

# BMJ Open

## The role of financial hardship, mastery and social support in the association between employment status and depression: Results from a longitudinal cohort study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2015-009834
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Aug-2015
Complete List of Authors:	Crowe, Laura; Australian National University, Butterworth, Peter; Australian National University, Research School of Population Health, Centre for Research on Ageing, Health and Wellbeing
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Mental health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, Unemployment, Depression, Financial Hardship, Mastery

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**The role of financial hardship, mastery and social support in the association between employment status and depression: Results from a longitudinal cohort study**  
*Running head: Employment status and depression*  
**Laura Crowe<sup>1</sup> and Peter Butterworth<sup>2</sup>**

Corresponding author:  
Laura Crowe, Research School of Psychology, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia.  
e-mail: [Laura.Crowe@anu.edu.au](mailto:Laura.Crowe@anu.edu.au)

**Abstract**

**Objective:** There is robust epidemiological and clinical evidence of the harmful effects of unemployment on psychological wellbeing, but the mechanisms through which this occurs is still strongly debated. In addition, there is even less evidence on the impact of underemployment on mental health. Utilising longitudinal data collected from a cohort of 20 – 24 year olds, the present study examines a range of employed states and investigates the role of mastery, financial hardship and social support in the relationship between labour status and depression.

**Method:** Responses were from the PATH Through Life Project: A representative, community based survey conducted in Canberra and Queanbeyan (NSW) in Australia, where respondents (n = 2,389) in the early twenties were followed for eight years. Depression was measured using the self-report Goldberg Depression Scale.

**Results:** The analyses identified unemployment and underemployment as significant predictors of depression, compared to their employed counterparts. Both unemployment and underemployment remained significantly correlated with depression even after accounting for socio-demographic, economic and psychological variables. Social support, financial hardship and a sense of personal control (mastery) all emerged as important mediators between unemployment and depression.

**Conclusion:** Both unemployment and underemployment were associated with increased risk of depression. The strength of this relationship was attenuated but remained significant after accounting for key variables (mastery, financial hardship and social support) and extensive socio-demographic and health covariates, indicating that no or inadequate employment contributes to poorer mental health over and above these factors.

**Keywords**

Unemployment, depression, financial hardship, epidemiology, mastery

**Strengths and Limitations:**

- Use of large longitudinal cohort data with a high response rate.
- The data allowed for the analysis of the independent effects of employment status and depression after controlling for sociodemographic and health factors.
- The limitations were as follows: Self-reported health and mental health measures; different measures of financial hardship/difficulty utilized in wave 1; the findings come from a community sample and require further research to confirm the generalizability for a national sample; lack of data on duration of un/under-employment.

<sup>1</sup> L. Crowe, Research School of Psychology, Australian National University, Australia  
<sup>2</sup> P. Butterworth, Research School of Population Health, Centre for Research on Ageing, Health and Wellbeing, Australian National University, Australia

## Introduction

Understanding the relationship between social factors and mental health has long been of interest for mental health service providers and, social and economic policy. It has been well established that those who are not employed, or those who are unable obtain “good quality” employment, are at significantly higher risk for poorer mental and physical health [1-5]. Research has identified a number of pathways through which unemployment may be related to poorer mental health outcomes, including a disruption to daily routine, lower self-esteem, adoption of health-threatening coping behaviours, and a higher level of stress [6]. This has been further clarified through the identification of the protective mechanisms inherent in obtaining gainful employment. Employment fulfils material and psychological needs such as financial security, social inclusion, and encourages regular social and mental activity [7]. However, recent literature has also highlighted that jobs that are perceived as unsatisfying, stressful and offer little autonomy do not always protect physical and mental health, and have been associated with comparable health outcomes as unemployment [8, 9].

Theory and research evidence suggests that the effects of unemployment on depressive symptomatology may be mediated by financial hardship and the related psychological experience of poor personal control over one’s life [4, 10]. The focus of this paper is to investigate the extent that financial hardship and a sense of personal control may mediate the relationship between employment status and depression, after taking into account other relevant social and physical factors [11]. Of particular interest is to compare the experience of underemployment and unemployment with the fulltime employment, not just between groups but also considering within-person change. Research thus far has demonstrated that underemployment is typically associated with lower levels of health and wellbeing [12-14]. Therefore, failure to account for this group could lead to an underestimation of the harmful effects seen in inadequate employment settings, or could fail

to identify what might be some of the beneficial effects of even minimal employment compared to no employment at all.

Financial loss is an inevitable outcome of unemployment [15]. Measures of financial hardship or deprivation usually assess whether people are unable to provide basic necessities for themselves, their family or other dependents due to a lack of resources [1, 16]. Over a seven year period, Lorant and colleagues (2007) showed that subjective financial strain and high scores on the deprivation index were associated with increases in both depressive symptoms and incidence of major depression across annual waves. The study found that changes in income or employment were less strongly associated with changes in depressive symptoms or major depression than poverty and hardship measures [17]. These findings have been demonstrated amongst other groups, including: families [18], adults [19, 20], single mothers [21, 22] and among young unemployed persons [23]. Financial hardship is thus considered to be one of the main pathways through which employment status affects depression.

This is consistent with the neo-material perspective, which argues that indices of deprivation such as owning a car or a house should be incorporated into research on the social epidemiology of psychiatric disorders [11]. Neo-material scholars argue that it is the material risk and lack of protective factors linked to poverty – such as, poor housing, poor diet, drugs, environmental and workplace hazards, lack of access to healthcare – that determine most social inequalities in health [11, 24]. In contrast, the psychosocial theoretical perspective argues that financial hardship affects overall mental health through undermining an individual's sense of mastery, which in turn renders an individual more vulnerable to depression [25, 26]. This psychological approach emphasizes individuals' perceptions of relative standing in income distribution and perceived stress to explain the social gradient in mental health [11, 24].

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Mastery is commonly used as a measure of control, defined Pearlin and Schooler (1979) as the perception that events are under one's own personal control, rather than under the control of external forces. Financial hardship or strain is typically considered to contribute to low mastery through providing a sense that there is great difficulty in changing circumstances in major domains of life [27], as well as actual control over one's life (i.e. choice over what neighbourhood to live in or payment of medical treatment) [28]. It is thus hypothesized that that lower socioeconomic status imbues an individual with a sense that they experience relative disadvantage [25, 28]. However, not all individuals who are exposed to stressors or financial hardship experience deterioration in physical and psychological functioning [29, 30]. Research has shown that a sense of mastery can both directly reduce psychological distress and can also act as a buffer against deleterious effects of stressful life events [31, 32], such as poor physical health [32]; and economic hardship [31, 32].

Similarly, high levels social support are also thought to 'buffer' or mitigate the effects of stressful life events on mental health [33]. Unemployed individuals who experience greater social connectedness may perceive unemployed induced stressors to be more manageable, protecting declines in mental health [34]. Though social support might attenuate the effects of stress and financial hardship on mental health, those who are of low socio-economic status or who are unemployed typically report lower social support levels [35, 36]. Furthermore, research has demonstrated that not only does social support confer resilience to stress, but that unemployment stress is actually exacerbated by low levels of social support [37]

The current study seeks to explore the relationship between employment circumstances and mental health in one cohort followed across eight years and three waves of data collection. Compared with much of the previous research in this area, this study will incorporate a category of "underemployment" in addition to unemployment, and those who are "Not in the labour force" (NILF), and an employed category. Specifically, the study seeks

to measure the extent to which a sense of mastery, financial hardship and social support mediate the relationship between employment status and depression, after taking into account potential confounding socio-demographic and health factors.

**Method**

*Data source and sample*

The data used for this analysis are from the Personality and Total Health (PATH) Through Life Project. PATH follows three cohorts of respondents from Canberra and the neighbouring town of Queanbeyan (initial interviews conducted between 1999 and 2001), and assesses the health and wellbeing. The sampling frame was the electoral roll (registration on the electoral roll is compulsory for Australian citizens), with the initial participation rate was 56.6%. The current study is restricted to the youngest PATH cohort (birth years: 1975 – 1979) who were aged 20 to 24 years at the initial interview. This resulted in a total possible sample of 2404 participants. Three waves of data were collected with 4 year intervals between intervals, and were interviewed over 1 year; all respondents were sent a letter outlining the purpose of the research and, if they were willing to participate, they were then interviewed by a professionally trained interviewer. The wave to wave response rate for this sample at each wave of subsequent data collection was 89% (Wave 2) and 82% (Wave 3). Participants who did not respond at one wave may still return for a later wave. The Human Research Ethics Committee of The Australian National University approved the study protocol. The survey was conducted by highly trained professional interviewers. Further details of the survey included the sampling procedure are reported elsewhere (Anstey et al., 2011).

*Survey Procedure*

Participants completed the questionnaire on a laptop computer. An interviewer took each participant through the first set of questions, demonstrating how to enter responses into the



personal computer. The interviewer conducted the physical and cognitive tests. The components of the questionnaire relevant to the present study are outlined below. Unless stated otherwise, measures were collected at each wave.

### *Measures*

#### ▪ Depression

The outcome measure analysed in this study was the Goldberg Depression Scale (Goldberg et al. 1988), a nine-item scale measuring experience of a particular symptom of depression (e.g., loss of weight, lack of energy) in the prior four weeks. Total scores for depression are calculated by summing the number of items endorsed providing a continuous score of 0 to 9. This total was dichotomized so that a score of seven or greater indicated the presence of likely depression (1), and below seven represented no depression (0). The Goldberg Depression Scales has been previously validated for detecting depression caseness [38].

#### ▪ Mastery, Financial Hardship/Difficulty and Social Support

Mastery was measured by Pearlin's Mastery Scale (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978), which is a seven-item scale used to assess the degree to which individual's believe that their life is under their control by indicating the degree to which they agree or disagree with statements such as 'There is really no way I can solve problems I have' or, 'I have little control over the things that happen to me.' Scores range from 7 to 28, with higher scores indicating higher mastery. Although a cut-off point has not been established, generally, a score of 21 or less indicates the likelihood that one perceives that their life is directed by forces outside of their control [39]. Therefore this measure was dichotomised accordingly.

Financial hardship assessed four core components of objective deprivation drawn from the Australian Household Expenditure Survey (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012). The questions pertaining to financial strain asked participants the following: Over the past

year have the following happened to you because you were short of money – 1) pawned or sold something 2) went without meals, 3) unable to heat home, d) asked for help from welfare/community organisations. Participants endorsing one or more of these items were categorised as experiencing financial strain. The hardship items were not included in Wave 1, instead a measure of financial difficulty was utilized which asked participants if they had gone without things they really needed in the last year because they were short of money. Participants who answered “yes, sometimes” and “yes often” were categorised as experiencing financial strain. While this does not constitute an objective measure of deprivation, it allows comparison of the association of depression with financial circumstances.

Finally, a social support measure that assessed the level of positive social supports from friends and family (high versus low) and conflict from friends and family (high versus low) was included. These interactions were assessed using two sets of five items, each applied to both friend and family relationships (Schuster, Kessler & Aseltine, 1990). These measures were dichotomized at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, with the bottom 50% representing low positive social support and the top 50% representing high positive social support from family and friends, and the reverse for negative social support – the bottom 50% representing high conflict and the top 50% representing low conflict.

▪ Employment status and covariates

Based on participants’ reports, employment status was categorised as ‘fulltime/part-time employed’, ‘part-time employed but looking for full-time employment’, ‘unemployed’ and, ‘not in the labour force’ (NILF). Other demographic, social and physical measures that were utilized as covariates for the analyses included: gender, age, years of education, marital/partner status, any dependent children, physical health and social support (friends and family). Marital status was categorised into ‘cohabiting relationship’, i.e. married or defacto,



‘divorced/separated/widowed’ and ‘never married’. Education was categorised into ‘finished Year 12’ and ‘not finished Year 12’. Participants were categorised into “have at least one dependent child” and “no children”. Physical health was measured using the 12-Item Short Form Health Survey [SF-12; 40] , with higher scores indicating better health.

### *Statistical analyses*

Descriptive statistics of the socio-demographic and economic circumstances of the respondents were calculated by gender and age (Table 1). Simple logistic regression was then utilized to assess the association of depression with the demographic and socio-economic characteristics (Table 2). Eight separate longitudinal random intercept multivariable logistic regression models were used to examine predictors of depression for individuals who were unemployed, PTLFT, NILF and employed. Moderating variables included social support, financial hardship/deprivation and a sense of personal control. Covariates included age, gender, marital status, physical health, and dependent children (Table 3). Finally, the ‘explained fraction’ approach (Whitehead et al., 2000) was used to calculate the proportion of the relationship between employment status and depression that was explained by important mediating variables (i.e. financial hardship, mastery, social support and the socio-demographic variables). Table 4 shows the percent reduction in odds ratios for employment status (comparing models 4, 5, 6 and 8 with model 3), which is calculated by contrasting the OR before (ORa) and after (ORb) the addition of the mediating variables by applying the following formula:  $(ORa - 1) - (ORb - 1) / (ORa - 1)$ .

Missing data for most of the items examined in this analysis were minimal. Most participants (n = 6521) had complete data at both baseline and follow-up. In wave 2, 265 participants (11%) had dropped out of the survey, and 426 participants (17%) had dropped out by wave 3. Cases were with minimal data were minimal (ranging from 0 to 1.1% for individual items). The statistical models used all available data; those with missing data were

excluded. Previous sensitivity analysis conducted on the data by Butterworth et al. (2009) showed that attrition was not independently associated with depression, but was associated with being male, not participating in the labour force (although not unemployment), poorer physical functioning, lower levels of educational attainment and not having a spouse/partner.

**Results**

Table 1 presents descriptive data on the respondents across wave 1, 2 and 3 by gender. As expected, unemployment rates were highest at wave 1 (ages 20-24 years) and declined across the following two waves (ages 24-28 and 28-32 years). Table 2 demonstrated the univariate relationships between the measure of depression and a number of socio-demographic, economic and psychological measures. Around a fifth of respondents who were unemployed were classified as being depressed, compared to only 9% of those who were employed. The prevalence of depression amongst the “underemployed” was also nearly double of the prevalence rates of those who were employed at 17%. The odds ratios for both unemployment and PTLFT indicated a greater likelihood of depression (OR = 2.35; OR = 1.80) compared to employed. Experiencing financial hardship (OR = 2.50) and a low sense of mastery (OR = 5.82) each demonstrated a strong association with depression

Table 3 presents a series of separate multivariate logistic regression models conducted to examine the association between employment circumstance and depression, while controlling for a number of demographic, physical health, socio-economic and psychological variables.

Model 1 demonstrated that the association between unemployment and depression remained significant (OR = 2.40) after controlling for gender. There was also an association between PTLFT and depression (OR = 1.79). In model 2, when age is incorporated into the model, the odds ratios of both unemployment and PTLFT work increased (OR = 2.49; OR = 1.89). Model 3 demonstrates that this association between unemployment and depression (OR = 2.13), and PTLFT and depression (OR = 1.75), remained significant after controlling

for all the covariates. In addition to the experience of unemployment and PTLFT employment, being separated/divorced or never being married, lower physical function, not having finished Year 12, aged 24 – 28 years, and being female all showed an independent association with depression.

The next three models consider the role of key explanatory covariates. Model 4 included the social support measures (family and friends). These measures did not appear to impact the association between PTLFT employment and depression which remained significant at (OR = 1.75), while the association between unemployment and depression decreased but remained significant (OR = 1.91). Low positive family, low positive friend, and high negative friend support were all associated with increased odds of having depression.

Model 5 included a measure of financial hardship, which was associated with over double the odds of depression (OR = 2.17). After controlling for financial difficulty, the odds ratio between unemployment and depression, and between PTLFT employment and depression, decreased but both remained significant (OR = 1.88; OR = 1.62). Model 6 incorporated Pearlin's measure of Mastery. After controlling for sense of mastery, the association between unemployment and depression decreased but remained significant (OR = 1.80). Similar to Model 4, accounting for the measure of mastery did not impact the association of depression with PTLFT (OR = 1.73). In Model 7, both mastery and financial hardship were included in the model. This saw a further reduction in the odds ratio between depression and unemployment (OR = 1.64) and between depression and PTLFT (OR = 1.60).

Model 8 incorporated all the variables. The odds of depression when unemployed decreased further (OR = 1.55) when compared to being employed, while the association between depression and PTLFT did not change significantly. Having a low sense of personal control over one's life showed the highest odds of depression.

Finally, Table 4 quantifies the change in odds ratios for the unemployed and PTLFT work, following the addition of key mediating variables. For example, the explained fraction showed 51% of the difference between unemployed and employed individuals in the prevalence of depression was explained by the socio-demographic, social support, mastery and financial hardship measures, compared to only 21% of the explained fraction of difference between PTLFT and employed individuals. Considered separately, the inclusion of financial hardship accounted for 28% and 17% of the association of depression with unemployment and PTLFT work respectively. While the mastery and social support measures also mediated the relationship between unemployment and depression, they did not account for much of the association between PTLFT and depression.

**Discussion**

This study examined employment status and its association with depression in one cohort from the PATH study across three waves, taking into account both unemployed and “underemployment”. While this study did not directly seek to evaluate the psychological theories of unemployment, it did assess two key factors thought to mediate the effects of employment status: a sense of personal control and financial hardship. The multivariate logistic regression confirmed that both under-employment and unemployment were associated with increased risk of depression compared to being employed after controlling for all other measures, including educational attainment, marital status, dependent children, and gender. A key finding of this study was the increased risk of depression that under-employment has, which supports previous research [13]. However, the odds of depression for the PTLFT compared to the employed group remained largely unaffected by the inclusion of covariates across the different models, except for age and financial hardship. After accounting for all variables the odds of depression for underemployment (OR = 1.59) was comparable to the odds of depression for the unemployment (OR = 1.55).

Another key study finding is that social support, financial hardship and a sense of personal control are all important determinants of the association between unemployment and depression. This provides support for the impact of both manifest and latent benefits of work for mental health. The increased risk of financial hardship and deprivation is a salient characteristic in the experience of unemployment. Perhaps this reflects the effect of absolute poverty, but perhaps a more likely explanation is the inability to participate in the generally accepted standards of society [15]. Therefore, hardship can be conceptualised as analogous to psychological aspects of unemployment, especially related to a reduced sense of personal control over one's future and perceived opportunities. The association between unemployment and depression was also moderated by levels of support from family and friends. Social support may be influential in affecting how unemployed people react to their situation and their capacity to deal with it, in providing a 'buffer' from the negative effects of unemployment [41]. However, it may also indicate a loss of social connection through the workplace and the importance of maintaining social connection/inclusion for those who are out of the workforce.

While the PTLFT group also showed poorer mental health than those otherwise employed, the current findings showed a distinct set of moderating factors. Importantly, these results also lend support for the distinction between latent and manifest benefits of work. It could be argued that even inadequate levels of employment participation may nonetheless provide individuals with some of these benefits. The evidence that social support and a sense of personal control were not important mediators in the association between PTLFT status and depression supports this argument. In contrast, hardship was identified as a significant mediator of this association, suggesting that the inadequate remuneration associated with underemployment is a determinant of the poorer mental health of those who are seeking increased working hours. These findings do require further investigation in the context of our

previous research showing poor quality work may be associated with poorer mental health than unemployment [8].

*Strengths and Limitations*

There are a number of strengths associated with this study and the use of the PATH dataset. The large sample size, random selection from the population, and longitudinal design contribute to the high statistical power and limited sampling bias [42]. Furthermore, the prospective longitudinal design following respondents, initially aged in their early 20s over 8 years, allowed the analyses to consider age differences within the same cohort. However, this study has a number of limitations. Most notably were the different measures used for financial hardship, whereby the measure for the first wave was a subjective measure of financial difficulty, and the measure for the second and third wave sought to provide a more objective measure of hardship. As per the study conducted by Butterworth and colleagues (2009) using these different measures, each was strongly associated with depression, were strongly interrelated, and did not differ significantly in prevalence rates. Another potential limitation was the use of “part-time employed, looking for full-time work” as a marker of underemployment. Without further information around hours, quality and stability of the part-time work the respondents in this group may be quite heterogeneous in terms of social and economic circumstances. This is beyond the scope of the current project, but is an important topic for future research. Finally, another potential limitation is that participants drawn from the Canberra/Queanbeyan region may not be representative of the broader Australian population due to relatively higher levels of educational attainment and higher socio-economic status. Therefore it is important that this research is replicated at a national level.

*Implications for policy and practice*



These findings sit within the broader research field in seeking to understand the mechanisms through which employment status contributes to mental health outcomes, and has clinical and social policy relevance. In the face of unemployment and financial hardship, having a low sense of mastery is likely to strongly increase the odds of developing depression in comparison to those individuals who are able to maintain a sense of personal control over their life [4, 43, 44]. Those with a high sense of mastery, may be able to adopt positive coping strategies, such as focusing on the employment situation that is amenable to change, or implementing a problem-solving approach [43, 45]. Policy and clinical programs that seek to encourage social inclusion and workforce participation should focus on providing experiences for mastery, as well as access to social relationships, which are both seemingly constrained when facing unemployment (Heckhausen et al., 2010). The findings support the continuation of interventions to assist people with mental health problems to find and sustain employment, but they also suggests that a focus is on underemployment is needed to prevent mental health problems.

### *Conclusion*

This study shows that the effects of unemployment and underemployment on depression are not completely explained by socio-demographic, -economic and psychosocial factors. There is something unique about the experience of inadequate employment that contributes to poorer mental health over and above financial hardship and a loss of personal control over one's life. However, it should also be noted that unemployment does not automatically equate with poor mental health. Rather, unemployment in comparison to employment increases the risk of experiencing the conditions that contribute and perpetuate psychological distress, i.e. relative poverty, financial stress, loss of personal control and autonomy, poor social support. In order to apply this research on a national level, these results need to be replicated using longitudinal data collected from all around Australia.

Further research should consider the effect that protracted unemployed periods might have on an individual’s mental health, and how mastery and financial hardship might moderate this experience. Looking specifically at welfare receipt and the job search experience may also elucidate some of the unique experiences that contribute to the poor mental health of the unemployed. However, it is clear that research needs to recognise the heterogeneous effects of different types of inadequate employment. Research should seek to more comprehensively define employment states, such underemployment and length of time an individual is unemployed, to fully understand the role that employment can play in protecting or reducing an individual’s mental health.

**Acknowledgements:**

Thank you to the study participants, PATH Interviewers, Karen Maxwell and Trish Jacomb; and to the current PATH Chief Investigators: Kaarin Anstey, Helen Christensen, Anthony Jorm, Bryan Rodgers, Andrew Mackinnon, Simon Easteal and Nicolas Cherbuin.

**Contributors**

LC and PB were both involved in the conception and design of the study. LC conducted the primary statistical analysis and drafted the manuscript, under the supervision of PB. PB provided statistical expertise and revision of the manuscript. Both approve and take responsibility for the final manuscript.

**Funding**

The PATH Through Life Study is funded by National Health and Medical Research Council Grants 973302, 179805 and 418039. LC was supported by the ANU Scholarship and PB was supported by the Australian Research Council Future Fellowship #FT 130101444.

**Competing Interests**

None declared

**Data Sharing**

Data for the study is from the PATH Through Life 20s cohort. Further information including a list of publications is available at <http://crahw.anu.edu.au/research/projects/personality-total-health-path-through-life>. There is no open access to the data set, but strategic collaborations are welcome and contact information is available on the website for interested parties to learn more about formal application procedures.

## References

1. Butterworth, P., B. Rodgers, and T.D. Windsor, *Financial hardship, socio-economic position and depression: Results from the PATH Through Life Survey*. Social Science & Medicine, 2009. **69**(2): p. 229-237.
2. Weich, S. and G. Lewis, *Material standard of living, social class, and the prevalence of the common mental disorders in Great Britain*. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 1998. **52**(1): p. 8-14.
3. Dooley, D. and R. Catalano, *Group interventions and the limits of behavioral medicine*. Behavioural Medicine, 2000. **26**(3): p. 116-128.
4. Kessler, R.C., J.B. Turner, and J.S. House, *Intervening processes in the relationship between unemployment and health*. Psychological Medicine, 1987. **17**(4): p. 949-961.
5. Murphy, G.C. and J.A. Athanasou, *The effect of unemployment on mental health*. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 1999. **72**(1): p. 83-99.
6. Tompa, E., M. Polanyi, and J. Foley, 'Labour Market Flexibility and Worker Insecurity.' in D. Raphael (Ed.) *Social Determinants of Health: Canadian Perspectives* (p. 88- 82) 2nd Edition. 2009, Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
7. Walsh, F. and A. Tickle, *Working Towards Recovery: The Role of Employment in Recovery From Serious Mental Health Problems: A Qualitative Meta-synthesis*. The International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 2013. **17**(2): p. 35 - 49.
8. Butterworth, P., et al., *The Psychosocial Quality of Work Determines Whether Employment has Benefits for Mental Health*. Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 2011. **68**(11): p. 806-812.
9. Broom, D.H., et al., *The lesser evil: bad jobs or unemployment? A survey of mid-aged Australians*. Social Science and Medicine, 2006. **63**(3): p. 575-586.
10. Creed, P. and S. MacIntyre, *The relative effects of deprivation of the latent and manifest benefits of employment on the well-being of unemployed people*. Journal of Occupation Health Psychology, 2001. **6**(4): p. 324-31.
11. Muntaner, C., et al., *Class Exploitation and Psychiatric Disorders*, in *Tackling Health Inequalities Through Public Health Practice: Theory to Action*, R.B. Hofrichter, R, Editor. 2010, Oxford University Press: Oxford.
12. Dooley, D. and J.A. Prause, *The social costs of underemployment: inadequate employment as disguised unemployment*. 2004, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Friedland, D.S. and R.H. Price, *Underemployment: consequences for the health and well-being of workers*. Am J Community Psychol, 2003. **32**(1-2): p. 33-45.

14. Eamon, M.K. and C.-F. Wu, *Effects of unemployment and underemployment on material hardship in single-mother families*. Children and Youth Services Review, 2011. **33**(2): p. 233-241.

15. Creed, P.A., J. Muller, and M.A. Machin, *The role of satisfaction with occupational status, neuroticism, financial strain and categories of experience in predicting mental health in the unemployed*. Personality and Individual Differences, 2001. **30**(3): p. 435-447.

16. Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Extended Labour Force Underutilisation Rate*. Australian Labour Market Statistics 2014; Available from: : <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/394333889d406eeb9ca2570610019e9a5/ef44f37da92fddeeca2571a3001a4180!OpenDocument> (Accessed 12 February 2015).

17. Lorant, V., et al., *Depression and socio-economic risk factors: 7-year longitudinal population study*. The British Journal of Psychiatry, 2007. **190**(4): p. 293-298.

18. Whelan, C.T., *The role of income, life-style deprivation and financial strain in mediating the impact of unemployment on psychological distress: Evidence from the Republic of Ireland*. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 1992. **65**(4): p. 331-344.

19. Payne, R.L. and J. Hartley, *A test of a model for explaining the affective experience of unemployed men*. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 1987. **60**(1): p. 31-47.

20. Butterworth, P., S.C. Olesen, and L.S. Leach, *The role of hardship in the association between socio-economic position and depression*. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 2012. **46**(4): p. 364-73.

21. Crosier, T., P. Butterworth, and B. Rodgers, *Mental health problems among single and partnered mothers. The role of financial hardship and social support*. Social Psychiatry and Psychiatroc Epidemiology, 2007. **42**(1): p. 6-13.

22. Brown, G.W. and P.M. Moran, *Single mothers, poverty and depression*. Psychological Medicine, 1997. **27**(1): p. 21-33.

23. Ullah, P., *The association between income, financial strain and psychological well-being among unemployed youths*. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 1990. **63**(4): p. 317-330.

24. Lynch, J.W., et al., *Income inequality and mortality: importance to health of individual income, psychosocial environment, or material conditions*. British Medical Journal, 2000. **320**(7243): p. 1200-4.

25. Mirowsky, J. and C.E. Ross, *Age and the Effect of Economic Hardship on Depression*. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 2001. **42**(2): p. 132-150.

26. Weng, C.Y., *SES Gradient in Psychological Distress Revisited: A Dynamic Perspective on the Mediating Effect of Financial Strain and Mastery*. 2008: Iowa State University.

27. Pearlin, L.I., et al., *The life-course origins of mastery among older people*. J Health Soc Behav, 2007. **48**(2): p. 164-79.

28. Karraker, A., *"Feeling Poor": Perceived Economic Position and Environmental Mastery Among Older Americans*. Journal of Aging and Health, 2014. **26**(3): p. 474-494.
29. Pearlin, L.I., *The stress process revisited: Reflections on concepts and their interrelationships.*, in *Handbook of the sociology of mental health*, C.S.P. Aneshensel, J.C., Editor. 1999, Kluwer Academic/Plenum: New York. p. 395 - 416.
30. Thoits, P., *Stress, Coping, and Social Support Processes: Where Are We? What Next?* Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1995. **35**: p. 53 - 79.
31. Pudrovskaya, T., et al., *The Sense of Mastery as a Mediator and Moderator in the Association Between Economic Hardship and Health in Late Life*. Journal of Aging and Health, 2005. **17**(5): p. 634-660.
32. Lachman, M.E. and S.L. Weaver, *The sense of control as a moderator of social class differences in health and well-being*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1998. **74**(3): p. 763 - 773.
33. Cohen, S. and T.A. Wills, *Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis*. Psychol Bull, 1985. **98**(2): p. 310-57.
34. Infurna, F., et al., *Perceived Control Facilitates Adjustment to Unemployment : Findings from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP) in 10th International German Socio-Economic Panel User Conference 2012*: Berlin.
35. Price, R.H., J.N. Choi, and A.D. Vinokur, *Links in the chain of adversity following job loss: how financial strain and loss of personal control lead to depression, impaired functioning, and poor health*. J Occup Health Psychol, 2002. **7**(4): p. 302-12.
36. Creed, P.A. and K. Moore, *Social Support, Social Undermining, and Coping in Underemployed and Unemployed Persons*. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2006. **36**(2): p. 321-339.
37. Gore, S., *The effect of social support in moderating the health consequences of unemployment*. J Health Soc Behav, 1978. **19**(2): p. 157-65.
38. Kiely, K.M. and P. Butterworth, *Validation of four measures of mental health against depression and generalized anxiety in a community based sample*. Psychiatry Res, 2015. **225**(3): p. 291-8.
39. Franks, F. and S.A. Faux, *Depression, stress, mastery, and social resources in four ethnocultural women's groups*. Research in Nursing & Health, 1990. **13**(5): p. 283-292.
40. Ware, J., Jr., M. Kosinski, and S.D. Keller, *A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity*. Med Care, 1996. **34**(3): p. 220-33.
41. Paul, K.I. and K. Moser, *Unemployment impairs mental health: Meta-analyses*. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 2009. **74**(3): p. 264-282.

42. Anstey, K.J., et al., *Cohort Profile: The PATH through life project*. International Journal of Epidemiology, 2012. **41**(4): p. 951-960.

43. Kilian, R. and T. Becker, *Macro-economic indicators and labour force participation of people with schizophrenia*. Journal of Mental Health, 2007. **16**(2): p. 211-222.

44. Turner, J.B., R.C. Kessler, and J.S. House, *Factors facilitating adjustment to unemployment: implications for intervention*. Am J Community Psychol, 1991. **19**(4): p. 521-42.

45. Taylor, S.E. and L.G. Aspinwall, *Mediating and moderating processes in psychosocial stress: Appraisal, coping, resistance, and vulnerability*, in *Psychosocial stress: Perspectives on structure, theory, life-course, and methods*. 1996, Academic Press: San Diego, CA, US. p. 71-110.



**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics reporting health, socio-economic, demographic and psychosocial characteristics of respondents across the three waves.

	Wave 1 (20–		Wave 2 (24–		Wave 3 (28–	
	24yrs)		28yrs)		32yrs)	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
<i>N</i>	1162	1242	1013	1126	920	1058
Employment status (%)						
- Employed	81.24	79.22	89.72	84.07	94.35	85.35
- Unemployed	6.74	5.11	4.25	2.58	2.28	1.80
- PT looking FT	4.58	4.79	2.08	1.69	.43	.95
- NILF	7.43	10.88	3.95	11.65	2.93	11.91
Marital status (%)						
- Married	18.58	27.84	22.04	30.19	42.61	48.25
- Never married	81.16	70.45	76.19	65.98	52.07	46.83
- Divorced/Separated/Widowed	.26	1.70	1.78	3.83	5.33	4.92
Education (%)						
- Did not finish Year 12	7.78	7.39	5.64	5.35	4.35	4.84
Dependent Children (%)						
- Have dependent children	6.23	13.88	15.91	26.27	36.41	46.50
Physical health						
- RAND SF12 (mean score & sd)	52.31 (6.5)	50.81 (7.2)	52.36 (6.1)	50.66 (7.6)	51.8 (6.5)	50.3 (8.2)
Financial Difficulty (%)						

-	Facing financial difficulty	24.35	30.24	15.61	13.02	7.74	9.11
	sometimes or often (w1),						
	experience hardship (w2 +						
	w3) <sup>§</sup>						
	Mastery (%)						
-	Low sense of mastery score	33.94	40.86	35.98	41.29	35.56	38.18
	(Pearlin’s scale)						
	Depression (%)						
-	High score (indicating	7.19	12.27	9.80	12.15	8.92	10.98
	clinical depression)						

<sup>§</sup>w1 = wave1, w2 = wave 2, w3 = wave 3

**Table 2.** Prevalence of depression and univariate relationship between depression and various socio-economic, demographic and psychological measures.

	Current Depression (%)	Univariate Odds ratio (95% CI)
Employment status		
- Employed	9	
- Unemployed	21	<b>2.35 (1.71 – 2.72)</b>
- PT looking FT	17	<b>1.80 (1.20 – 2.72)</b>
- NILF	17	<b>1.74 (1.35 – 2.23)</b>
Gender		
- Male	9	
- Female	12	<b>1.44 (1.18 – 1.75)</b>
Marital status		
- Married	8	
- Never married	11	<b>1.37 (1.13 – 1.67)</b>
- Divorced/Separated/Widowed	23	<b>3.14 (2.14 – 4.60)</b>
Education		
- Finished Year 12	10	
- Did not finish Year 12	18	<b>1.92 (1.41 – 2.63)</b>
Dependent Children		
- No children	10	
- Have dependent Children	12	<b>1.15 (.95 – 1.39)</b>
Physical health		
- RAND SF12		<b>.91 (.91 – .93)</b>
Financial Difficulty/Hardship		

1	-	No	8	
2				
3	-	Yes	21	2.50 (2.08 – 2.98)
4				
5				
6		Mastery		
7				
8	-	High	4	
9				
10	-	Low	21	5.82 (4.79 – 7.06)
11				
12				
13		Social support friends (positive)		
14				
15	-	Low	14	2.06 (1.75 – 2.44)
16				
17	-	High	7	
18				
19		Social support family (positive)		
20				
21				
22	-	Low	16	2.06 (1.74 – 2.45)
23				
24	-	High	8	
25				
26		Social support friends (conflict)		
27				
28	-	Low	7	
29				
30	-	High	12	1.64 (1.36 – 1.98)
31				
32		Social support family (conflict)		
33				
34	-	Low	7	
35				
36	-	High	12	1.63 (1.36 – 1.95)
37				
38		Age/Wave		
39				
40	-	Wave 1 (20-24yrs)	10	
41				
42	-	Wave 2 (24-28yrs)	11	1.15 (.97 – 1.38)
43				
44	-	Wave 3 (28-32yrs)	10	1.05 (.88 – 1.25)
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				
50				
51				
52				
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

**Table 3.** Results of a multivariable logistic regression analyses for predictors of depression

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
Labour-force status								
(reference: employed)								
<i>Part-time looking for full-time work</i>	<b>1.79</b> (1.19 – 2.70)	<b>1.89</b> (1.25 – 2.87)	<b>1.75</b> (1.13 – 2.70)	<b>1.75</b> (1.12 – 2.74)	<b>1.62</b> (1.04 – 2.52)	<b>1.73</b> (1.10 – 2.71)	<b>1.60</b> (1.01 – 2.53)	<b>1.59</b> (1.00 – 2.53)
<i>Unemployed</i>	<b>2.40</b> (1.74 – 3.32)	<b>2.49</b> (1.80 – 3.62)	<b>2.13</b> (1.50 – 3.00)	<b>1.91</b> (1.34 – 2.72)	<b>1.88</b> (1.32 – 2.68)	<b>1.80</b> (1.25 – 2.88)	<b>1.64</b> (1.14 – 2.38)	<b>1.55</b> (1.06 – 2.25)
<i>NILF</i>	1.65 (1.29 – 2.13)	<b>1.67</b> (1.30 – 2.14)	1.25 (.95 – 1.66)	1.23 (.92 – 1.64)	1.13 (.85 – 1.52)	1.16 (.86 – 1.55)	1.06 (.79 – 1.44)	1.06 (.78 – 1.44)
Gender (men reference)	<b>1.42</b> (1.16 – 1.73)	<b>1.41</b> (1.16 – 1.72)	<b>1.28</b> (1.05 – 1.56)	<b>1.54</b> (1.27 – 1.88)	<b>1.30</b> (1.06 – 1.52)	1.22 (.99 – 1.49)	<b>1.24</b> (1.00 – 1.52)	<b>1.39</b> (1.13 – 1.71)
Age (reference: 20 – 24 yrs)								
<i>Age 24 – 28 years</i>		<b>1.22</b> (1.02 – 1.44)	<b>1.20</b> (1.00 – 1.45)	<b>1.24</b> (1.02 – 1.52)	<b>1.37</b> (1.13 – 1.66)	<b>1.22</b> (1.00 – 1.48)	<b>1.37</b> (1.12 – 1.69)	<b>1.40</b> (1.13 – 1.73)
<i>Age 28 – 32 years</i>		1.13 (.94 – 1.35)	1.04 (.85 – 1.24)	1.01 (.88 – 1.36)	<b>1.26</b> (1.01 – 1.56)	1.06 (.86 – 1.33)	<b>1.26</b> (1.00 – 1.59)	<b>1.28</b> (1.01 – 1.62)

1		1.08	1.11	1.05	1.06
2		1.70 (.85	.99 (.78		
3	Dependent children	(.84 –	(.86 -	(.81 -	(.82 -
4		- 1.29)	- 1.28)		
5		1.39)	1.43)	1.35)	1.36)
6					
7					
8	Marital Status				
9	(partner/spouse				
10	reference)				
11					
12					
13					
14					
15		1.47	1.45	1.43	1.46
16		1.41	1.38		
17	Never Married	(1.18 -	(1.16 –	(1.14 -	(1.16 -
18		(1.12 -	(1.09 -		
19		1.84)	1.82)	1.79)	1.84)
20		1.78)	1.75)		
21					
22					
23	Separated/Divorced/	3.29	3.12	3.07	3.18
24		2.96	2.89		
25	Widowed	(2.18 -	(2.04 –	(2.03 -	(2.07 -
26		(1.92 –	(1.86 -		
27		4.97))	4.76)	4.65)	4.88)
28		4.59)	4.89)		
29					
30	RAND SF-12 Physical	.92 (.91	.93 (.92	.93 (.92	.93 (.92
31		.93 (.92	.93 (.92	.93 (.92	.93 (.92
32	Function	- .93)	- .93)	- .94)	- .94)
33		- .94)	- .94)	- .94)	- .94)
34					
35	Did not finished Year 12	1.58	1.41	1.43	1.43
36		1.32	1.26		
37	(finished Year 12	(1.13 -	(1.01 –	(1.02 -	(1.02 -
38		(.93 -	(.89 -		
39	reference)	2.21)	1.98)	2.00)	2.02)
40		1.86)	1.79)		
41					
42	Social Support				
43					
44					
45	Low positive family	1.59			1.32
46					
47	support	(1.32 –			(1.09 -
48		1.91)			1.60)
49					
50					
51	High conflict family	1.13			1.03
52					
53	support	(.89 –			(.81 -
54		1.42)			1.31)
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					



1	<i>Low positive friend</i>	1.92		1.50
2				
3	<i>support</i>	(1.59 –		(1.27 –
4				
5		2.32)		1.82)
6				
7				
8	<i>High conflict friend</i>	1.44		1.32
9				
10	<i>support</i>	(1.14 –		(1.05 –
11				
12		1.81)		1.69)
13				
14	Economic measures	2.17	1.99	1.87
15				
16	<i>Financial</i>	(1.78 –	(1.62 –	(1.51 –
17				
18	<i>Difficulty/Hardship</i>	2.65)	2.45)	2.30)
19				
20			4.71	4.57
21				4.05
22				
23				
24				
25	Pearlin's Mastery Scale	(3.85 –	(3.74 –	(3.30 –
26				
27		5.75)	2.45)	4.98)
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				
50				
51				
52				
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

**Table 4.** Fraction of difference between unemployed (and PTLFT) and employed persons in the presence of depression

Unemployed versus Employed		PTLFT versus Employed	
Mediating Variable	Depression	Mediating Variable	Depression
Social support only	19	Social support only	1
Financial Hardship only	28	Financial Hardship only	17
Mastery only	29	Mastery only	3
Socio-demographic, social support, financial hardship, mastery	51	Socio-demographic, social support, financial hardship, mastery	21

## STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Pg. # & paragraph #
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Noted in title and abstract p. 1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	p. 1
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	p. 2
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	p.4 paragraph 7
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	p. 5 paragraph 8
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	p. 5 paragraph 8/9
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	p. 5 paragraph 8/9 – reference for detailed sampling provided in study
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	p. 6/7 paragraph 11/15
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	p. 6/7 paragraph 11/15
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	p. 8 paragraph 17
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	NA
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	p. 6/7 paragraph 11/15
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	p. 8 paragraph 16
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	NA
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	p. 8 paragraph 17
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	p. 8 paragraph 17

Results			Page # & paragraph #
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	Table 1.
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	See above for attrition rates amongst groups – p. 8 paragraph 17
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	p. 9 paragraph 17
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Minimal - p. 8 paragraph 16
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	Follow up is 4 years, documented throughout manuscript
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	See results tables – table 1
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	See results in tables – 95% CI
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Table 4.
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	p. 11/12 paragraph 25/27
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	p. 12 paragraph 28
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	p. 13 paragraph 30
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	p. 14 paragraph 31
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	p. 15

For peer review only

# BMJ Open

## The role of financial hardship, mastery and social support in the association between employment status and depression: Results from an Australian longitudinal cohort study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2015-009834.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	22-Mar-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Crowe, Laura; Australian National University, Butterworth, Peter; Australian National University, Research School of Population Health, Centre for Research on Ageing, Health and Wellbeing
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Mental health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, Unemployment, Depression, Financial Hardship, Mastery, Underemployment

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



**The role of financial hardship, mastery and social support in the association between employment status and depression: Results from an Australian longitudinal cohort study**  
*Running head: Employment status and depression*  
**Laura Crowe<sup>1</sup> and Peter Butterworth<sup>2</sup>**

Corresponding author:  
Laura Crowe, Research School of Psychology, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia.  
e-mail: [Laura.Crowe@anu.edu.au](mailto:Laura.Crowe@anu.edu.au)

**Abstract**  
**Objective:** There is robust epidemiological and clinical evidence of the harmful effects of unemployment on psychological wellbeing, but the mechanisms through which this occurs is still strongly debated. In addition, there is even less evidence on the impact of underemployment on mental health. Utilising longitudinal data collected from a cohort of 20 – 24 year olds, the present study examines a range of employed states and investigates the role of mastery, financial hardship and social support in the relationship between labour status and depression.  
**Method:** Responses were from the PATH Through Life Project: A representative, community based survey conducted in Canberra and Queanbeyan (NSW) in Australia, where respondents (n = 2,404) in the early twenties were followed for eight years. Depression was measured using the self-report Goldberg Depression Scale, with the likely presence of depression being indicated by scores 7 or greater.  
**Results:** The analyses identified unemployment and underemployment as significant predictors of depression, compared to their employed counterparts. Both unemployment and underemployment remained significantly correlated with depression even after accounting for socio-demographic, economic and psychological variables. Social support, financial hardship and a sense of personal control (mastery) all emerged as important mediators between unemployment and depression.  
**Conclusion:** Both unemployment and underemployment were associated with increased risk of depression. The strength of this relationship was attenuated but remained significant after accounting for key variables (mastery, financial hardship and social support) and extensive socio-demographic and health covariates, indicating that no or inadequate employment contributes to poorer mental health over and above these factors.  
**Keywords**  
Unemployment, underemployment, depression, financial hardship, epidemiology, mastery

**Strengths and Limitations:**

- Use of large longitudinal cohort data with a high response rate.
- The data allowed for the analysis of the independent effects of employment status and depression after controlling for sociodemographic and health factors.
- The limitations were as follows: Self-reported health and mental health measures; different measures of financial hardship/difficulty utilized in wave 1; the findings come from a community sample and require further research to confirm the generalizability for a national sample; lack of data on duration of un/under-employment.

<sup>1</sup> L. Crowe, Research School of Psychology, Australian National University, Australia  
<sup>2</sup> P. Butterworth, Research School of Population Health, Centre for Research on Ageing, Health and Wellbeing, Australian National University, Australia

## Introduction

Understanding the relationship between social factors and mental health has long been of interest for mental health service providers and, social and economic policy. It has been well established that those who are not employed, or those who are unable obtain “good quality” employment, are at significant risk for poor mental and physical health.[1-5] Research has identified a number of pathways through which unemployment may be related to poorer mental health outcomes, including a disruption to daily routine, lower self-esteem, adoption of health-threatening coping behaviours, and a higher level of stress.[6] This has been further clarified through the identification of the protective mechanisms inherent in obtaining gainful employment. Employment fulfils material and psychological needs such as financial security, social inclusion, and encourages regular social and mental activity.[7] However, recent literature has also highlighted that jobs that are perceived as unsatisfying, stressful and offer little autonomy do not always protect physical and mental health, and have been associated with comparable health outcomes as unemployment.[8 9]

Theory and research evidence suggests that the effects of unemployment on depressive symptomatology may be mediated by financial hardship and the related psychological experience of poor personal control over one’s life.[4 10] The focus of this paper is to investigate the extent that financial hardship and a sense of personal control may mediate the relationship between employment status and depression, after taking into account other relevant social and physical factors.[11] Of particular interest is to compare the experience of underemployment and unemployment with fulltime employment, not just between groups but also considering within-person change. Research thus far has demonstrated that underemployment is typically associated with lower levels of health and wellbeing.[12-14] Therefore, failure to account for this group could lead to an

underestimation of the harmful effects seen in inadequate employment settings, or could fail to identify beneficial effects of even minimal employment compared to no employment at all.

Financial loss is an inevitable outcome of unemployment.[15] Measures of financial hardship or deprivation usually assess whether people are unable to provide basic necessities for themselves, their family or other dependents due to a lack of resources.[1 16] Over a seven year period, Lorant and colleagues[17] showed that subjective financial strain and high scores on the deprivation index were associated with increases in both depressive symptoms and incidence of major depression across annual waves. The study found that changes in income or employment were less strongly associated with changes in depressive symptoms or major depression than poverty and hardship measures.[17] These findings have been demonstrated amongst other groups, including: families,[18] adults,[19 20] single mothers,[21 22] and among young unemployed persons.[23] Financial hardship is thus considered to be one of the main pathways through which employment status affects depression.

This is consistent with the neo-material perspective, which argues that indices of deprivation such as owning a car or a house should be incorporated into research on the social epidemiology of psychiatric disorders.[11] Neo-material scholars argue that it is the material risk and lack of protective factors linked to poverty – such as, poor housing, poor diet, drugs, environmental and workplace hazards, lack of access to healthcare – that determine most social inequalities in health.[11 24] In contrast, the psychosocial theoretical perspective argues that financial hardship affects overall mental health through undermining an individual's sense of mastery, which in turn renders an individual more vulnerable to depression.[25 26] This psychological approach emphasizes individuals' perceptions of their relative standing in the income distribution and perceived stress to explain the social gradient in mental health.[11 24]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Mastery is commonly used as a measure of control, defined by Pearlin and Schooler[27] as the perception that events are under one's own personal control, rather than under the control of external forces. Financial hardship or strain is typically considered to contribute to low mastery through providing a sense that there is great difficulty in changing circumstances in major domains of life,[28] as well as actual control over one's life (i.e. choice over what neighbourhood to live in or payment for medical treatment).[29] It is thus hypothesized that that lower socioeconomic status imbues an individual with a sense that they experience relative disadvantage.[25 29] However, not all individuals who are exposed to stressors or financial hardship experience deterioration in physical and psychological functioning.[30 31] Research has shown that a sense of mastery can both directly reduce psychological distress and can also act as a buffer against deleterious effects of stressful life events,[32 33] such as poor physical health;[33] and economic hardship.[32 33]

Similarly, high levels social support are also thought to 'buffer' or mitigate the effects of stressful life events on mental health.[34] Unemployed individuals who experience greater social connectedness may perceive unemployed induced stressors to be more manageable, protecting declines in mental health.[35] Though social support might attenuate the effects of stress and financial hardship on mental health, those who are of low socio-economic status or who are unemployed typically report lower social support levels.[36 37] Furthermore, research has demonstrated that not only does social support confer resilience to stress, but that unemployment stress is actually exacerbated by low levels of social support.[38]

The current study seeks to explore the relationship between employment circumstances and mental health in one cohort followed across eight years and three waves of data. Compared with much of the previous research in this area, this study will incorporate a category of "underemployment" in addition to unemployment, and those who are "Not in the labour force" (NILF), and an employed category. Specifically, the study seeks to measure the

extent to which a sense of mastery, financial hardship and social support mediate the relationship between employment status and depression, after taking into account potential confounding socio-demographic and health factors.

**Method**

*Data source and sample*

The data used for this analysis are from the Personality and Total Health (PATH) Through Life Project. PATH follows three cohorts of respondents from Canberra and the neighbouring town of Queanbeyan (initial interviews conducted between 1999 and 2001), and assesses the health and wellbeing. The sampling frame was the electoral roll (registration on the electoral roll is compulsory for Australian citizens over the age of 18 years), and the initial participation rate was 56.6%. Three waves of data were collected with 4 year intervals between each wave. All respondents were sent a letter outlining the purpose of the research and, if they were willing to participate, they were then interviewed by a professionally trained interviewer. The wave to wave response rate for this sample at each wave of subsequent data collection was 89% (Wave 2) and 82% (Wave 3). Participants who did not respond at one wave may still return for a later wave. The Human Research Ethics Committee of The Australian National University approved the study protocol. Further details of the survey including the sampling procedure are reported elsewhere.[39] The current study is restricted to the youngest PATH cohort (birth years: 1975 – 1979) who were aged 20 to 24 years at the initial interview. This resulted in a total possible sample of 2404 participants.

*Survey Procedure*

Participants completed the questionnaire on a laptop computer. An interviewer took each participant through the first set of questions, demonstrating how to enter responses into the personal computer. The interviewer conducted physical and cognitive tests. The components

of the questionnaire relevant to the present study are outlined below. Unless stated otherwise, measures were collected at each wave.

### *Measures*

#### ▪ Depression

The outcome measure analysed in this study was the Goldberg Depression Scale,[40] a nine-item scale measuring experience of a particular symptom of depression (e.g., loss of weight, lack of energy) in the prior four weeks. Total scores for depression are calculated by summing the number of items endorsed providing a continuous score of 0 to 9. We drew upon the results of previous research assessing the validity The Goldberg Depression Scales to identify an appropriate cut point to classify likely depression in this study.[41] This previous research, also based upon PATH data, assessed depressive episodes according to the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10) using the World Health Organisation (WHO) Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI) as criterion. The results showed high concordance between scores on the Goldberg Depression Scale and depression diagnosis, and good discrimination between cases and non-cases. The analysis supported the use of a score of seven or greater on the Goldberg Depression Scale to indicate the presence of likely depression (1). For this analysis, therefore, the total score was dichotomized so that a score of seven or greater indicated the presence of likely depression (1), and below seven represented no depression (0). For ease of reading we often use the term ‘depression’ through this report, but acknowledge this is more accurately defined as ‘likely depression’.

#### ▪ Mastery, Financial Hardship/Difficulty and Social Support

Mastery was measured by Pearlin’s Mastery Scale,[27] which is a seven-item scale used to assess the degree to which individual’s believe that their life is under their control by indicating the degree to which they agree or disagree with statements such as ‘There is really no way I can solve problems I have’ or, ‘I have little control over the things that happen to



me.’ Scores range from 7 to 28, with higher scores indicating higher mastery. Although a cut-off point has not been established, generally, a score of 21 or less indicates the likelihood that one perceives that their life is directed by forces outside of their control.[42] Therefore this measure was dichotomised accordingly.

Financial hardship assessed four core components of objective deprivation drawn from the Australian Household Expenditure Survey.[43] The questions pertaining to financial strain asked participants the following: Over the past year have the following happened to you because you were short of money – 1) pawned or sold something 2) went without meals, 3) unable to heat home, 4) asked for help from welfare/community organisations. Participants endorsing one or more of these items were categorised as experiencing financial strain. The hardship items were not included in Wave 1, instead a measure of financial difficulty was utilized which asked participants if they had gone without things they really needed in the last year because they were short of money. Participants who answered “yes, sometimes” and “yes often” were categorised as experiencing financial strain. While this does not constitute an objective measure of deprivation, it allows comparison of the association of depression with financial circumstances.

Finally, a social support measure that assessed the level of positive social supports from friends and family (high versus low) and conflict from friends and family (high versus low) was included. These interactions were assessed using two sets of five items, each applied to both friend and family relationships.[44] These measures were dichotomized at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, with the bottom 50% representing low positive social support and the top 50% representing high positive social support from family and friends, and the reverse for negative social support – the bottom 50% representing high conflict and the top 50% representing low conflict.

- Employment status and covariates

Based on participants' reports, employment status was categorised as 'fulltime/part-time employed', 'part-time employed but looking for full-time employment', 'unemployed' and, 'not in the labour force' (NILF). Other demographic, social and physical measures that were utilized as covariates for the analyses included: gender, age, years of education, marital/partner status, any dependent children, physical health and social support (friends and family). Marital status was categorised into 'cohabiting relationship', i.e. married or defacto, 'divorced/separated/widowed' and 'never married'. Education was categorised into 'finished Year 12' and 'not finished Year 12'. Participants were categorised into "have at least one dependent child" and "no children". Physical health was measured using the 12-Item Short Form Health Survey [SF-12; 45] with higher scores indicating better health. As the SF-12 measure is not a key variable and our preliminary analysis showed a linear relationship with the measure of depression, this was included in the model as a continuous variable

### *Statistical analyses*

Descriptive statistics of the socio-demographic and economic circumstances of the respondents were calculated by gender and age. Simple logistic regression was then utilized to assess the association of depression with the demographic and socio-economic characteristics. Eight separate longitudinal random intercept multivariable logistic regression models were used to examine predictors of depression for individuals who were unemployed, PTLFT, NILF and employed. Moderating variables included social support, financial hardship/deprivation and a sense of personal control. Covariates included age, gender, marital status, physical health, and dependent children. Finally, the 'explained fraction' approach[46] was used to calculate the proportion of the relationship between employment status and depression that was explained by important mediating variables (i.e. financial hardship, mastery, social support and the socio-demographic variables). The change in odds ratios for the unemployed and PTLFT work were quantified by calculating the percent reduction in

odds ratios after the addition of the key mediating variables. This was calculated by contrasting the OR of the model before (ORa) (Model 3) with the OR after (ORb) (Models 4, 5, 6 and 7) each of the mediating variables were added by applying the following formula:  $((ORa - 1) - (ORb - 1)) / (ORa - 1)$ .

Most participants (n = 6521) had complete data at both baseline and follow-up. In wave 2, 265 participants (11%) had dropped out of the survey, and 426 participants (17%) had dropped out by wave 3. Cases with missing data were minimal (ranging from 0 to 1.1% for individual items). The statistical models used all available data; those with missing data were excluded. Previous sensitivity analysis conducted on the data by Butterworth et al.[1] showed that attrition was not independently associated with depression, but was associated with being male, not participating in the labour force (although not unemployment), poorer physical functioning, lower levels of educational attainment and not having a spouse/partner.

**Results**

Table 1 presents descriptive data on the respondents across wave 1, 2 and 3 by gender. Unemployment rates were highest at wave 1 (ages 20-24 years) and declined across the following two waves (ages 24-28 and 28-32 years). Table 2 demonstrated the univariate relationships between the measure of depression and a number of socio-demographic, economic and psychological measures. Around a fifth of respondents who were unemployed were classified with likely depression, compared to only 9% of those who were employed. The prevalence of depression amongst the “underemployed” was also nearly double of the prevalence rates of those who were employed at 17%. The odds ratios for both unemployment and PTLFT indicated a greater likelihood of depression (OR = 2.35; OR = 1.80) compared to employed. Experiencing financial hardship (OR = 2.50) and a low sense of mastery (OR = 5.82) each demonstrated a strong association with depression

Table 3 presents a series of separate multivariate logistic regression models conducted to examine the association between employment circumstance and depression, while controlling for a number of demographic, physical health, socio-economic and psychological variables.

Model 1 demonstrated that the association between unemployment and depression remained significant (OR = 2.40) after controlling for gender. There was also an association between PTLFT and depression (OR = 1.79). In model 2, when age is incorporated into the model, the odds ratios of both unemployment and PTLFT work increased (OR = 2.49; OR = 1.89). Model 3 demonstrates that this association between unemployment and depression (OR = 2.13), and PTLFT and depression (OR = 1.75), remained significant after controlling for all the covariates. In addition to the experience of unemployment and PTLFT employment, being separated/divorced or never being married, lower physical function, not having finished Year 12, aged 24 – 28 years, and being female all showed an independent association with depression.

The next three models consider the role of key explanatory covariates. Model 4 included the social support measures (family and friends). These measures did not appear to impact the association between PTLFT employment and depression which remained significant at (OR = 1.75), while the association between unemployment and depression decreased but remained significant (OR = 1.91). Low positive family, low positive friend, and high negative friend support were all associated with increased odds of having depression.

Model 5 included a measure of financial hardship, which was associated with over double the odds of depression (OR = 2.17). After controlling for financial difficulty, the odds ratio between unemployment and depression, and between PTLFT employment and depression, decreased but both remained significant (OR = 1.88; OR = 1.62). Model 6 incorporated Pearlin's measure of Mastery. After controlling for sense of mastery, the association between unemployment and depression decreased but remained significant (OR = 1.80). Similar to

Model 4, accounting for the measure of mastery did not impact the association of depression with PTLFT (OR = 1.73). In Model 7, both mastery and financial hardship were included in the model. This saw a further reduction in the odds ratio between depression and unemployment (OR = 1.64) and between depression and PTLFT (OR = 1.60).

Model 8 incorporated all the variables. The odds of depression when unemployed decreased further (OR = 1.55) when compared to being employed, while the association between depression and PTLFT remained largely unchanged. Having a low sense of personal control over one's life showed the highest odds of depression.

Finally, Table 4 quantifies the change in odds ratios for the unemployed and PTLFT work following the addition of key mediating variables. For example, the explained fraction showed 51% of the difference between unemployed and employed individuals in the prevalence of depression was explained by the socio-demographic, social support, mastery and financial hardship measures, compared to only 21% of the difference between PTLFT and employed individuals. Considered separately, the inclusion of financial hardship accounted for 28% and 17% of the association of depression with unemployment and PTLFT work respectively. While the mastery and social support measures also mediated the relationship between unemployment and depression, they explained little of the association between PTLFT and depression.

**Discussion**

This study examined employment status and its association with depression in one cohort from the PATH study across three waves, taking into account both unemployed and “underemployment”. While this study did not directly seek to evaluate the psychological theories of unemployment, it did assess two key factors thought to mediate the effects of employment status: a sense of personal control and financial hardship. The multivariate logistic regression models confirmed that both under-employment and unemployment were

associated with increased risk of depression compared to being employed after controlling for all other measures, including educational attainment, marital status, dependent children, and gender. A key finding of this study was the increased risk of depression that underemployment infers, which supports previous research.[13] However, the odds of depression for the PTLFT compared to the employed group remained largely unaffected by the inclusion of covariates across the different models, except for age and financial hardship. After accounting for all variables the odds of depression for underemployment (OR = 1.59) was comparable to the odds of depression for unemployment (OR = 1.55).

Another key study finding is that social support, financial hardship and a sense of personal control are all important determinants of the association between unemployment and depression. This is consistent with theories that posit that mental health is enhanced by both the manifest (e.g., direct financial) and latent (e.g., interpersonal and psychological) benefits that arise from work.[47 48] The increased risk of financial hardship and deprivation is a salient characteristic in the experience of unemployment. Financial hardship may influence mental health by limiting the capacity of unemployed individuals to fully participate in the generally accepted standards of society.[15] As such, hardship may be conceptualised as analogous to the psychological aspects of unemployment, reducing one's sense of personal control over the future and perceived opportunities. The association between unemployment and depression was also moderated by levels of support from family and friends. Social support may influence how unemployed people respond to their situation and their capacity to deal with it, providing a 'buffer' from the negative effects of unemployment.[49] For some individuals, limited social support from friends and family may be compensated by social connections in the workplace. For such individuals, the impact of job loss may be greater.

While the PTLFT group also showed poorer mental health than those otherwise employed, the current findings showed a distinct set of moderating factors. Importantly, the



pattern of results observed for this group also lend support for the distinction between latent and manifest benefits of work. Evidence that social support and a sense of personal control were not important mediators of the association between PTLFT status and depression suggests that even inadequate levels of employment may provide individuals with some access to these latent benefits. In contrast, hardship was identified as a significant mediator of this association, suggesting that the inadequate remuneration associated with underemployment is a determinant of the poorer mental health of those who are seeking increased working hours.

*Strengths and Limitations*

There are a number of strengths associated with this study and the use of the PATH dataset. The large sample size, random selection from the population, and longitudinal design contribute to the high statistical power and limited sampling bias.[39] Furthermore, the study design, following respondents initially aged in their early 20s over 8 years, focuses our attention on the consequences of employment for a key age group. However, this study has a number of limitations. Most notably were the different measures used for financial hardship, whereby the measure for the first wave was a subjective measure of financial difficulty, and the measure for the second and third wave sought to provide a more objective measure of hardship. As per the study conducted by Butterworth and colleagues[1] using these different measures, each was strongly associated with depression, were strongly interrelated, and did not differ significantly in prevalence rates. Another potential limitation was the use of “part-time employed, looking for full-time work” as a marker of underemployment. Without further information around hours, quality and stability of the part-time work the respondents in this group may be quite heterogeneous in terms of social and economic circumstances. This is beyond the scope of the current project, but is an important topic for future research. Finally, another potential limitation is that participants drawn from the Canberra/Queanbeyan



region may not be representative of the broader Australian population due to relatively higher levels of educational attainment and higher socio-economic status. Therefore it is important that this research is replicated at a national level.

### *Implications for policy and practice*

These findings sit within the broader research field in seeking to understand the mechanisms through which employment status contributes to mental health outcomes, and has clinical and social policy relevance. In the face of unemployment and financial hardship, having a low sense of mastery is likely to strongly increase the risk of depression in comparison to those individuals who are able to maintain a sense of personal control over their life.[4 50 51] Those with a high sense of mastery, may be able to adopt positive coping strategies, such as focusing on the employment situation that is amenable to change, or implementing a problem-solving approach.[50 52] Policy and clinical programs that seek to encourage social inclusion and workforce participation should focus on providing experiences for mastery, as well as access to social relationships, which are both seemingly constrained when facing unemployment.[53] The findings support the continuation of interventions to assist people with mental health problems to find and sustain employment, but they also suggests that a focus is on underemployment is needed to prevent mental health problems.

### *Conclusion*

This study shows that the effects of unemployment and underemployment on depression are not completely explained by socio-demographic, -economic and psychosocial factors. There is something unique about the experience of inadequate employment that contributes to poorer mental health over and above financial hardship and a loss of personal control over one's life. However, it should also be noted that unemployment does not automatically equate with poor mental health. Rather, unemployment in comparison to

employment increases the risk of experiencing the conditions that contribute and perpetuate psychological distress, i.e. relative poverty, financial stress, loss of personal control and autonomy, poor social support. In order to apply this research on a national level, these results need to be replicated using longitudinal data collected from all around Australia. Further research should consider the effect that protracted unemployed periods might have on an individual's mental health, and how mastery and financial hardship might moderate this experience. Looking specifically at welfare receipt and the job search experience may also elucidate some of the unique experiences that contribute to the poor mental health of the unemployed. However, it is clear that research needs to recognise the heterogeneous effects of different types of inadequate employment. Research should seek to more comprehensively define employment states, such as underemployment and the length of time an individual is unemployed, to fully understand the role that employment can play in protecting or reducing an individual's mental health.

**Acknowledgements:**

Thank you to the study participants, PATH Interviewers, Karen Maxwell and Trish Jacomb; and to the current PATH Chief Investigators: Kaarin Anstey, Helen Christensen, Anthony Jorm, Bryan Rodgers, Andrew Mackinnon, Simon Easteal and Nicolas Cherbuin.

**Contributors**

LC and PB were both involved in the conception and design of the study. LC conducted the primary statistical analysis and drafted the manuscript, under the supervision of PB. PB provided statistical expertise and revision of the manuscript. Both approve and take responsibility for the final manuscript.

**Funding**

The PATH Through Life Study is funded by National Health and Medical Research Council Grants 973302, 179805 and 418039. LC was supported by the ANU Scholarship and PB was supported by the Australian Research Council Future Fellowship #FT 130101444.

**Competing Interests**

None declared

**Data Sharing**

Data for the study is from the PATH Through Life 20s cohort. Further information including a list of publications is available at <http://crahw.anu.edu.au/research/projects/personality-total-health-path-through-life>. There is no open access to the data set, but strategic collaborations are welcome and contact information is available on the website for interested parties to learn more about formal application procedures.

## References

1. Butterworth P, Rodgers B, Windsor TD. Financial hardship, socio-economic position and depression: Results from the PATH Through Life Survey. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 2009;**69**(2):229-37
2. Weich S, Lewis G. Material standard of living, social class, and the prevalence of the common mental disorders in Great Britain. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 1998;**52**(1):8-14
3. Dooley D, Catalano R. Group interventions and the limits of behavioral medicine. *Behavioural Medicine* 2000;**26**(3):116-28
4. Kessler RC, Turner JB, House JS. Intervening processes in the relationship between unemployment and health. *Psychol. Med.* 1987;**17**(4):949-61
5. Murphy GC, Athanasou JA. The effect of unemployment on mental health. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 1999;**72**(1):83-99
6. Tompa E, Polanyi M, Foley J. *'Labour Market Flexibility and Worker Insecurity.'* in D. Raphael (Ed.) *Social Determinants of Health: Canadian Perspectives* (p. 88- 82) 2nd Edition. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 2009.
7. Walsh F, Tickle A. Working Towards Recovery: The Role of Employment in Recovery From Serious Mental Health Problems: A Qualitative Meta-synthesis. *The International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation* 2013;**17**(2):35 - 49
8. Butterworth P, Leach LS, Strazdins L, Olesen SC, Rodgers B, Broom DH. The Psychosocial Quality of Work Determines Whether Employment has Benefits for Mental Health. *Occup. Environ. Med.* 2011;**68**(11):806-12
9. Broom DH, D'Souza RM, Strazdins L, Butterworth P, Parslow R, Rodgers B. The lesser evil: bad jobs or unemployment? A survey of mid-aged Australians. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 2006;**63**(3):575-86
10. Creed P, MacIntyre S. The relative effects of deprivation of the latent and manifest benefits of employment on the well-being of unemployed people. *Journal of Occupation Health Psychology* 2001;**6**(4):324-31.
11. Muntaner C, Borrell C, Chung H, Benach J. Class Exploitation and Psychiatric Disorders. In: Hofrichter RB, R, ed. *Tackling Health Inequalities Through Public Health Practice: Theory to Action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
12. Dooley D, Prause JA. *The social costs of underemployment: inadequate employment as disguised unemployment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

13. Friedland DS, Price RH. Underemployment: consequences for the health and well-being of workers. *Am. J. Community Psychol.* 2003;**32**(1-2):33-45

14. Eamon MK, Wu C-F. Effects of unemployment and underemployment on material hardship in single-mother families. *Children and Youth Services Review* 2011;**33**(2):233-41

15. Creed PA, Muller J, Machin MA. The role of satisfaction with occupational status, neuroticism, financial strain and categories of experience in predicting mental health in the unemployed. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 2001;**30**(3):435-47

16. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Extended Labour Force Underutilisation Rate. Secondary Extended Labour Force Underutilisation Rate 2014. : <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/39433889d406eeb9ca2570610019e9a5/ef44f37da92fddeeca2571a3001a4180!OpenDocument> (Accessed 12 February 2015).

17. Lorant V, Croux C, Weich S, Deliege D, Mackenbach J, Anseau M. Depression and socio-economic risk factors: 7-year longitudinal population study. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 2007;**190**(4):293-98

18. Whelan CT. The role of income, life-style deprivation and financial strain in mediating the impact of unemployment on psychological distress: Evidence from the Republic of Ireland. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 1992;**65**(4):331-44

19. Payne RL, Hartley J. A test of a model for explaining the affective experience of unemployed men. *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 1987;**60**(1):31-47

20. Butterworth P, Olesen SC, Leach LS. The role of hardship in the association between socio-economic position and depression. *Aust. N. Z. J. Psychiatry* 2012;**46**(4):364-73

21. Crosier T, Butterworth P, Rodgers B. Mental health problems among single and partnered mothers. The role of financial hardship and social support. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 2007;**42**(1):6-13

22. Brown GW, Moran PM. Single mothers, poverty and depression. *Psychol. Med.* 1997;**27**(1):21-33

23. Ullah P. The association between income, financial strain and psychological well-being among unemployed youths. *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 1990;**63**(4):317-30

24. Lynch JW, Smith GD, Kaplan GA, House JS. Income inequality and mortality: importance to health of individual income, psychosocial environment, or material conditions. *British Medical Journal* 2000;**320**(7243):1200-4

25. Mirowsky J, Ross CE. Age and the Effect of Economic Hardship on Depression. *J. Health Soc. Behav.* 2001;**42**(2):132-50

26. Weng CY. *SES Gradient in Psychological Distress Revisited: A Dynamic Perspective on the Mediating Effect of Financial Strain and Mastery*. Iowa State University, 2008.

27. Pearlin LI, Schooler C. The structure of coping. *J. Health Soc. Behav.* 1978;**19**(1):2-21

28. Pearlin LI, Nguyen KB, Schieman S, Milkie MA. The life-course origins of mastery among older people. *J Health Soc Behav* 2007;**48**(2):164-79
29. Karraker A. "Feeling Poor": Perceived Economic Position and Environmental Mastery Among Older Americans. *J. Aging Health* 2014;**26**(3):474-94
30. Pearlin LI. The stress process revisited: Reflections on concepts and their interrelationships. In: Aneshensel CSP, J.C., ed. *Handbook of the sociology of mental health*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum, 1999:395 - 416.
31. Thoits P. Stress, Coping, and Social Support Processes: Where Are We? What Next? *J. Health Soc. Behav.* 1995;**35**:53 - 79
32. Pudrovska T, Schieman S, Pearlin LI, Nguyen K. The Sense of Mastery as a Mediator and Moderator in the Association Between Economic Hardship and Health in Late Life. *J. Aging Health* 2005;**17**(5):634-60
33. Lachman ME, Weaver SL. The sense of control as a moderator of social class differences in health and well-being. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 1998;**74**(3):763 - 73
34. Cohen S, Wills TA. Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological bulletin* 1985;**98**(2):310-57
35. Infurna F, Gerstorf D, Ram N, Wagner G, J. H. Perceived Control Facilitates Adjustment to Unemployment : Findings from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP) 10th International German Socio-Economic Panel User Conference Berlin, 2012.
36. Price RH, Choi JN, Vinokur AD. Links in the chain of adversity following job loss: how financial strain and loss of personal control lead to depression, impaired functioning, and poor health. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* 2002;**7**(4):302-12
37. Creed PA, Moore K. Social Support, Social Undermining, and Coping in Underemployed and Unemployed Persons. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 2006;**36**(2):321-39 doi: 10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00010.x[published Online First: Epub Date].
38. Gore S. The effect of social support in moderating the health consequences of unemployment. *J Health Soc Behav* 1978;**19**(2):157-65
39. Anstey KJ, Christensen H, Butterworth P, et al. Cohort Profile: The PATH through life project. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* 2012;**41**(4):951-60
40. Goldberg D, Bridges K, Duncan-Jones P, Grayson D. Detecting anxiety and depression in general medical settings. *British Medical Journal* 1988;**297**:897-99
41. Kiely KM, Butterworth P. Validation of four measures of mental health against depression and generalized anxiety in a community based sample. *Psychiatry Res.* 2015;**225**(3):291-8
42. Franks F, Faux SA. Depression, stress, mastery, and social resources in four ethnocultural women's groups. *Res. Nurs. Health* 1990;**13**(5):283-92
43. ABS. Life on Struggle Street. In: Statistics ABo, ed. *Using Statistics to Paint a Picture of Australian Society: Commonwealth of Australia*, 2012.

44. Schuster TL, Kessler RC, Aseltine RH. Supportive interactions, negative interactions, and depressed mood. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 1990;**18**:423-38

45. Ware J, Jr., Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Med. Care* 1996;**34**(3):220-33

46. Whitehead M, Burstroöm B, Diderichsen F. Social policies and the pathways to inequalities in health: a comparative analysis of lone mothers in Britain and Sweden. *Social Science and Medicine* 2000;**50**:255– 70

47. Creed PA, Macintyre SR. The relative effects of deprivation of the latent and manifest benefits of employment on the well-being of unemployed people. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* 2001;**6**(4):324-31 doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.6.4.324[published Online First: Epub Date]].

48. Jahoda M. *Employment and Unemployment: A Social-psychological Analysis*. London, 1982.

49. Paul KI, Moser K. Unemployment impairs mental health: Meta-analyses. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 2009;**74**(3):264-82

50. Kilian R, Becker T. Macro-economic indicators and labour force participation of people with schizophrenia. *Journal of Mental Health* 2007;**16**(2):211-22

51. Turner JB, Kessler RC, House JS. Factors facilitating adjustment to unemployment: implications for intervention. *Am. J. Community Psychol.* 1991;**19**(4):521-42

52. Taylor SE, Aspinwall LG. Mediating and moderating processes in psychosocial stress: Appraisal, coping, resistance, and vulnerability. *Psychosocial stress: Perspectives on structure, theory, life-course, and methods*. San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press, 1996:71-110.

53. Heckhausen J, Wrosch C, Schulz R. A motivational theory of life-span development. *Psychological Review* 2010;**117**:32 – 60



**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics reporting health, socio-economic, demographic and psychosocial characteristics of respondents across the three waves.

	Wave 1 (20– 24yrs)		Wave 2 (24– 28yrs)		Wave 3 (28– 32yrs)	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
<i>N</i>	1162	1242	1013	1126	920	1058
Employment status (%)						
- Employed	81.24	79.22	89.72	84.07	94.35	85.35
- Unemployed	6.74	5.11	4.25	2.58	2.28	1.80
- PT looking FT	4.58	4.79	2.08	1.69	.43	.95
- NILF	7.43	10.88	3.95	11.65	2.93	11.91
Marital status (%)						
- Married	18.58	27.84	22.04	30.19	42.61	48.25
- Never married	81.16	70.45	76.19	65.98	52.07	46.83
- Divorced/Separated/Widowed	.26	1.70	1.78	3.83	5.33	4.92
Education (%)						
- Did not finish Year 12	7.78	7.39	5.64	5.35	4.35	4.84
Dependent Children (%)						
- Have dependent children	6.23	13.88	15.91	26.27	36.41	46.50
Physical health						
- RAND SF12 (mean score & sd)	52.31 (6.5)	50.81 (7.2)	52.36 (6.1)	50.66 (7.6)	51.8 (6.5)	50.3 (8.2)
Financial Difficulty (%)						



1	-	Facing financial difficulty	24.35	30.24	15.61	13.02	7.74	9.11
2								
3		sometimes or often (w1),						
4								
5		experience hardship (w2 +						
6								
7		w3) <sup>§</sup>						
8								
9								
10								
11		Mastery (%)						
12								
13	-	Low sense of mastery score	33.94	40.86	35.98	41.29	35.56	38.18
14								
15		(Pearlin's scale)						
16								
17								
18		Depression (%)						
19								
20	-	High score (indicating	7.19	12.27	9.80	12.15	8.92	10.98
21								
22		clinical depression)						
23								
24								

<sup>§</sup>w1 = wave1, w2 = wave 2, w3 = wave 3

**Table 2.** Prevalence of depression and univariate relationship between depression and various socio-economic, demographic and psychological measures.

	Current Depression (%)	Univariate Odds ratio (95% CI)
<b>Employment status</b>		
- Employed	9	
- Unemployed	21	<b>2.35 (1.71 – 2.72)</b>
- PT looking FT	17	<b>1.80 (1.20 – 2.72)</b>
- NILF	17	<b>1.74 (1.35 – 2.23)</b>
<b>Gender</b>		
- Male	9	
- Female	12	<b>1.44 (1.18 – 1.75)</b>
<b>Marital status</b>		
- Married	8	
- Never married	11	<b>1.37 (1.13 – 1.67)</b>
- Divorced/Separated/Widowed	23	<b>3.14 (2.14 – 4.60)</b>
<b>Education</b>		
- Finished Year 12	10	
- Did not finish Year 12	18	<b>1.92 (1.41 – 2.63)</b>
<b>Dependent Children</b>		
- No children	10	
- Have dependent Children	12	<b>1.15 (.95 – 1.39)</b>
<b>Physical health</b>		
- RAND SF12		<b>.91 (.91 – .93)</b>
<b>Financial Difficulty/Hardship</b>		

1	-	No	8	
2				
3	-	Yes	21	2.50 (2.08 – 2.98)
4				
5				
6		Mastery		
7				
8	-	High	4	
9				
10	-	Low	21	5.82 (4.79 – 7.06)
11				
12				
13		Social support friends (positive)		
14				
15	-	Low	14	2.06 (1.75 – 2.44)
16				
17	-	High	7	
18				
19		Social support family (positive)		
20				
21				
22	-	Low	16	2.06 (1.74 – 2.45)
23				
24	-	High	8	
25				
26		Social support friends (conflict)		
27				
28	-	Low	7	
29				
30	-	High	12	1.64 (1.36 – 1.98)
31				
32		Social support family (conflict)		
33				
34	-	Low	7	
35				
36	-	High	12	1.63 (1.36 – 1.95)
37				
38		Age/Wave		
39				
40	-	Wave 1 (20-24yrs)	10	
41				
42	-	Wave 2 (24-28yrs)	11	1.15 (.97 – 1.38)
43				
44	-	Wave 3 (28-32yrs)	10	1.05 (.88 – 1.25)
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				
50				
51				
52				
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

**Table 3.** Results of a multivariable logistic regression analyses for predictors of depression

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
Labour-force status								
(reference: employed)								
<i>Part-time looking for full-time work</i>	<b>1.79</b> (1.19 – 2.70)	<b>1.89</b> (1.25 – 2.87)	<b>1.75</b> (1.13 – 2.70)	<b>1.75</b> (1.12 – 2.74)	<b>1.62</b> (1.04 – 2.52)	<b>1.73</b> (1.10 – 2.71)	<b>1.60</b> (1.01 – 2.53)	<b>1.59</b> (1.00 – 2.53)
<i>Unemployed</i>	<b>2.40</b> (1.74 – 3.32)	<b>2.49</b> (1.80 – 3.62)	<b>2.13</b> (1.50 – 3.00)	<b>1.91</b> (1.34 – 2.72)	<b>1.88</b> (1.32 – 2.68)	<b>1.80</b> (1.25 – 2.88)	<b>1.64</b> (1.14 – 2.38)	<b>1.55</b> (1.06 – 2.25)
<i>NILF</i>	1.65 (1.29 – 2.13)	<b>1.67</b> (1.30 – 2.14)	1.25 (.95 – 1.66)	1.23 (.92 – 1.64)	1.13 (.85 – 1.52)	1.16 (.86 – 1.55)	1.06 (.79 – 1.44)	1.06 (.78 – 1.44)
Gender (men reference)	<b>1.42</b> (1.16 – 1.73)	<b>1.41</b> (1.16 – 1.72)	<b>1.28</b> (1.05 – 1.56)	<b>1.54</b> (1.27 – 1.88)	<b>1.30</b> (1.06 – 1.52)	1.22 (.99 – 1.49)	<b>1.24</b> (1.00 – 1.52)	<b>1.39</b> (1.13 – 1.71)
Age (reference: 20 – 24 yrs)								
<i>Age 24 – 28 years</i>		<b>1.22</b> (1.02 – 1.44)	<b>1.20</b> (1.00 – 1.45)	<b>1.24</b> (1.02 – 1.52)	<b>1.37</b> (1.13 – 1.66)	<b>1.22</b> (1.00 – 1.48)	<b>1.37</b> (1.12 – 1.69)	<b>1.40</b> (1.13 – 1.73)
<i>Age 28 – 32 years</i>		1.13 (.94 – 1.35)	1.04 (.85 – 1.24)	1.01 (.88 – 1.36)	<b>1.26</b> (1.01 – 1.56)	1.06 (.86 – 1.33)	<b>1.26</b> (1.00 – 1.59)	<b>1.28</b> (1.01 – 1.62)

1		1.08	1.11	1.05	1.06
2		1.70 (.85	.99 (.78		
3	Dependent children	(.84 –	(.86 -	(.81 -	(.82 -
4		- 1.29)	- 1.28)		
5		1.39)	1.43)	1.35)	1.36)
6					
7					
8	Marital Status				
9	(partner/spouse				
10	reference)				
11					
12					
13					
14					
15		1.47	1.45	1.43	1.46
16		1.41	1.38		
17	Never Married	(1.18 -	(1.16 –	(1.14 -	(1.16 -
18		(1.12 -	(1.09 -		
19		1.84)	1.82)	1.79)	1.84)
20		1.78)	1.75)		
21					
22					
23	Separated/Divorced/	3.29	3.12	3.07	3.18
24		2.96	2.89		
25	Widowed	(2.18 -	(2.04 –	(2.03 -	(2.07 -
26		(1.92 –	(1.86 -		
27		4.97))	4.76)	4.65)	4.88)
28		4.59)	4.89)		
29					
30	RAND SF-12 Physical	.92 (.91	.93 (.92	.93 (.92	.93 (.92
31		.93 (.92	.93 (.92	.93 (.92	.93 (.92
32	Function	- .93)	- .93)	- .94)	- .94)
33		- .94)	- .94)	- .94)	- .94)
34					
35	Did not finished Year 12	1.58	1.41	1.43	1.43
36		1.32	1.26		
37	(finished Year 12	(1.13 -	(1.01 –	(1.02 -	(1.02 -
38		(.93 -	(.89 -		
39	reference)	2.21)	1.98)	2.00)	2.02)
40		1.86)	1.79)		
41					
42	Social Support				
43					
44					
45	Low positive family	1.59			1.32
46					
47	support	(1.32 –			(1.09 -
48		1.91)			1.60)
49					
50					
51	High conflict family	1.13			1.03
52					
53	support	(.89 –			(.81 -
54		1.42)			1.31)
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					

1	<i>Low positive friend</i>	1.92		1.50
2				
3	<i>support</i>	(1.59 –		(1.27 –
4				
5		2.32)		1.82)
6				
7				
8	<i>High conflict friend</i>	1.44		1.32
9				
10	<i>support</i>	(1.14 –		(1.05 –
11				
12		1.81)		1.69)
13				
14	Economic measures	2.17	1.99	1.87
15				
16	<i>Financial</i>	(1.78 –	(1.62 –	(1.51 –
17				
18	<i>Difficulty/Hardship</i>	2.65)	2.45)	2.30)
19				
20				
21				
22				
23		4.71	4.57	4.05
24				
25	Pearlin's Mastery Scale	(3.85 –	(3.74 –	(3.30 –
26				
27		5.75)	2.45)	4.98)
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				
50				
51				
52				
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

**Table 4.** Percentage of difference between unemployed (and PTLFT) and employed persons in the prevalence of depression

Unemployed versus Employed		PTLFT versus Employed	
Mediating Variable	Depression	Mediating Variable	Depression
Social support only	19	Social support only	1
Financial Hardship only	22	Financial Hardship only	17
Mastery only	29	Mastery only	3
Social support, financial hardship, mastery	51	Social support, financial hardship, mastery	21



## STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Pg. # & paragraph #
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Noted in title and abstract p. 1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	p. 1
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	p. 2
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	p.4 paragraph 7
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	p. 5 paragraph 8
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	p. 5 paragraph 8/9
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	p. 5 paragraph 8/9 – reference for detailed sampling provided in study
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	p. 6/7 paragraph 11/15
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	p. 6/7 paragraph 11/15
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	p. 8 paragraph 17
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	NA
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	p. 6/7 paragraph 11/15
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	p. 8 paragraph 16
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	NA
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	p. 8 paragraph 17
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	p. 8 paragraph 17

Results			Page # & paragraph #
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	Table 1.
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	See above for attrition rates amongst groups – p. 8 paragraph 17
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	p. 9 paragraph 17
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Minimal - p. 8 paragraph 16
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	Follow up is 4 years, documented throughout manuscript
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	See results tables – table 1
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	See results in tables – 95% CI
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Table 4.
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	p. 11/12 paragraph 25/27
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	p. 12 paragraph 28
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	p. 13 paragraph 30
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	p. 14 paragraph 31
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	p. 15

For peer review only