Psychological distress in Canada: The role of employment and reasons of non-employment

Alain Marchand^{1,2}, Aline Drapeau^{3,4}, and Dominic Beaulieu-Prévost⁵

¹École de Relations Industrielles, Université de Montréal, Canada

²Institut de Recherche en Santé Publique, Université de Montréal, Canada

³Centre de Recherche Fernand Seguin, Hôpital Louis-H. Lafontaine, Montréal, Canada

⁴Département de Psychiatrie, Université de Montréal, Canada

⁵Département de Sexologie, Université du Québec à Montréal, Canada

Abstract

Background—This study investigated variations in psychological distress in a large sample of the Canadian population according to employment status, occupation, work organization conditions, reasons for non-employment, stress and support outside the work environment, family situation and individual characteristics.

Methods—Data came from cycle 4 (2000–1) of the Canadian National Population Health Survey conducted by Statistics Canada. Multiple regression analyses, adjusted for the family situation, the level of support from the social network and the individual characteristics, were carried out on a sample of 7258 individuals aged from 18 to 65 years.

Results—Occupation, social support at work, age, self-esteem, presence of children aged five and under and social support outside of the workplace were associated with lower levels of psychological distress, while permanent and temporary disability, psychological demands in the workplace, job insecurity, female gender, and stressful financial, marital and parental situations were related to higher levels of psychological distress.

Conclusions—Findings from this study suggest that, in terms of psychological distress, having a job is not always better than non-employment, and that specific non-employment situations associate differently with psychological distress.

Keywords

mental health; psychological distress; employment; non-employment; survey

Introduction

Psychological distress is a mental health outcome typified by psychophysiological and behavioural symptoms that are not specific to a given mental pathology. It includes

symptoms of anxiety, depressive reactions, irritability, declining intellectual capacity, tiredness, sleepiness, and so forth (Dohrenwend, Shrout, Egri, & Mendelsohn, 1980). Untreated, psychological distress may lead to premature morbidity and mortality (Robinson, McBeth, & Macfarlane, 2004). It is estimated that about 15%–20% of the population in industrialized countries are moderately or highly distressed (International Labour Organization, 2000).

Individual experience of psychological distress is associated to employment status. The estimated odds of distress is 1.8 to 3.1 times higher in the non-employed than in the employed (Brown et al., 2003; Comino et al., 2003; Honkonen et al., 2007) and tend to vary by age and length of unemployment (Brown et al., 2003). This difference in psychological distress has been attributed to the fact that non-workers do not benefit from the positive aspects of working that contribute to the psychological well-being of individuals, such as a sense of control, skill utilization, socialization, financial resources and time structure (McKee-Ryan, Kinicki, Song, & Wanberg, 2005). However, in most studies, both workers and non-workers are conceptualized as homogeneous groups. This simplistic view fails to recognize the diversity of occupations and work organization conditions likely to affect the mental health of workers, as well as the reasons underlying non-employment (e.g. seeking for a job, health-related incapacity, family obligations) that may, by themselves, coincide with some risk factors associated with psychological distress.

As far as work is concerned, white- and blue-collar workers, semi-professionals and supervisors tend to experience a higher level of psychological distress compared to upper managers (Bultmann, Kant, van Amelsvoort, van den Brandt, & Kasl, 2001; Grosch & Murphy, 1998; Marchand, Durand, & Demers, 2005; Niedhammer, Goldberg, Leclerc, Bugel, & David, 1998; Sanne, Mykletun, Dahl, Moen, & Tell, 2003; Wieclaw, Agerbo, Mortensen, & Bonde, 2005; Wilhelm, Kovess, Rios-Seidel, & Finch, 2004). Work organization conditions associated with skill utilisation, decision authority, social support in the workplace and gratifications (i.e. pay, prestige, security, career perspective, recognition, etc.) appear to prevent psychological distress, whereas psychological, physical and contractual (i.e. long working hours, irregular work schedule) demands tend to foster it (Bonde, 2008; Marchand, Demers, & Durand, 2005; Stansfeld, 2002; Stansfeld & Candy, 2006). Studies based on the demands–control model (Karasek, 1979) and the efforts–reward model (Siegrist, 1996), proposed to explain how stress is generated and how it contributes to ill health in the workplace, have produced conflicting results (Bonde, 2008; Netterstrøm et al., 2008; Stansfeld & Candy, 2006). Nevertheless, as stress is operating in the work environment, having a job may not necessarily lead to a lower risk of psychological distress compared to non-employment. Non-employed individuals are not exposed to work-related stress but they also do not have access to the work-related benefit mentioned above. However, they may find in their environment and daily routine some opportunities for skill utilization and decision authority, together with social support and gratification that will contribute to their psychological well-being (Karasek, 1979). Thus, both workers and non-workers are exposed to the stress and benefits of their way of life outside of the workplace, whereas workers also experience the stress and benefits of their employment. Taking into account the occupation, the work organization conditions and the reasons for non-employment, as well as the family situation, the stress and support outside the work

environment and the individual characteristics of both workers and non-workers may provide a more subtle and instructive picture than the traditional ‘work is good for your health’ adage.

The objective of this study was to disentangle the relationship between employment status and psychological distress in a model that integrates type of occupation and work organization conditions in workers and the reasons for non-employment in non-workers; as well as the stress and support outside the work environment, and the individual and family characteristics of both workers and non-workers. Stress and social support outside the workplace and individual and family characteristics have been shown to be associated with mental health in the employed (Marchand, Demers et al., 2005; Stansfeld, 2002; Virtanen et al., 2008) and the non-employed (Bjarnason & Sigurdardottir, 2003; McKee-Ryan et al., 2005; Turner, 2007). Finally, gender differences in psychological distress have been observed worldwide. In consequence, gender interactions between employment status, occupation, work organization conditions and reasons for non-employment were investigated.

Methods

Data

This study is based on data from the Canadian National Population Health Survey (C-NPHS) (Catlin & Will, 1992; Tambay & Catlin, 1995), an ongoing health population-based longitudinal survey conducted every two years since 1994 by Statistics Canada. A multi-level stratified sampling strategy was used at baseline to identify 20,095 households from which one person aged 12 years and over was selected at random. A total of 17,276 respondents representative of the Canadian population were interviewed with computer-assisted phone interviews (CAPI). This study used data from cycle 4 (2000–1) since the stress-related variables under study were documented for the first time at that cycle of the survey. At cycle 4, the response rate was 84.8% ($N = 14,651$) and the cumulative attrition rate from baseline was 21.4%. The main reasons for the attrition were refusal, unable to trace, partial response at cycle 1 and subsequent cycles, no one home/no answer, moved outside Canada, mental/physical health problem, and other non-responses. Additional information regarding the design of the C-NPHS has been published elsewhere (Tambay & Catlin, 1995). After retaining those respondents aged 18–65, the final sample under study comprised 7258 respondents. The data were weighted according to selection probabilities, non-responses, and distribution by gender, age and province (1996 Canadian census).

Measures

Psychological distress—Psychological distress was assessed using the K6 scale developed by Kessler and colleagues (Kessler et al., 2002; Kessler et al., 2003). The K6 comprises six items asking respondents how often during the previous 30 days they felt: so sad that nothing could cheer them up; nervous; restless or fidgety; hopeless; worthless; and that everything was an effort. Each item is scaled from 0 (‘none of the time’) to 4 (‘all of the time’). The total psychological distress score is computed by summing the six item scores and so may range from 0 to 24. Estimated by Cronbach’s α , the reliability of the K6 for the

sample under study is .79, and the construct validity across gender and age group has been demonstrated (Drapeau et al., 2010).

Occupation—Occupations were categorized according to the four-digit codes of Statistics Canada's 1991 Standard Occupational Classification (Statistique Canada, 1993). Overall, 471 occupations were first merged into the 16 categories of the Pineo, Porter and McRoberts' (1977) classification of occupation assumed to be sociologically homogenous in terms of prestige, income and schooling. In accord with previous research showing greater risk for mental health problems in specific occupations, the 16 categories were further merged into six groups: upper managers, supervisors, professionals, white-collar workers, blue-collar workers, and non-employed. This classification has been used in previous studies (Marchand, Durand et al., 2005; Marchand & Blanc, 2010a) in Canada and it is comparable to the one used in the UK (Office for National Statistics, 2000).

Work organization conditions—Skill utilization, decision authority, physical and psychological demands, social support at work and job insecurity were assessed for those employed using the brief version of the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ; Karasek et al., 1985), in which each item is scaled from 0 ('completely disagree') to 4 ('completely agree'). Skill utilization is in the range 0–12 and includes three items (e.g. 'your job requires that you learn new things'). Decision authority ranges from 0 to 8 and includes two items (e.g. 'your job allows you freedom to decide how you do your job'). Physical demands and job insecurity both range from 0 to 4 and include one item (respectively, 'your job requires a lot of physical effort' and 'your job security is good'). Psychological demands ranges from 0 to 8 and is based on two items (e.g. 'your job is very hectic'). Social support at work is in the range 0–12 and includes three items (e.g. 'the people you work with are helpful in getting the job done'). High scores indicate a high level of each dimension of job condition. Irregular work schedules is a dichotomous variable (0 = 'normal shift', 1 = 'rotating, split, on call, other'). The number of working hours per week was centred on 35 (the norm in Canada) for the analyses.

Non-employment reasons—Self-reported reason for non-employment was recorded on a list of 11 possibilities. Given the small sample size in some classes, these possibilities were grouped into five categories: self-reported permanent disability; self-reported temporary disability; family responsibilities; looking for a job; and other (school or educational leave, no work is available in area or suited to skills, vacation due to the lack of work, job starting in near future, other).

Individual characteristics—Individual characteristics included gender (male coded 0), age (continuous variable centred on the mean of 39.2 years old for the analyses) and self-esteem, which was assessed with Rosenberg's scale (Rosenberg, 1979) based on six five-point items. Self-esteem ranged from 0 to 24 and was centred on the mean of 19.73 for the analyses.

Family characteristics—Marital status discriminates between respondents with a partner (spouse or common-law partner) and those without (widow, divorced, separated, never married). Parental status differentiates those with children (young or adult) and those

without. The presence of children in the household was taken into account by two dichotomous variables: children aged 0–5 and children aged 6–12. Marital stress was based on an additive scale (Wheaton, 1994) of three dichotomous items (e.g. ‘your partner doesn’t understand you’) and ranged from 0 to 3. Parental stress was measured with two dichotomous items (Wheaton, 1994) (e.g. ‘one of your children seems very unhappy’) and ranged from 0 to 2. Respondents who were not married or were not a parent were coded 0 for marital or parental stress. Financial stress was assessed with a single dichotomous item referring to the adequacy of the income to meet the need of the family. Household income was measured with Statistics Canada’s income adequacy. The measure is divided into five categories based on the total household income and the number of individuals living in the household. The variable was centred on the second highest category (upper middle income) because it was both the modal category and the closest to the median.

Social network—Social network was captured by the level of social support outside the workplace, measured with the Medical Outcomes Study (MOS) Social Support Survey (Sherbourne & Stewart, 1991). The MOS includes 19 items evaluated on a five-point scale (1 = ‘none of the time’, 5 = ‘all of the time’) divided into four subscales. A global support index was computed from the four subscales by, first, dividing each scale by its number of items to transform it into a scale from 1 to 5, and, second, averaging the un-weighted four transformed scales. The social support index was centred on the mean of 3.45.

Table 1 presents summary descriptive data.

Statistical analysis

The analyses were conducted with Stata 11. In multiple regression analyses, standard errors were corrected by a bootstrap procedure based on the population weight to take into account the sampling design of the survey. Non-employed individuals looking for a job were the reference category to which all the other occupation types and reasons for non-employment were compared. Non-employed individuals were given a score of 0 for skill utilization, decision authority, physical and psychological demands, social support at work, job insecurity, irregular work schedule and number of hours worked. Six models were tested subsequently to evaluate possible mediation-suppressive effects of individual, family and social characteristics. Finally, gender interactions with employment status and occupation, work organization conditions and reasons of non-employment were investigated.

Results

Table 2 reports the mean level of psychological distress for workers and non-workers.

Psychological distress was generally lower in workers than in non-workers, with a mean difference (MD) of -1.85 (range: -2.21 — -1.49). When assessed separately, all the non-employed groups, except with family responsibilities, were associated with statistically higher levels of distress than all employed groups. Individuals who were non-employed due to family obligations expressed a mean difference of distress statistically equivalent to that of professionals (MD = -0.51 (-1.02 – 0.01)) and white collars (MD = -0.17 (-0.68 – 0.35)),

but statistically higher than for upper managers ($MD = 0.72$ ($0.17-1.27$)), supervisors ($MD = 0.64$ ($0.04-1.25$)) and blue collars ($MD = 0.63$ ($0.10-1.17$)).

Table 3 shows the results of the six regression models.

The changes in the coefficients from model 1 to model 2 show that work organization conditions play an important role in the relation between psychological distress and occupation. The changes in the coefficients between model 2 and each of the three subsequent models indicate that individual characteristics (model 3), family characteristics (model 4) and, to a lesser extent, social network (model 5), also play a role in the relations between psychological distress and the different situations of employment and non-employment.

The inclusion of individual characteristics in model 3 increased the regression coefficients of all categories of workers, whereas the inclusion of family characteristics (model 4) acted in the opposite direction so strongly that these coefficients lost their statistical significance, except for blue collars. The addition of family characteristics only had a noticeable effect on the association between the type of non-employment and distress. Non-employment due to family responsibilities decreased by half when family characteristics were taken into account. The addition of social support (model 5) did not appear to significantly modify the associations between categories of workers and non-workers and psychological distress.

When individual, family and social support outside the workplace were included in the equation (model 6), the effect of individual and family characteristics on the association between categories of workers and psychological distress cancelled out. Overall, model 6 shows that occupation, social support at work, age, self-esteem, the presence of children aged up to five and social support outside the workplace were associated with lower level of psychological distress, while permanent and temporary disability, psychological demands in the workplace, job insecurity, female gender, and stressful financial, marital and parental situations were associated with higher levels of psychological distress. The only statistically significant difference between occupations was that being a white collar was associated to a slightly higher mean level of distress than being a blue collar ($MD = 0.28$ ($0.03-0.54$)). Among reasons of non-employment, both permanent and temporary disabilities were associated with significantly higher levels of distress than job seeking, family responsibilities and other reasons. No other difference was statistically significant.

Gender interactions with work organization conditions ($F(8, 499) = 1.39, p = .20$) and reason of non-employment ($F(5, 499) = 1.62, p = .15$) were not statistically significant, while the interaction between gender and employment status was found to be significant ($F(5, 499) = 3.64, p = .00$) (Figure 1).

Women experienced statistically higher mean levels of psychological distress than men in the same category for non-employed (irrespective of non-employment reason), supervisors and blue collars. Gender differences in the other groups (upper managers, professionals, white collars) were smaller and statistically non-significant.

Since the distribution of the psychological distress variable was positively skewed in this study as in other studies, all regression analyses were rerun using a square root transformation. The results were equivalent and thus not affected by the distribution of psychological distress.

Discussion

This study aimed at disentangling the relationship between employment status and psychological distress in a large Canadian community sample. Our results show that employment is not necessarily better than non-employment in terms of psychological distress when occupation, work organization conditions, the reason of non-employment, the stress and support outside the workplace and the individual characteristics are taken into account. Furthermore, different non-employment situations may lead to different levels of psychological distress.

Starting with the employment characteristics, the type of occupation is not, by itself, an important factor explaining differences in psychological distress. Upper managers, supervisors, professionals and blue collars report a similar mean level of psychological distress. We found only a small difference between white and blue collar workers, and all occupation groups expressed a lower mean of psychological distress than job seekers. This is consistent with recent studies reporting a small or no significant association between occupation and psychological distress when the analytic model included work organization conditions, and individual, family and social network characteristics (Bultmann et al., 2001; Cohidon, Santin, Imbernon, & Goldberg, 2010; Marchand, Demers et al., 2005; Wieclaw et al., 2005).

Work organization conditions, however, prove to be more important than occupation in explaining variations in psychological distress. Increasing levels of skill utilization, psychological demands and job insecurity are associated with a higher level of psychological distress, which can put workers in a worse state than non-workers. This is consistent with previous reports based solely on a working population (Bonde, 2008; Marchand, Demers et al., 2005; Stansfeld, 2002; Stansfeld & Candy, 2006). Our study goes one step further by showing that these associations remain when non-employed individuals are included in the analysis. By definition, the non-employed are not exposed to these workplace factors. This reinforces the evidence on the specific contribution of work stress as a mechanism explaining the experience of psychological distress. In some circumstances, it is better to be non-employed than to be working and having to deal with stressful skill utilization, psychological demands and job insecurity. Nevertheless, when workers are supported by colleagues and their supervisor, the level of psychological distress declines, as has been observed in many studies (Bonde, 2008; Marchand, Demers et al., 2005; Stansfeld, 2002; Stansfeld & Candy, 2006).

Our results clearly show that specific types of non-employment produce different risk for psychological distress. After accounting for several factors, individuals with permanent disability and, even more so, those with temporary disability are critically distressed, while the average level of distress associated to not working because of family responsibilities or

other reasons is relatively equivalent to the level of distress associated with job seeking. It is noticeable, however, that although being outside of the work environment due to family obligations is associated with a decrease in the mean level of distress, this association is no longer significant when the family situation is taken into account. Therefore, being non-employed does not always translate into psychological distress since some categories of non-employed fare better than others and fare better than some groups of workers. Furthermore, because work conditions could foster psychological distress, being non-employed because of family responsibilities or because of job seeking could represent a favourable position in the light of psychological distress compared to individuals stressed by pathogenic work organization conditions. Even if one is not working, the social environment may offer room for skill utilization and decision authority, together with social support and gratification that will contribute to psychological well-being (McKee-Ryan et al., 2005).

Beyond work and non-employment, the characteristics of the individual, the family and the social network prove to be strongly associated to the level of psychological distress experienced. The associations found here are consistent with previous reports (Beauregard, Marchand, & Blanc, 2011; Bjarnason & Sigurdardottir, 2003; Marchand, Demers et al., 2005; McKee-Ryan et al., 2005; Stansfeld, 2002; Turner, 2007; Virtanen et al., 2008). Taken jointly, these factors acted as suppressors or confounders of skill utilization, decision authority, physical demands among workers, and of permanent disability, and family responsibility among non-workers. Women reported more distress, while getting older and having a higher level of self-esteem were associated with less psychological distress. Gender, age and self-esteem have suppressive effects on the relationship between permanent incapacity and distress. Furthermore, gender appears to moderate the relationship between employment status and psychological distress. Women report higher levels of psychological distress than men when they are non-employed, supervisors or blue collars, but not otherwise. This is consistent with a recent study showing a greater risk of psychotropic medication use over time for women employed as a supervisor or a blue collar, compared to men in the same occupational groups (Marchand & Blanc, 2010b). Looking at the family situation, living with young children (five and under) is a positive experience associated with lower distress, but stressful marital, parental and financial situations are clearly associated with higher levels of psychological distress. Furthermore, the family situation may confound the association with occupation, physical demands and non-employment because of family responsibilities. At the social network level, when people can benefit from social support outside the workplace, the level of psychological distress is lower. However, social support, by itself, did not seem to suppress or confound the associations linking occupation, work organization conditions and non-employment reasons to psychological distress.

Limitations

The limitations of this study should be considered carefully when interpreting the results. First, the design is cross-sectional and the estimated relationships could not be interpreted as causal. Second, the scales for skill utilization, decision authority, psychological demands and social support in the workplace are known to have low internal consistency in the C-NPHS (Marchand & Blanc, 2010a), and the psychological demands scale was also known to have a questionable validity (Brisson & Larocque, 2001). The impact of these variables could have

thus been underestimated. However, both psychological demands and social support were statistically significant here. Also, even with the full version of the JCQ, decision authority was not found to be statistically associated to psychological distress when the analysis included the individual characteristics, the family situation and the social network outside the workplace (Marchand, Demers et al., 2005). Last, the C-NPHS does not take into account workplace factors related to the physical environment (e.g. noise, temperature, toxins), supervisory styles, health and safety resources, or elements in the work contract that allow employees to better balance work and family responsibilities. These elements could be strong determinants of well-being at work and could be associated with psychological distress.

Conclusion

Considering jointly the role of employment status, occupation, work organization conditions and reasons for non-employment, this study adds to previous research by showing that, when psychological distress is under investigation, any job is not always better than any type of non-employment. High levels of skill utilization, psychological demands, job insecurity, as well as lower levels of social support at work are associated with elevated levels of psychological distress that can be even higher than the levels experienced by individuals seeking a job or those non-employed because of family responsibilities, or other reasons. For those non-employed, only individuals with either a permanent or a temporary disability experienced higher mean levels of distress compared to job seekers when all other factors under study were included in the model. This confirms that different non-employment situations associate differently with psychological distress and that non-employment is not a uniform status across individuals. Therefore, work is not always good for health and non-employment is not always bad for health. Because work takes up a large part of adult life, the development of public health policies and interventions directed towards the regulation of mental health problems in the workplace are needed and are one of the most important challenges ahead in the coming years.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the Fonds de la recherche en santé du Québec (ref. # 14389), which provided researcher awards to AM and AD. Access to C-NPHS data was granted by the Social Science and Humanities Council of Canada and by Statistics Canada. Analyses were carried out at the Centre Inter-universitaire Québécois de Statistiques Sociales.

References

- Beauregard N, Marchand A, Blanc ME. What do we know about the non-work determinants of workers' mental health? A systematic review of longitudinal studies. *BMC Public Health*. 2011; 11:439. [PubMed: 21645393]
- Bjarnason T, Sigurdardottir TJ. Psychological distress during unemployment and beyond: Social support and material deprivation among youth in six northern European countries. *Social Science and Medicine*. 2003; 56:973–985. [PubMed: 12593871]
- Bonde JPE. Psychosocial factors at work and risk of depression: A systematic review of the epidemiological evidence. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 2008; 65:438–445. [PubMed: 18417557]

- Brisson C, Larocque B. Validité des indices de demande psychologique et de latitude décisionnelle utilisés dans l'Enquête nationale sur la santé de la population (ENSP) 1994–1995. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*. 2001; 92:468–474. [PubMed: 11799555]
- Brown DW, Balluz LS, Ford ES, Giles WH, Strine TW, Moriarty DG, Mokdad AH. Associations between short- and long-term unemployment and frequent mental distress among a national sample of men and women. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 2003; 45:1159–1166. [PubMed: 14610397]
- Bultmann U, Kant I, van Amelsvoort LG, van den Brandt PA, Kasl SV. Differences in fatigue and psychological distress across occupations: Results from the Maastricht Cohort Study of Fatigue at Work. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 2001; 43:976–983. [PubMed: 11725338]
- Catlin G, Will P. The National Population Health Survey: Highlights of initial developments. *Health Reports*. 1992; 4:313–319. [PubMed: 1493200]
- Cohidon C, Santin G, Imbernon E, Goldberg M. Working conditions and depressive symptoms in the 2003 decennial health survey: The role of the occupational category. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*. 2010; 45:1135–1147. [PubMed: 19876581]
- Comino EJ, Harris E, Chey T, Manicavasagar V, Penrose Wall J, Powell Davies G, Harris MF. Relationship between mental health disorders and unemployment status in Australian adults. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*. 2003; 37:230–235. [PubMed: 12656965]
- Dohrenwend B, Shrout PE, Egri G, Mendelsohn FS. Nonspecific psychological distress and other dimensions of psychopathology: Measures for Use in the general population. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 1980; 37:1229–1236. [PubMed: 7436685]
- Drapeau A, Beaulieu-Prevost D, Marchand A, Boyer R, Preville M, Kairouz S. A life-course and time perspective on the construct validity of psychological distress in women and men. *Measurement invariance of the K6 across gender*. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2010; 10:68. [PubMed: 20663128]
- Grosch JW, Murphy LR. Occupational differences in depression and global health: Results from a national sample of US workers. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 1998; 40:153–164. [PubMed: 9503292]
- Honkonen T, Virtanen M, Ahola K, Kivimäki M, Pirkola S, Isometsä E, Lonnqvist J. Employment status, mental disorders and service use in the working age population. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health*. 2007; 33:29–36.
- International Labour Organization. *Mental health in the workplace*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Organization; 2000.
- Karasek R., Gordon G., Pietrokovsky C., Frese M., Pieper C., Schwartz J., Schirer D. *Job content questionnaire: Questionnaire and users' guide*. Lowell, MA: University of Massachusetts; 1985.
- Karasek RA. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implication for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 1979; 24:285–309.
- Kessler RC, Andrews G, Colpe LJ, Hiripi E, Mroczek DK, Normand SLT, Zaslavsky AM. Short screening scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychological Medicine*. 2002; 32:959–976. [PubMed: 12214795]
- Kessler RC, Barker PR, Colpe LJ, Epstein JF, Gfroerer JC, Hiripi E, Zaslavsky AM. Screening for serious mental illness in the general population. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 2003; 60:184–189. [PubMed: 12578436]
- Marchand A, Blanc ME. The contribution of work and non-work factors to the onset of psychological distress: An eight-year prospective study of a representative sample of employees in Canada. *Journal of Occupational Health*. 2010a; 52:176–185. [PubMed: 20410672]
- Marchand A, Blanc ME. Chronic psychotropic drugs use in the Canadian labor force: What are the contributions of occupation and work organization conditions? *Revue d'Epidémiologie et de Santé Publique*. 2010b; 58:89–99. [in French].
- Marchand A, Demers A, Durand P. Does work really cause distress? The contribution of occupational structure and work organization to the experience of psychological distress. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2005; 60:1–14. [PubMed: 15482862]

- Marchand A, Durand P, Demers A. Work and mental health: The experience of the Quebec workforce between 1987 and 1998. *Work*. 2005; 25:135–142. [PubMed: 16131743]
- McKee-Ryan FM, Kinicki AJ, Song Z, Wanberg CR. Psychological and physical well-being during employment: A meta-analytic study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2005; 90:53–76. [PubMed: 15641890]
- Netterstrøm B, Conrad N, Bech P, Fink P, Olsen O, Rugulies R, Stansfeld S. The relation between work-related psychosocial factors and the development of depression. *Epidemiological Reviews*. 2008; 30:118–132.
- Niedhammer I, Goldberg M, Leclerc A, Bugel I, David S. Psychosocial factors at work and subsequent depressive symptoms in the Gazel cohort. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health*. 1998; 24:197–205.
- Office for National Statistics. Standard occupational classification 2000. London, UK: Office for National Statistics; 2000.
- Pineo PC, Porter J, McRoberts HA. The 1971 census and the socioeconomic classification of occupations. *Canadian Review Of Sociology and Anthropology*. 1977; 14:91–102.
- Robinson KL, McBeth J, Macfarlane GJ. Psychological distress and premature mortality in the general population: A prospective study. *Annals of Epidemiology*. 2004; 14:467–472. [PubMed: 15301783]
- Rosenberg, M. *Conceiving the self*. New York: Basic Books; 1979.
- Sanne B, Mykletun A, Dahl AA, Moen BE, Tell GS. Occupational differences in levels of anxiety and depression: The Hordaland health study. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 2003; 45:628–638. [PubMed: 12802216]
- Sherbourne CD, Stewart AL. The MOS social support survey. *Social Science and Medicine*. 1991; 32:705–714. [PubMed: 2035047]
- Siegrist J. Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. 1996; 1:27–41. [PubMed: 9547031]
- Stansfeld S. Work, personality and mental health. *British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2002; 181:96–98. [PubMed: 12151277]
- Stansfeld S, Candy B. Psychosocial work environment and mental health: A meta-analytic review. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health*. 2006; 32:443–462.
- Statistique Canada. Classification type des professions 1991. Ottawa, Canada: Statistique Canada, Division des normes; 1993.
- Tambay JL, Catlin G. Sample design of the national population health survey. *Health Reports*. 1995; 7:29–38. 31–42. [PubMed: 7578995]
- Turner HA. The significance of employment for chronic stress and psychological distress among rural single mothers. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2007; 40:181–193. [PubMed: 17909962]
- Virtanen M, Koskinen S, Kivimäki M, Honkonen T, Vahtera J, Ahola K, Lonnqvist J. Contribution of non-work and work-related risk factors to the association between income and mental disorders in a working population: The Health 2000 Study. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 2008; 65:171–178. [PubMed: 18283127]
- Wheaton, B. Sampling the stress universe. In: Avison, WR., Gotlib, IH., editors. *Stress and mental health contemporary issues and prospects for the future*. New York: Plenum Press; 1994. p. 77–114.
- Wieclaw J, Agerbo E, Mortensen PB, Bonde JP. Occupational risk of affective and stress-related disorders in the Danish workforce. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health*. 2005; 31:343–351.
- Wilhelm K, Kovess V, Rios-Seidel C, Finch A. Work and mental health. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*. 2004; 39:866–873. [PubMed: 15549238]

Figure 1.
Mean level of predicted psychological distress by employment status for men and women ($N = 7258$).

Table 1Sample characteristics ($n = 7258$).

	Proportion (%) or <i>M</i> (SD)
Employed	84.3%
Upper managers	7.6%
Supervisors	5.4%
Professionals	15.9%
White collars	36.9%
Blue collars	18.5%
Non-employed	15.7%
Permanent disability	1.8%
Temporary disability	2.3%
Family responsibilities	4.1%
Job seeker	3.9%
Other	3.6%
Work organization conditions	
Skill utilization (0–12)	6.01 (3.29)
Decision authority (0–8)	4.52 (2.49)
Physical demands (0–4)	1.60 (1.31)
Psychological demands (0–8)	3.78 (2.25)
Working hours per week	40.23 (13.30)
Work schedule (irregular)	17.1%
Social support (0–12)	6.69 (3.37)
Job insecurity (0–4)	1.01 (0.96)
Individual characteristics	
Age	39.19 (11.72)
Gender (female)	49.6%
Self-esteem	19.73 (2.73)
Family characteristics	
Living in couple	62.5%
Presence of children	66.0%
Presence of children 0–5 years	15.7%
Presence of children 6–12 years	24.6%
Household income adequacy	
– Lowest	3.6%
– Lower middle	4.9%
– Middle	18.2%
– Upper middle	40.0%
– Highest	33.3%
Marital stress (0–3)	
0	90.8%
1	5.2%

	Proportion (%) or <i>M</i> (SD)
2	2.7%
3	1.3%
Parental stress (0–2)	
0	79.9%
1	14.3%
2	5.8%
Presence of financial stress (yes)	28.4%
Social network	
Social support (1–5)	3.45 (0.68)

Table 2

Mean level of psychological distress and 95% confidence interval by employment status ($N = 7258$).

	<i>M</i>	95%CI
Employed	2.2	2.2–2.3
Upper managers	2.0	1.7–2.2
Supervisors	2.0	1.6–2.5
Professionals	2.2	2.0–2.4
White collars	2.5	2.4–2.7
Blue collars	2.0	1.8–2.2
Non-employed	4.1	3.8–4.5
Permanent disability	5.6	4.3–7.0
Temporary disability	6.7	5.5–8.0
Family responsibilities	2.7	2.2–3.2
Job seeker	4.0	3.4–4.6
Other	3.5	2.8–4.1

Table 3

Regression models for psychological distress ($N = 7258$).

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Employed						
Upper managers	-2.04 ***	-1.37 **	-1.91 ***	-0.80	-1.45 **	-1.35 **
Supervisors	-1.97 ***	-1.36 **	-1.93 ***	-0.96	-1.45 **	-1.50 **
Professionals	-1.85 ***	-1.11 *	-1.73 ***	-0.57	-1.27 **	-1.23 *
White collars	-1.49 ***	-0.99 *	-1.66 ***	-0.61	-1.10 **	-1.26 **
Blue collars	-1.96 ***	-1.48 **	-2.01 ***	-0.99 *	-1.58 **	-1.54 **
Non-employed						
Job seeking	reference	reference	reference	reference	reference	reference
Permanent disability	1.64 *	1.64 *	1.69 *	1.76 *	1.31	1.65 *
Temporary disability	2.74 ***	2.74 ***	2.77 ***	2.70 ***	2.23 ***	2.42 ***
Family responsibilities	-1.32 ***	-1.32 ***	-1.22 **	-0.60	-1.12 **	-0.60
Other	-0.53	-0.53	-0.66	-0.48	-0.44	-0.48
Work organization conditions						
Hours paid per week		-0.006	-0.002	-0.004	-0.006	-0.002
Irregular work shift		0.21	0.24	0.16	0.19	0.21
Skill utilization		-0.02	0.03	0.008	-0.003	0.06 *
Decision authority		-0.11 **	-0.02	-0.07 *	-0.08 *	0.007
Psychological demands		0.18 ***	0.17 ***	0.15 ***	0.15 ***	0.12 ***
Physical demands		0.11 *	0.10 *	0.04	0.11 **	0.05
Social support at work		-0.15 ***	-0.12 ***	-0.14 ***	-0.12 ***	-0.10 ***
Insecurity		0.31 ***	0.25 ***	0.20 ***	0.23 ***	0.11 *
Individual characteristics						
Gender			0.40 ***			0.46 ***
Age			-0.03 ***			-0.04 ***
Self-esteem			-0.25 ***			-0.20 ***

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Family characteristics						
Parental status				−0.48***		0.02
Children aged 0–5				−0.19		−0.58***
Children aged 6–12				0.14		−0.08
Marital status				−0.59***		−0.02
Household income				−0.16*		−0.07
Stress – Financial				1.07***		0.96***
Stress – Marital				0.72***		0.43***
Stress – parental				0.59***		0.48***
Social network						
Social support					−1.15***	−0.89***
Constant	4.00***	4.00***	3.50***	3.57***	3.88***	2.69***
<i>F</i>	16.78***	20.21***	3.01***	22.86***	28.73***	29.23***
<i>R</i> ²	0.08	0.11	0.17	0.18	0.167	0.25

* $p < .05$,

** $p < .01$,

*** $p < .001$