# CAUSAL EFFECTS OF DEPRESSION ON JOB SATISFACTION

F. Mindy Burton Princeton University

### MOTIVATION

- < 50% of employees in U.S. are satisfied with their jobs (Deloitte, 2019)
- "Disengaged employees cost the U.S. an estimated \$450-500 billion in a single year" (Inc., 2018)
- Increasing job satisfaction can lead to cutting costs, improving productivity, and supporting worker wellbeing
- Depression is on the rise, tripling across all demographic groups during COVID-19 (Fox, 2018)

### **RESEARCH QUESTION**

- Does depression affect job satisfaction?
- Data: Americans' Changing Lives
  - Sample restricted to individuals with a job who did not drop from the study (N = 3,423 observations; 1,286 unique individuals)
- Focus: employed Americans over the age of 25
- Time Period: 1986, 1989, 1994

# LITERATURE REVIEW

- Many studies have found that depression and bipolar disorder cause a decrease in labor force participation and lifetime earnings (Banerjee et al., 2015; Chatterji et al., 2011; Frank et al., 2019; Hakulinen et al., 2019; Peng et al., 2015)
- Health-impaired employees are less satisfied than their nonimpaired counterparts (Drydakis, 2011)
- Contributions of my project:
  - Use of multiple measures of depression, drawing on research from Andresen et al. (1993)
  - Use of two identification strategies
  - New longitudinal dataset

### MEASURING DEPRESSION

- Mental health can often be amorphous and difficult to quantify
- Three variables:
  - Continuous measure, based on CES-D questionnaire (scale of 0-12)
  - Indicator, based on continuous variable
  - Index, measuring difference from average mental health

# DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

| Variable                           | Total                   | Depressed                | Not Depressed           | <b>t-statistic</b><br>(H <sub>0</sub> : $\mu_{Dep.} = \mu_{Not Dep.}$ ) |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Job Satisfaction                   | <b>63.8%</b><br>(0.481) | <b>49.8%</b> (0.500)     | <b>69.0%</b> (0.463)    | 10.49*  |
| Depressed<br>(continuous measure)  | <b>2.282</b> (2.376)    | 5.582<br>(1.749)         | <b>I.064</b><br>(1.047) | -92.02*   |
| Clinical Depression<br>(indicator) | 27.0%<br>(0.444)        | I 00%<br>(0)             | 0%<br>(0)               | N/A   |
| Mental Health Index                | -0.010<br>(0.689)       | <b>0.95 l</b><br>(0.509) | -0.365<br>(0.297)       | -93.17*   |

#### CONTROL VARIABLES

| Variable    | Mean                         | Variable           | Mean                       |
|-------------|------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Age         | <b>42.71</b><br>(10.003)     | Black              | <b>28.3%</b><br>(0.451)    |
| Age-Squared | <b>1,924.02</b><br>(895.591) | Married            | 63.6%<br>(0.481)           |
| Male        | <b>47.5%</b><br>(0.499)      | Years of Education | <b>I 3. I 8</b><br>(2.543) |

## CONTROL VARIABLES

| Variable            | Mean    | Variable            | Mean    |
|---------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|
| Income Range:       | 8.9%    | Income Range:       | I 6.0%  |
| \$0 - \$9,999       | (0.284) | \$30,000 - \$39,999 | (0.366) |
| Income Range:       | 19.0%   | Income Range:       | 20.2%   |
| \$10,000 - \$19,999 | (0.393) | \$40,000 - \$59,999 | (0.402) |
| Income Range:       | 19.6%   | Income Over         | 16.3%   |
| \$20,000 - \$29,999 | (0.397) | \$60,000            | (0.369) |

#### EMPIRICAL METHODOLOGY

- Endogeneity problem simultaneity and omitted variable bias
- Fixed Effects:

jobsatisfaction<sub>it</sub> =  $\beta_0 + \beta_1 depressed_{it} + \beta_2 X_{it} + \delta_{it} + \epsilon_{it}$ 

• Ordinary Least Squares with Lagged Depression Variable:

jobsatisfaction<sub>it</sub> =  $\gamma_o + \gamma_1 depressed_{i,t-1} + \gamma_2 W_{it} + \mu_{it}$ 

• Models will be repeated with each measure of depression

# FIXED EFFECTS RESULTS (N = 3,423)

| VARIABLES                                    | Job Satisfaction     | Job Satisfaction | Job Satisfaction            |
|--|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Depressed*                                   | -0.055***<br>(0.021) |                  |                             |
| (continuous measure)<br>Clinical Depression* | (0.021)              | -0.065***        |                             |
| (indicator)                                  |                      | (0.024)          |                             |
| Mental Health Index*                         |                      |                  | <b>-0.058***</b><br>(0.017) |
| % Change in Job<br>Satisfaction              | -8.62%               | -10.19%          | -9.09%                      |

# LAGGED DEPRESSION RESULTS (N = 2, 137)

| VARIABLES                                  | Job Satisfaction            | Job Satisfaction     | Job Satisfaction            |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Lagged Depression<br>(continuous measure)* | <b>-0.034***</b><br>(0.004) |                      |                             |
| Lagged Clinical<br>Depression (indicator)* |                             | -0.147***<br>(0.024) |                             |
| Lagged Mental Health<br>Index*             |                             |                      | <b>-0.116***</b><br>(0.015) |
| % Change in Job<br>Satisfaction            | -5.37%                      | -23.22%              | -18.33%                     |

#### HETEROGENEITY ANALYSIS: GENDER (N = 2, 137)

| VARIABLES                                  | Job Satisfaction           | Job Satisfaction           | Job Satisfaction     |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Lagged Depression<br>(continuous measure)* | -0.026***<br>(0.006)       |                            |                      |
| Lagged Clinical Depression<br>(indicator)* |                            | -0.101***<br>(0.031)       |                      |
| Lagged Mental Health<br>Index*             |                            |                            | -0.089***<br>(0.019) |
| Male x Lagged Depression<br>Measure*       | <b>-0.019**</b><br>(0.009) | <b>-0.103**</b><br>(0.047) | -0.067**<br>(0.031)  |
| Male                                       | 0.036<br>(0.028)           | 0.025<br>(0.024)           | -0.008<br>(0.021)    |

### DISCUSSION

- Both models produced negative effects of depression on job satisfaction
  - Remain cautious about claiming causality
- Supports Drydakis (2011)'s findings that job satisfaction of physicallyimpaired employees is more negatively affected by adverse mental health than non-impaired counterparts
- Relationship may suggest broad impacts of mental health, causing a spillover effect from personal to professional life
- Potential limitations: endogeneity problems, external validity

## POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- Depression is not just a personal problem poor job satisfaction contributes to worsened productivity and motivation
- Mental health policies in workplace have a positive effect on worker wellbeing (Charoensukmongkol, 2014)
- Potential policies by both government and/or individual firms may alleviate triggers of depression
  - Paid parental leave
  - Increased vacation days
  - Flex time

#### CONCLUSIONS

- Statistically significant negative relationship between depression and job satisfaction, adding to the literature
  - Gender differences in effect of lagged depression variable model
- Compelling evidence that depression has a causal impact
- Mental health programs may simultaneously improve worker wellbeing and cause positive spillover effects on business outcomes
- Future work: strengthen assertion of causality, identify effect of depression on productivity or benefit of mental health programs

# THANK YOU!