11.3 (5.1)		8.9 (4.5)	
Cisgender male (43.7%)	71.3 (18.7)	ref	67.7 (21.5)	ref	1.7 (2.5)	ref	13.4 (5.6)	ref	10.7 (5.1)	ref	9.2 (5.2)	ref
Other gender identity (2.0%)	64.5 (20.3)		49.2 (25.4)		3.1 (4.0)		14.9 (6.1)		12.3 (4.4)		11.1 (4.5)	
Prefer not to say (7.3%)	68.6 (24.5)		65.6 (19.5)		1.4 (1.6)		13.9 (5.5)		11.1 (5.2)		9.6 (5.3)	
<u>Marital status</u>		0.06		<b>&lt;0.001</b>		0.20		0.12		<b>0.002</b>		<b>0.008</b>

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

	Quality of Life Physical Health		Quality of Life Psychological Health		Stressful Life Events		Problem- focused coping		Emotion- focused coping		Avoidant coping	
	(Range 0-100)		(Range 0-100)		(Range 0-21)		(Range 0-24)		(Range 0-24)		(Range 0-24)	
	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>
Divorced (9.6%)	66.6 (24.5)		61.6 (21.8)		1.5 (1.8)		13.2 (5.5)		9.6 (5.2)		8.1 (4.3)	
Married (46.7%)	72.1 (19.0)		70.4 (19.4)		1.7 (2.6)		13.8 (5.6)		11.5 (5.3)		9.0 (5.2)	
Not married, but in a relationship and living together (7.7%)	66.9 (17.9)		57.6 (18.9)		1.8 (2.0)		14.9 (5.0)		11.6 (4.6)		10.3 (5.0)	
Not married, but in a relationship and not living together (5.5%)	71.9 (17.2)		57.0 (20.0)		1.8 (1.8)		15.4 (4.5)		12.2 (4.2)		10.5 (4.4)	
Separated (0.6%)	55.4 (27.4)		56.3 (31.5)		1.3 (1.8)		12.8 (1.6)		8.2 (5.2)		7.3 (4.1)	
Single/never married (27.0%)	70.1 (18.9)		56.9 (21.3)		1.7 (1.6)		13.5 (5.2)		10.6 (4.9)		9.3 (4.4)	
Widowed (2.2%)	67.7 (26.6)		72.7 (21.5)		1.2 (1.1)		12.8 (6.2)		10.5 (5.7)		7.1 (5.9)	
Unknown or prefer not to say (0.8%)	74.1 (15.9)		64.1 (23.4)		2.4 (2.3)		14.4 (4.1)		10.3 (4.7)		8.4 (5.9)	
<u>Age</u> <sup>a</sup>	0.01 (-0.05, 0.07)	0.71	0.27 (0.22, 0.33)	<0.001	-0.21 (-0.26, -0.15)	<0.001	-0.21 (-0.27, -0.15)	<0.001	-0.25 (-0.30, -0.19)	<0.001	-0.36 (-0.41, -0.30)	<0.001



## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

	Quality of Life Physical Health		Quality of Life Psychological Health		Stressful Life Events		Problem- focused coping		Emotion- focused coping		Avoidant coping	
	(Range 0-100)		(Range 0-100)		(Range 0-21)		(Range 0-24)		(Range 0-24)		(Range 0-24)	
	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>
<b>Pre-existing health conditions (%)</b>												
<u>Any chronic physical health condition</u>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>		0.52		0.08		<b>&lt;0.001</b>		<b>0.005</b>		<b>&lt;0.001</b>	
Yes (45.4%)	65.6 (20.8)		63.6 (20.8)		1.9 (2.5)		13.2 (5.2)		10.5 (5.1)		8.6 (4.9)	
No (54.6%)	74.5 (17.7)	ref	64.6 (21.7)	ref	1.5 (1.8)	ref	14.3 (5.4)	ref	11.5 (5.1)	ref	9.6 (4.8)	ref
<u>Any mental health condition</u>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>		<b>&lt;0.001</b>		<b>&lt;0.001</b>		0.10		0.10		<b>&lt;0.001</b>	
Yes (34.7%)	63.7 (20.7)		54.4 (21.3)		2.0 (2.0)		14.2 (5.1)		11.4 (4.8)		10.1 (4.7)	
No (65.3%)	74.0 (18.1)	ref	69.3 (19.4)	ref	1.5 (2.2)	ref	13.6 (5.5)	ref	10.9 (5.3)	ref	8.6 (4.9)	ref
<u>Any disability</u>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>		<b>&lt;0.001</b>		<b>&lt;0.001</b>		0.16		0.94		0.39	
Yes (20.4%)	60.5 (22.3)		58.8 (22.6)		2.3 (2.4)		13.6 (5.0)		11.0 (5.0)		9.4 (5.0)	
No (79.6%)	73.0 (18.1)	ref	65.5 (20.7)	ref	1.5 (2.1)	ref	13.8 (5.4)	ref	11.1 (5.1)	ref	9.1 (4.9)	ref

263 ref = reference group; Bolded p-values are statistically significant; \*Pearson correlation coefficients (with 95% confidence intervals)  
 264 for age are provided instead of means

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

265 **Results**266 Description of sample

267 The sample was predominantly White, followed by Black, Asian, Latinx, and multiracial  
268 individuals (Table 2). The sample was evenly spread out through the annual household income  
269 categories. The sample was relatively equally distributed by cisgender male and female, with  
270 only 2% of respondents in the “other” category (transgender, non-binary, or does not identify as  
271 male, female, or transgender). Almost 50% of the sample was married, and 27% were  
272 single/never married. The age distribution of respondents ranged from 18 to 82 years old, and the  
273 mean age was 44. Further, 42% of the sample reported having a chronic physical health  
274 condition, 35% reported having a mental health condition, and 20% reported having a disability.

275

276 The mean count of SLEs was 1.6, with a large spread within the sample ranging from zero to  
277 eighteen events (Table 2). The three most prevalent SLEs reported in the sample were a decrease  
278 in financial status, followed by personal injury or illness and a change in living conditions  
279 (Figure 1). Further, on average, the respondents reported higher levels of problem-focused  
280 coping, followed by emotion-focused coping and avoidant coping (Table 2).

281

282 Bivariate analysis

283 Table 1 illustrates the descriptive statistics of the study measures as well as the correlations  
284 between measures. Bivariate analyses indicate that SLEs were positively associated with all three  
285 coping strategies and negatively associated with both QOL dimensions. Problem-focused coping  
286 was positively correlated with both QOL dimensions, emotion-focused coping was positively

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

287 associated with QOL psychological health, and avoidant coping was negatively correlated with  
288 both QOL dimensions.

289

290 Significant unadjusted racial and ethnic differences in QOL psychological health and emotion-  
291 focused coping were found (Table 2). Latinx individuals reported the lowest QOL psychological  
292 health, whereas Asian individuals reported the lowest emotion-focused coping scores. Black  
293 individuals reported the highest scores for both measures. Further, there were significant  
294 differences by annual household income in QOL physical health, QOL psychological health, and  
295 all three coping strategies. Reported QOL generally increased with income levels. No  
296 consistently identifiable pattern emerged with coping strategies; individuals who had an income  
297 between \$25,000 and \$35,000 reported the lowest scores for all three types of coping, and  
298 individuals who had an income of \$100,000-\$150,000 generally reported the highest scores for  
299 all three types of coping. Additionally, the only significant differences in the gender identity  
300 variable were observed in QOL psychological health, with those who identified as “other”  
301 gender identity reporting the lowest QOL and cisgender males reporting the highest QOL.

302

303 There were significant differences by marital status for QOL psychological health, emotion-  
304 focused coping, and avoidant coping. Separated individuals generally reported the lowest scores  
305 across these measures, and those in a relationship but not cohabiting reported the highest  
306 emotion-focused and avoidant coping scores. Married and widowed individuals reported the  
307 highest QOL psychological health (Table 2). Further, those with a chronic health condition,  
308 mental health condition, or disability reported significantly lower QOL physical health.  
309 Individuals with a mental health condition or disability also reported significantly lower QOL

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

310 psychological health and a higher number of SLEs. Those with a chronic health condition  
311 reported significantly lower scores for the three types of coping, and those with a mental health  
312 condition reported higher avoidant coping scores.

313

314 Multivariate analysis

315 Staged multivariate linear regression analyses examined the relationships between QOL (the  
316 physical and psychological health dimensions), SLEs, and the three coping strategies. Table 3  
317 displays the statistically significant covariates in each of the models for which the QOL physical  
318 health dimension was the outcome variable. Based on the final model (model 6), experiencing a  
319 higher number of SLEs was associated with increasingly reduced QOL physical health. After  
320 adjusting for all other covariates, problem-focused coping was positively associated with QOL  
321 physical health, whereas avoidant coping was negatively associated with this outcome. Other  
322 significant covariates that were associated with significantly reduced QOL physical health  
323 included “other” race/ethnicity, having an annual household income between \$25,000-\$34,999,  
324 and having a chronic physical health condition, mental health condition, or disability.

325 Further, the final model revealed that avoidant coping is a potential partial mediator in the  
326 relationships between the QOL physical health dimension and experiencing 2, 3, and 4+ SLEs,  
327 with reductions in the SLE coefficients with the inclusion of avoidant coping. Figure 2A  
328 illustrates the partial mediation model for the relationship between experiencing 4+ SLEs,  
329 avoidant coping, and QOL physical health. Sensitivity analysis through Sobel tests confirmed  
330 that avoidant coping partially mediated the relationships between experiencing 2, 3, and 4+ SLEs  
331 and QOL physical health.

332

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

333 **Table 3: Relationships between Number of Stressful Life Events and Quality of Life (Physical Health)**

Significant covariates <sup>a</sup>	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	$\beta$ (SE)	<i>p</i>	$\beta$ (SE)	<i>p</i>	$\beta$ (SE)	<i>p</i>	$\beta$ (SE)	<i>p</i>	$\beta$ (SE)	<i>p</i>	$\beta$ (SE)	<i>p</i>
1 stressful life event	-1.95 (1.59)	0.22	-2.16 (1.58)	0.17	-1.00 (1.51)	0.51	-1.43 (1.51)	0.34	-1.43 (1.51)	0.34	-1.01 (1.47)	0.49
2 stressful life events	-8.71 (1.79)	<0.001	-9.00 (1.82)	<0.001	-5.99 (1.75)	<0.001	-6.36 (1.75)	<0.001	-6.37 (1.75)	<0.001	-4.94 (1.72)	0.004
3 stressful life events	-13.35 (2.04)	<0.001	-13.31 (2.06)	<0.001	-9.17 (1.99)	<0.001	-9.75 (1.99)	<0.001	-9.75 (1.99)	<0.001	-7.98 (1.96)	<0.001
4+ stressful life events	-14.39 (1.87)	<0.001	-14.25 (1.94)	<0.001	-10.14 (1.87)	<0.001	-11.05 (1.88)	<0.001	-11.05 (1.88)	<0.001	-8.67 (1.86)	<0.001
“Other”			-12.05 (5.51)	0.03	-11.06 (5.23)	0.03	-11.23 (5.20)*	0.03	-11.22 (5.20)	0.03	-10.64 (5.07)	0.04
race/ethnicity			-7.44 (2.70)	0.006	-6.02 (2.56)	0.02	-5.80 (2.55)*	0.02	-5.80 (2.55)	0.02	-6.84 (2.49)	0.006
Income of \$25,000-\$34,999												
Chronic physical health condition					-6.90 (1.25)	<0.001	-6.70 (1.25)	<0.001	-6.70 (1.25)	<0.001	-6.77 (1.22)	<0.001
Mental health condition					-7.08 (1.25)	<0.001	-7.13 (1.24)	<0.001	-7.13 (1.24)	<0.001	-6.20 (1.21)	<0.001
Disability					-7.78 (1.45)	<0.001	-7.73 (1.45)	<0.001	-7.71 (1.45)	<0.001	-7.61 (1.41)	<0.001
Problem-focused coping							0.37 (0.11)	<0.001	0.39 (0.13)	0.003	0.42 (0.13)	<0.001
Emotion-focused coping									-0.03 (0.14)	0.81	0.15 (0.14)	
Avoidant coping											-0.93 (0.13)	<0.001

334 <sup>a</sup>Only statistically significant coefficients, with the exception of the stressful life event categories, are reported in this table.

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

335

336 **Fig. 2: Mediation Models Relating Stressful Life Events to Quality of Life**

337

338 Table 4 shows the staged linear regression models for the relationships between SLEs and the  
339 QOL psychological health dimension. In the final model, both problem-focused coping and  
340 emotion-focused coping were positively associated with QOL psychological health, while  
341 avoidant coping was negatively associated with QOL psychological health. Individuals who had  
342 an annual household income between \$25,000-\$49,999, those who were cisgender female or had  
343 an “other” gender identity, those who were divorced, unmarried but in a relationship, or  
344 single/never married, and those who had a chronic physical health condition or mental health  
345 condition had significantly lower QOL psychological health. On the other hand, increasing age  
346 had a small, positive association with QOL psychological health. Further, in the final model,  
347 experiencing 2 SLEs predicted the highest reduction in QOL psychological health, followed by  
348 experiencing 3 SLEs, 4+ SLEs, and 1 SLE. Again, avoidant coping partially mediated these  
349 relationships, with reductions in the SLE coefficients. The partial mediation model for the  
350 relationship between experiencing 4+ SLEs, avoidant coping, and QOL psychological health is  
351 shown in Figure 2B. Sobel test findings also indicated that avoidant coping partially mediated  
352 the relationships between experiencing 1, 2, 3, and 4+ SLEs and QOL psychological health.

353

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

354 **Table 4: Relationships between Number of Stressful Life Events and Quality of Life (Psychological Health)**

Significant covariates <sup>a</sup>	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	$\beta$ (SE)	<i>p</i>	$\beta$ (SE)	<i>p</i>	$\beta$ (SE)	<i>p</i>	$\beta$ (SE)	<i>p</i>	$\beta$ (SE)	<i>p</i>	$\beta$ (SE)	<i>p</i>
1 stressful life event	-5.11 (1.70)	0.003	-4.12 (1.61)	0.01	-3.17 (1.55)*	0.04	-4.12 (1.52)	0.007	-4.11 (1.50)	0.006	-3.52 (1.42)	0.01
2 stressful life events	-15.20 (1.92)	<0.001	-12.47 (1.86)	<0.001	-10.21 (1.81)	<0.001	-11.02 (1.76)	<0.001	-10.91 (1.75)	<0.001	-8.87 (1.66)	<0.001
3 stressful life events	-15.35 (2.18)	<0.001	-11.76 (2.09)	<0.001	-8.97 (2.05)	<0.001	-10.24 (2.00)	<0.001	-10.25 (1.99)	<0.001	-7.72 (1.90)	<0.001
4+ stressful life events	-14.98 (2.01)	<0.001	-10.69 (1.96)	<0.001	-7.93 (1.92)	<0.001	-9.94 (1.89)	<0.001	-10.00 (1.87)	<0.001	-6.60 (1.80)	<0.001
Black race/ethnicity			4.73 (1.97)	0.02	3.89 (1.90)	0.04						
Income of \$25,000-\$34,999			-5.48 (2.75)	0.05	-4.63 (2.64)	0.08	-4.14 (2.57)	0.11	-4.06 (2.55)	0.11	-5.54 (2.42)	0.02
Income of \$35,000-\$49,999			-5.84 (2.32)	0.01	-4.53 (2.24)	0.04	-4.33 (2.18)	0.05	-4.87 (2.16)	0.02	-4.88 (2.05)	0.02
Cisgender female			-4.97 (1.30)	<0.001	-3.34 (1.27)	0.009	-3.94 (1.23)	0.001	-4.21 (1.22)	<0.001	-5.12 (1.16)	<0.001
“Other” gender identity			-12.95 (4.38)	0.003	-9.27 (4.24)	0.03	-9.84 (4.12)	0.02	-10.09 (4.09)	0.01	-10.02 (3.87)	0.01
Divorced			-7.24 (2.26)	0.001	-5.63 (2.17)	0.01	-5.62 (2.12)	0.008	-4.84 (2.10)	0.02	-4.41 (1.99)	0.03
In a relationship and cohabiting			-7.85 (2.44)	0.001	-6.27 (2.36)	0.008	-6.72 (2.29)	0.003	-6.09 (2.28)	0.008	-5.25 (2.16)	0.02
In a relationship			-6.69 (2.92)	0.02	-6.92 (2.81)	0.01	-7.07 (2.73)	0.01	-6.40 (2.71)	0.02	-6.41 (2.56)	0.01

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

and not cohabiting										
Single/never married	-7.28 (1.68)	<0.001	-7.10 (1.62)	<0.001	-6.25 (1.58)	<0.001	-5.35 (1.58)	<0.001	-5.74 (1.49)	<0.001
Age	0.21 (0.04)	<0.001	0.23 (0.05)	<0.001	0.27 (0.05)	<0.001	0.30 (0.05)	<0.001	0.21 (0.04)	<0.001
Chronic physical health condition			-2.59 (1.29)	0.04	-2.16 (1.26)	0.09	-2.21 (1.25)		-2.32 (1.18)	0.05
Mental health condition			-10.87 (1.28)	<0.001	-10.99 (1.25)	<0.001	-11.01 (1.24)	<0.001	-9.69 (1.18)	<0.001
Problem- focused coping					0.82 (0.11)	<0.001	0.52 (0.13)	<0.001	0.57 (0.12)	<0.001
Emotion- focused coping							0.60 (0.14)	<0.001	0.86 (0.13)	<0.001
Avoidant coping									-1.33 (0.12)	<0.001

355 <sup>a</sup>Only statistically significant coefficients are reported in this table.



## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

356 **Discussion**

357 This study contributes to the emerging literature on the psychological impacts of the COVID-19  
358 pandemic by shedding light on individuals' experiences of SLEs, utilization of various coping  
359 strategies, and current QOL during this traumatic global event. Our findings indicate that the  
360 most common SLEs experienced during the pandemic were a decrease in financial status,  
361 personal injury or illness, and change in living conditions. We also found that on average,  
362 respondents reported higher levels of problem-focused coping, followed by emotion-focused  
363 coping and avoidant coping. Further, problem-focused coping and emotion-focused coping were  
364 significantly related to higher levels of QOL, whereas avoidant coping was associated with lower  
365 QOL. Importantly, our study revealed that avoidant coping partially mediated the relationship  
366 between experiencing SLEs and reduced physical and psychological QOL.

367

368 Studies have reported conflicting findings regarding the most prevalent SLEs experienced by  
369 individuals during the pandemic. A U.S.-based qualitative study by Jean-Baptiste et al. [33] found  
370 that the death of a loved one was the most common stressor experienced by respondents,  
371 followed by racism, discrimination including implicit bias and stereotyping, financial hardship  
372 and economic crisis, and personal health issues. On the other hand, a cross-sectional study  
373 conducted [34] in Iran found that the most prevalent stressor was the rise in essential good prices  
374 and that personal illness (i.e., being diagnosed with COVID-19) and the death of a loved one  
375 were ranked on the bottom of the list. Overall, our finding that experiencing financial difficulties  
376 and personal injury or illness were the most commonly experienced SLEs during the pandemic is  
377 consistent with this extant research.

378

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

379 Our findings corroborate existing literature indicating the positive association between the use of  
380 problem-focused coping and QOL pre-pandemic [35–37] and during the pandemic [25,27,28].  
381 On the other hand, previous research, most of which was conducted pre-pandemic, has  
382 demonstrated inconsistent findings regarding the relationship between emotion-focused coping  
383 and QOL, with many studies pointing to a negative association between these two constructs  
384 [35,37,38]. A study conducted during the pandemic by Shamlaw et al. [25], however, has  
385 suggested that some emotion-focused coping strategies, such as the use of emotional support,  
386 may be related to well-being. As the pandemic instigated or exacerbated a wide range of  
387 unexpected and unpredictable stressors, such as personal illness, illness and deaths of loved ones,  
388 and unemployment, we posit that the use of emotion-focused coping was likely helpful in  
389 navigating these situations. Further, our findings regarding the inverse link between the use of  
390 avoidant coping strategies and QOL is supported by most extant literature [25,35,39,40].  
391 Importantly, our study found that avoidant coping mediated the relationship between SLEs and  
392 reduced QOL during the pandemic. Some previous research has revealed similar findings in  
393 other contexts. For example, a study by Langford et al. [41] found that the avoidant coping  
394 strategy of disengagement coping mediated the association between SLEs and cancer-related  
395 distress.

396

397 Our study’s findings have important clinical and public health implications. Greater exposure to  
398 stressors was linked with avoidant coping strategies, which were, in turn, associated with  
399 significantly reduced QOL. Therefore, it is essential that mental healthcare and primary care  
400 providers dissuade the use of avoidant coping among patients, particularly those who experience  
401 elevated levels of stress. Alternatively, clinicians should promote the use of problem-focused

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

402 coping, in general, to decrease the severity of stressors and the use of emotion-focused coping  
403 strategies when addressing uncontrollable or unpredictable stressors, such as large-scale  
404 traumatic events. Our study also highlights the most prevalent SLEs experienced during the  
405 pandemic. Hence, these findings call for public health and clinical interventions to address the  
406 long-term impacts of these stressors post-pandemic, especially among vulnerable groups such as  
407 racial/ethnic and gender minorities, cisgender women, lower-income individuals, unmarried  
408 individuals, and those with a chronic physical health condition, mental health condition, or  
409 disability.

410

411 Our study has some limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings. First, as  
412 the survey was conducted in August 2021 and inquired about events that occurred over the time  
413 period of 17 months (since the lockdown in March 2020), responses may have been vulnerable to  
414 recall bias. Second, as this study was cross-sectional, causality cannot be assumed in the  
415 relationships between SLEs, coping strategies, and QOL. However, though respondents were  
416 asked to report on SLEs experienced and coping strategies used during the pandemic, responses  
417 regarding QOL inquired about current (i.e., in the past month) perceptions and feelings. Third,  
418 the sample, though nationally representative in terms of age, sex, and ethnicity, was not  
419 representative in terms of sociodemographic factors such as education or race. We partially  
420 addressed this limitation by not including education in our analysis; instead, we used income,  
421 which was more representative of the US population, as a proxy for socioeconomic status.

422

423 Despite these potential limitations, our study has critical implications for future research  
424 directions. Longitudinal research is needed to explore temporal relationships between the

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

425 previous experience of SLEs, subsequent coping strategies that are employed, and current QOL.  
426 Further, as previous research has suggested that social support may act as a moderator in the  
427 relationship between stress and QOL [42,43], researchers should consider the roles of social  
428 support and sense of community in the relationships between SLEs, coping strategies, and QOL,  
429 including the social relationships dimension of QOL, during global stressors such as the COVID-  
430 19 pandemic. Along these lines, traumatic events have been shown to lead not only to stress but  
431 also to posttraumatic growth [44]. Therefore, future research should explore the development of  
432 both posttraumatic stress and growth after the pandemic, as well as their relationships with  
433 coping strategies and QOL.

434

### 435 **Conclusion**

436 Our study contributes to the literature by being the first, to our knowledge, to indicate that  
437 avoidant coping mediated the relationship between experiencing SLEs and reduced physical and  
438 psychological QOL during the pandemic. Along these lines, we found that problem-focused  
439 coping and emotion-focused coping during the pandemic were significantly related to higher  
440 levels of current QOL, whereas avoidant coping was associated with lower QOL. Further, the  
441 most common SLEs experienced during the pandemic were a decrease in financial status,  
442 personal injury or illness, and change in living conditions. Our findings inform clinical  
443 interventions to help individuals adopt healthy behaviors to effectively manage stressors,  
444 especially large-scale traumatic events like the pandemic. Our study also sheds light on the most  
445 prevalent SLEs experienced during the pandemic, therefore calling for public health and clinical  
446 interventions to address the long-term impacts of these stressors post-pandemic, especially  
447 among vulnerable groups.

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

448

449 **Acknowledgements**

450 The authors would like to thank the Lehigh University COVID-19 Nationwide Study Team for  
451 their assistance with this study.

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

471 **References**

- 472 1. Black PH. The inflammatory response is an integral part of the stress response: Implications  
473 for atherosclerosis, insulin resistance, type II diabetes and metabolic syndrome X. *Brain*  
474 *Behav Immun.* 2003;17: 350–364. doi:10.1016/S0889-1591(03)00048-5
- 475 2. Chao AM, Jastreboff AM, White MA, Grilo CM, Sinha R. Stress, cortisol, and other  
476 appetite-related hormones: Prospective prediction of 6-month changes in food cravings and  
477 weight: Stress, Cravings, and Weight. *Obesity.* 2017;25: 713–720. doi:10.1002/oby.21790
- 478 3. Geiker NRW, Astrup A, Hjorth MF, Sjödin A, Pijls L, Markus CR. Does stress influence  
479 sleep patterns, food intake, weight gain, abdominal obesity and weight loss interventions  
480 and vice versa?: Effect of stress on food intake. *Obes Rev.* 2018;19: 81–97.  
481 doi:10.1111/obr.12603
- 482 4. Gu H, Tang C, Yang Y. Psychological stress, immune response, and atherosclerosis.  
483 *Atherosclerosis.* 2012;223: 69–77. doi:10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2012.01.021
- 484 5. Mariotti A. The effects of chronic stress on health: new insights into the molecular  
485 mechanisms of brain–body communication. *Future Sci OA.* 2015;1: fso.15.21.  
486 doi:10.4155/fso.15.21
- 487 6. McEwen BS, Sapolsky RM. Stress and cognitive function. *Curr Opin Neurobiol.* 1995;5:  
488 205–216. doi:10.1016/0959-4388(95)80028-X
- 489 7. Rozanski A, Blumenthal JA, Kaplan J. Impact of Psychological Factors on the Pathogenesis  
490 of Cardiovascular Disease and Implications for Therapy. *Circulation.* 1999;99: 2192–2217.  
491 doi:10.1161/01.CIR.99.16.2192
- 492 8. Sinha R. Role of addiction and stress neurobiology on food intake and obesity. *Biol*  
493 *Psychol.* 2018;131: 5–13. doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2017.05.001
- 494 9. Torres SJ, Nowson CA. Relationship between stress, eating behavior, and obesity.  
495 *Nutrition.* 2007;23: 887–894. doi:10.1016/j.nut.2007.08.008
- 496 10. Han H-R, Kim MT, Rose L, Dennison C, Bone L, Hill MN. Effects of stressful life events  
497 in young black men with high blood pressure. *Ethn Dis.* 2006;16: 64–70.
- 498 11. de Frias CM, Whyne E. Stress on health-related quality of life in older adults: the protective  
499 nature of mindfulness. *Aging Ment Health.* 2015;19: 201–206.  
500 doi:10.1080/13607863.2014.924090
- 501 12. de Paula Couto MCP, Koller SH, Novo R. Stressful Life Events and Psychological Well-  
502 being in a Brazilian Sample of Older Persons: The Role of Resilience. *Ageing Int.* 2011;36:  
503 492–505. doi:10.1007/s12126-011-9123-2

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE

- 504 13. Sherbourne CD, Meredith LS, Rogers W, Ware JE. Social support and stressful life events:  
505 age differences in their effects on health-related quality of life among the chronically ill.  
506 *Qual Life Res.* 1992;1: 235–246. doi:10.1007/BF00435632
- 507 14. Coker TR, Elliott MN, Wallander JL, Cuccaro P, Grunbaum JA, Corona R, et al.  
508 Association of Family Stressful Life-Change Events and Health-Related Quality of Life in  
509 Fifth-Grade Children. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med.* 2011;165.  
510 doi:10.1001/archpediatrics.2011.13
- 511 15. Villalonga-Olives E, Rojas-Farreras S, Vilagut G, Palacio-Vieira JA, Valderas JM,  
512 Herdman M, et al. Impact of recent life events on the health related quality of life of  
513 adolescents and youths: the role of gender and life events typologies in a follow-up study.  
514 *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2010;8: 71. doi:10.1186/1477-7525-8-71
- 515 16. The WHOQOL Group. The World Health Organization quality of life assessment  
516 (WHOQOL): Position paper from the World Health Organization. *Soc Sci Med.* 1995;41:  
517 1403–1409. doi:10.1016/0277-9536(95)00112-K
- 518 17. Hansel TC, Saltzman LY, Melton PA, Clark TL, Bordnick PS. COVID-19 behavioral  
519 health and quality of life. *Sci Rep.* 2022;12: 961. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-05042-z
- 520 18. Eicher S, Pryss R, Baumeister H, Hövener C, Knoll N, Cohrdes C. Quality of life during the  
521 COVID-19 pandemic – Results of the CORONA HEALTH App study. 2021 [cited 29 Sep  
522 2022]. doi:10.25646/8867
- 523 19. Lazarus RS, Folkman, S. *Stress, appraisal, and coping.* New York: Springer; 1984.
- 524 20. Schoenmakers EC, van Tilburg TG, Fokkema T. Problem-focused and emotion-focused  
525 coping options and loneliness: how are they related? *Eur J Ageing.* 2015;12: 153–161.  
526 doi:10.1007/s10433-015-0336-1
- 527 21. Carver CS. You want to measure coping but your protocol’ too long: Consider the brief  
528 cope. *Int J Behav Med.* 1997;4: 92–100. doi:10.1207/s15327558ijbm0401\_6
- 529 22. Carver CS, Scheier MF, Weintraub JK. Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based  
530 approach. *J Pers Soc Psychol.* 1989;56: 267–283. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.56.2.267
- 531 23. Dubow EF, Rubinlicht M. Coping. *Encyclopedia of Adolescence.* Elsevier; 2011. pp. 109–  
532 118. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-373951-3.00107-1
- 533 24. Myaskovsky L, Dew MA, Switzer GE, Hall M, Kormos RL, Goycoolea JM, et al. Avoidant  
534 Coping with Health Problems is Related to Poorer Quality of Life among Lung Transplant  
535 Candidates. *Prog Transplant.* 2003;13: 183–192. doi:10.1177/152692480301300304
- 536 25. Shamblaw AL, Rumas RL, Best MW. Coping during the COVID-19 pandemic: Relations  
537 with mental health and quality of life. *Can Psychol Psychol Can.* 2021;62: 92–100.  
538 doi:10.1037/cap0000263

## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE


- 539 26. Fluharty M, Fancourt D. How have people been coping during the COVID-19 pandemic?  
540 Patterns and predictors of coping strategies amongst 26,016 UK adults. *BMC Psychol.*  
541 2021;9: 107. doi:10.1186/s40359-021-00603-9
- 542 27. Araghi N, Saei S, Alizadeh Zarei M, Dibajnia P, Angooti Oshnari L. The Relationship  
543 Between Quality of Life and Coping Strategies in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19.  
544 *Middle East J Rehabil Health Stud.* 2022;9. doi:10.5812/mejrh-118587
- 545 28. Quiroga-Garza A, Cepeda-Lopez AC, Villarreal Zambrano S, Villalobos-Daniel VE,  
546 Carreno DF, Eisenbeck N. How Having a Clear Why Can Help Us Cope With Almost  
547 Anything: Meaningful Well-Being and the COVID-19 Pandemic in México. *Front Psychol.*  
548 2021;12: 648069. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.648069
- 549 29. World Health Organization. The World Health Organization quality of life (WHOQOL) -  
550 BREF, 2012 revision. World Health Organization; 2004.
- 551 30. Holmes TH, Rahe RH. The social readjustment rating scale. *J Psychosom Res.* 1967;11:  
552 213–218. doi:10.1016/0022-3999(67)90010-4
- 553 31. Dias C, Cruz JF, Fonseca AM. The relationship between multidimensional competitive  
554 anxiety, cognitive threat appraisal, and coping strategies: A multi-sport study. *Int J Sport*  
555 *Exerc Psychol.* 2012;10: 52–65. doi:10.1080/1612197X.2012.645131
- 556 32. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria;  
557 2021. Available: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 558 33. Jean-Baptiste CO, Herring RP, Beeson WL, Dos Santos H, Banta JE. Stressful life events  
559 and social capital during the early phase of COVID-19 in the U.S. *Soc Sci Humanit Open.*  
560 2020;2: 100057. doi:10.1016/j.ssaho.2020.100057
- 561 34. Mousavi SA-M, Hooshyari Z, Ahmadi A. The Most Stressful Events during the COVID-19  
562 Epidemic. *Iran J Psychiatry.* 2020 [cited 29 Sep 2022]. doi:10.18502/ijps.v15i3.3814
- 563 35. Gattino S, Rollero C, De Piccoli N. The Influence of Coping Strategies on Quality of Life  
564 from a Gender Perspective. *Appl Res Qual Life.* 2015;10: 689–701. doi:10.1007/s11482-  
565 014-9348-9
- 566 36. Makhoul-Khoury S, Ben-Zur H. The Effects of Coping Strategies on Distress and Quality  
567 of Life among Jewish and Arab Mothers with a child diagnosed with cancer. *Eur J Oncol*  
568 *Nurs.* 2022;58: 102140. doi:10.1016/j.ejon.2022.102140
- 569 37. Tuncay T. Coping and Quality of Life in Turkish Women Living with Ovarian Cancer.  
570 *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* 2014;15: 4005–4012. doi:10.7314/APJCP.2014.15.9.4005
- 571 38. Shakeri J, Kamangar M, Ebrahimi E, Aznab M, Shakeri H, Arman F. Association of coping  
572 styles with quality of life in cancer patients. *Indian J Palliat Care.* 2015;21: 298.  
573 doi:10.4103/0973-1075.164890



## STRESS, COPING, AND QUALITY OF LIFE


- 574 39. Van De Ven MOM, Engels RCME, Sawyer SM, Otten R, Van Den Eijnden RJJM. The role  
575 of coping strategies in quality of life of adolescents with asthma. *Qual Life Res.* 2007;16:  
576 625–634. doi:10.1007/s11136-006-9146-4
- 577 40. Vervoordt SM, Bradson ML, Arnett PA. Avoidant Coping Is Associated with Quality of  
578 Life in Persons with Multiple Sclerosis with High Cognitive Reserve. *Arch Clin*  
579 *Neuropsychol.* 2022; acac049. doi:10.1093/arclin/acac049
- 580 41. Langford DJ, Cooper B, Paul S, Humphreys J, Keagy C, Conley YP, et al. Evaluation of  
581 coping as a mediator of the relationship between stressful life events and cancer-related  
582 distress. *Health Psychol.* 2017;36: 1147–1160. doi:10.1037/hea0000524
- 583 42. Abshire M, Russell SD, Davidson PM, Budhathoki C, Han H-R, Grady KL, et al. Social  
584 Support Moderates the Relationship Between Perceived Stress and Quality of Life in  
585 Patients With a Left Ventricular Assist Device. *J Cardiovasc Nurs.* 2018;33: E1–E9.  
586 doi:10.1097/JCN.0000000000000487
- 587 43. Szkody E, McKinney C. Appraisal and social support as moderators between stress and  
588 physical and psychological quality of life. *Stress Health.* 2020;36: 586–595.  
589 doi:10.1002/smi.2957
- 590 44. Tedeschi RG, Calhoun LG. TARGET ARTICLE: “Posttraumatic Growth: Conceptual  
591 Foundations and Empirical Evidence.” *Psychol Inq.* 2004;15: 1–18.  
592 doi:10.1207/s15327965pli1501\_01

Figure 1: Frequency of Stressful Life Events during COVID-19 Pandemic



*Note:* Figure 1 demonstrates the frequency of stressful life events experienced by respondents during the COVID-19 pandemic

Figure 2: Mediation Models Relating Stressful Life Events to Quality of Life



Note: Figure 2A demonstrates that avoidant coping partially mediates the relationship between experiencing 4+ stressful life events and quality of life (physical health) during the pandemic. Figure 2B shows that avoidant coping partially mediates the relationship between experiencing 4+ stressful life events and quality of life (psychological health) during the pandemic. Standardized coefficients and standard errors are shown. \* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $p < 0.001$