

Gender, Depression, and Blue-collar Work

A Retrospective Cohort Study of US Aluminum Manufacturers

Holly Elser,^a David H. Rehkopf,^b Valerie Meausoone,^c Nicholas P. Jewell,^d
Ellen A. Eisen,^c and Mark R. Cullen^c

Background: Industrial blue-collar workers face multiple work-related stressors, but evidence regarding the burden of mental illness among today's blue-collar men and women remains limited.

Methods: In this retrospective cohort study, we examined health and employment records for 37,183 blue- and white-collar workers employed by a single US aluminum manufacturer from 2003 to 2013. Using Cox proportional hazards regression, we modeled time to first episode of treated depression by gender and occupational class. Among cases, we modeled rates of depression-related service utilization with generalized gamma regression.

Results: Compared with their white-collar counterparts, blue-collar men were more likely to be treated for depression (hazard ratio [HR] = 1.3; 95% confidence interval [CI] = 1.1, 1.4) as were blue-collar women (HR = 1.4; 1.2, 1.6). Blue-collar women were most likely to be treated for depression as compared with white-collar men (HR = 3.2; 95% CI = 2.1, 5.0). However, blue-collar workers used depression-related services less frequently than their white-collar counterparts among both men (rate ratio = 0.91; 95% CI = 0.84, 0.98) and women (rate ratio = 0.82; 95% CI = 0.77, 0.88).

Editor's Note: A related commentary appears on p. 445.

Submitted June 6, 2018; accepted January 30, 2019.

^aDivision of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley, CA; ^bDivision of Primary Care and Population Health, Department of Medicine, School of Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA; ^cCenter for Population Health Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, CA; ^dDivision of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley, CA; and ^eDivision of Environmental Health Sciences, School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley, CA.

Supported by the National Institute on Mental Health grant F31 MH 112246; the National Institute on Aging grant R01 AG 026291; and by the National Institute on Occupational Safety and Health R01 OH 009939. The conclusions expressed are solely those of the authors.

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

SDC Supplemental digital content is available through direct URL citations in the HTML and PDF versions of this article (www.epidem.com).

As an alternative to providing a de-identified data set to the public domain, we currently allow access for the purpose of reanalyses or appropriate follow-up analyses by any qualified investigator willing to sign a contract with the host institution limiting use of data without direct PHI/PII identifiers, in accordance to HIPAA regulations, and with a 15-day manuscript review for compliance purposes. For access to the data, interested parties can contact the study PI, Mark Cullen, at mrcullen@stanford.edu.

Correspondence: Holly Elser, Division of Epidemiology, UC Berkeley School of Public Health, 2121 Berkeley Way West, Berkeley, CA 94704. E-mail: holly.stewart@berkeley.edu.

Copyright © 2019 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved.

ISSN: 1044-3983/19/3003-0435

DOI: 10.1097/EDE.0000000000000993

Conclusions: Blue-collar women were more likely to be treated for depression than white-collar workers, and blue-collar women were most likely to be treated for depression compared with white-collar men. However, blue-collar men and women used depression-related healthcare services less frequently than white-collar workers. These findings underscore that blue-collar women may be uniquely susceptible to depression, and suggest that blue-collar workers may encounter barriers to care-seeking related mental illness other than their insurance status.

Keywords: Depression; Gender differences; Manufacturing; Occupational class

(*Epidemiology* 2019;30: 435–444)

Increased risk of psychiatric distress is consistently observed among workers of lower occupational strata.^{1–3} Similarly, past research finds increased risk for depression and anxiety among industrial blue-collar workers compared with white-collar workers.⁴ Trends such as these may be explained by the fact that a predisposition towards mental illness may lead to downward social mobility into blue-collar jobs (i.e., “drift”) or may preclude the attainment of socioeconomic position that otherwise might be expected (i.e., “selection”). Alternatively, aspects of blue-collar work may increase the risk of mental illness through an etiologic process or prolong the duration of symptoms.^{5–7} These processes may work simultaneously to increase the burden of depression among blue-collar workers,² although most longitudinal analyses of depression suggest socioeconomic position plays an etiologic role in the onset of depression.^{8–11} Indeed, past research identifies several aspects of blue-collar jobs—including physical demand; their monotonous, repetitive nature; oftentimes inflexible and demanding work hours; negative coworker interactions; and requirements to work quickly—as independent risk-factors for depression and anxiety.^{12–16}

The existing literature on blue-collar workers' mental health faces at least two notable limitations, however. First, findings from present-day working-class populations remain scarce despite labor trends that have fundamentally altered the nature of blue-collar jobs over the past 30 years. In the United States, these trends include industry deregulation;

technological innovations (computerization and automation); union decline and weakened institutional protections for workers; and an overall decline in manufacturing.^{17–21} The net effect of these trends is that blue-collar jobs are increasingly scarce and decreasingly characterized by the benefits and entitlements that once made them desirable.

Second, past research also largely fails to consider the mental health of women in industrial blue-collar jobs. Even within occupations, women often have different experiences with respect to pay, promotion, and assigned tasks as compared with men.^{22,23} Women in blue-collar jobs may face a wide range of additional stressors including increased physical strain if tools and work arrangements are not optimized for female anthropometrics;^{22,24,25} workplace-based sexual harassment and gender discrimination from managers and coworkers;^{26–29} increased job insecurity and lack of control over work;^{28,30} and greater conflict between work schedules and family obligations.^{31,32} Careful study of female blue-collar workers' mental health should be further motivated by the fact that women now constitute a substantial proportion of the US manufacturing workforce (~29% in 2013),³³ and that in the general population, risk of mood disorders is approximately doubled in women compared with men.^{34–36}

In this retrospective cohort study, we characterize trends in depression by gender and occupational class among 37,183 men and women employed by a single US aluminum manufacturer between 2003 and 2013. Because of substantive changes in blue-collar work in recent decades and the additional stressors faced by women in these jobs, our focus is on occupational class, which relates to social relations of ownership and control over productive assets, rather than occupational status, which refers to the ordering of persons along a continuum based on their socioeconomic attributes.⁷ To that end, white-collar workers constitute an appropriate comparison group insofar as their jobs are less likely to be characterized by isolation, temporal inflexibility, physical demand, or gender discrimination.

Our study had two primary scientific objectives. First, we modeled time to first episode of treated depression over the course of the study period by gender and occupational class. Second, among workers who experienced at least one episode of treated depression, we compared rates of monthly depression-related service utilization by gender and occupational class. We hypothesized a priori that, due to factors such as selection, drift, and the wide range of stressors associated with blue-collar jobs, both male and female blue-collar workers would be more likely to experience depression and would utilize depression-related services more frequently than their counterparts in white-collar jobs.

METHODS

Study Population and Design

We conducted a retrospective cohort study of workers employed by a single firm at one of 32 US aluminum plants

between 1 January 2003 and 31 December 2013. Study data consisted of distinct administrative datasets. Records for individual workers were deterministically linked across datasets with a unique, encrypted identifier. Complete medical claims data were available for workers enrolled in their local preferred provider organization (PPO) health insurance plan. We therefore examined health and employment records for all personnel who were actively employed and enrolled in their local PPO plan for at least one month throughout the study period (~97% of workers). Plan characteristics for this study population have been described in detail previously, and local PPO plans were identical with respect to coverage, including psychiatric services, and differed only with respect to family coverage and deductible rates.³⁷

Follow-up for each worker extended from the date they first became eligible for insurance (on or after 1 January 2003) until either the end of eligibility or 31 December 2013. We restricted our cohort to workers between the ages of 18 and 65 at the start of follow-up. To ensure that retirees were excluded from our analysis, we further restricted our sample to workers hired after 1 January 1975 with activity in their employment records within 3 years of the date they first became eligible.

Occupational Class

Occupational class was ascertained from company personnel files. Consistent with previous analysis of these data, we classified hourly workers as blue-collar and salaried employees as white-collar.^{38,39}

Depression Measures

We created two separate measures of depression using primary outpatient diagnostic codes from the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision (ICD-9) and records of filled prescriptions from medical claims. We included ICD-9 codes 293.84, 296.2–296.3, 300.00–300.02, 309, and 311; and prescriptions for antidepressants included selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors, selective norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors, tricyclic antidepressants, and monoamine oxidase inhibitors.

We first created a case definition for treated depression, which included all workers with at least two depression-related outpatient visits or two prescribed antidepressants within 365 days at any point throughout the study period. We defined the date of the first episode of treated depression as the date of the second prescribed antidepressant or the second depression-related outpatient visit (whichever came first). We intended this case definition to be sufficiently flexible so as to capture workers who were being actively treated for depression through pharmacotherapy, but were not being billed with a depression-specific ICD-9 code by their provider. Because study data lacked additional information regarding workers' past histories of mental illness, we were unable to differentiate between new-onset versus preexisting disease. Our measure therefore corresponds to the date of the first observed episode of treated depression within the study period.

Second, we calculated rates of monthly depression-related service utilization among the cases. For each case, we summed all months in which there was a depression-related outpatient visit or prescription, and divided this sum by the total duration of PPO eligibility in years. Because prescriptions varied in duration, we assumed that prescriptions lasting between 45 and 75 days were equivalent to two consecutive months of depression-related service utilization, and prescriptions lasting 75–95 days were equivalent to three consecutive months of service utilization. The final rate measure summarized the average number of months per year in which each case utilized depression-related services and was bounded between 0 and 12 months per year. Any rate that exceeded the upper bound—which occurred for a small fraction of cases when prescriptions extended into periods of noneligibility—was truncated at 12 months per year.

Covariates

We derived basic demographic characteristics (gender, age, race/ethnicity), plant location, and calendar year from

company personnel files. We created categorical variables for gender, race/ethnicity (Black, Hispanic, white, and other) and a set of indicator variables for plant location and calendar year. Using eligibility files, we measured the number of dependent children (i.e., children younger than 18) listed on their insurance policy for each worker for each year of follow-up. We created a categorical variable with values of zero, one, two, and three or more dependent children. We ascertained whether workers had a dependent spouse on their insurance policy for each year of follow-up using eligibility files.

We further characterized our study population by summarizing additional employment characteristics derived from personnel files, including whether workers were hired after the study period commenced (i.e., “new hires”); tenure at baseline for workers hired before 1 January 2003; and annual wages at the start of follow-up, which we ascertained using W2 data. These variables were not included in any analyses since they were temporally preceded by gender and occupational class, and therefore could not confound our associations of interest.

TABLE 1. Baseline Demographic, Employment, and Health Characteristics for Active Workers at 32 US Aluminum Plants, 2003–2013

	Women (N = 7,148)		Men (N = 30,035)	
	Blue-collar (N = 5,279)	White-collar (N = 1,869)	Blue-collar (N = 24,124)	White-collar (N = 5,911)
Demographic characteristics				
Age, median (IQR)	44 (36–51)	41 (32–49)	42 (32–51)	44 (36–50)
Race, N (%)				
White	3,427 (65)	1,513 (81)	17,561 (73)	5,004 (85)
Black	871 (17)	164 (8.8)	2,585 (11)	355 (6.0)
Hispanic	748 (14)	101 (5.4)	2,839 (12)	278 (4.7)
Other	233 (4.4)	91 (4.9)	1,139 (4.7)	274 (4.6)
Dependent spouse, N (%)	2,033 (39)	820 (44)	15,213 (63)	4,487 (76)
No. dependent children, N (%)				
None	3,247 (62)	1,239 (66)	12,875 (53)	2,844 (48)
One	1,007 (19)	310 (17)	4,457 (19)	1,151 (20)
Two	655 (12)	231 (12)	4,093 (17)	1,237 (21)
Three or more	370 (7.0)	89 (4.8)	2,699 (11)	679 (12)
Employment characteristics				
New hires, N (%)	2,446 (46)	831 (45)	10,053 (42)	1,974 (33)
Tenure at baseline (years), ^a median (IQR)	2.9 (1.0–5.2)	5.0 (1.8–15)	5.5 (2.0–19)	4.0 (1.4–17)
Annual wages, ^b median (IQR)	\$29K (17–40)	\$46K (31–61)	\$40K (23–50)	\$59K (42–76)
Health characteristics				
Person-months of follow-up, N	221,210	88,355	1,301,649	379,745
No. cases, N (%) ^{c,d}	1,903 (36)	629 (34)	4,689 (19)	1,171 (20)
Average utilization rate for cases, ^e median (IQR)	2.8 (1.0–7.0)	4.0 (1.4–8.6)	2.08 (0.73–5.8)	2.61 (0.8–7.2)

^aTenure at baseline is calculated for workers who were hired before the start of follow-up on 1 January 2003.

^bWage data are missing for 200 women and 809 men.

^cWe define the date of the first depression episode within the study period as the second depression-related outpatient visit or the second prescribed antidepressant within 365 days (whichever was first). Depression-related outpatient visits were identified using ICD-9 codes 293.84, 296.2–296.3, 300, 309, and 311; antidepressants included selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), selective norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (SNRIs), tricyclic antidepressants (TCAs), and monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAOIs).

^dPercentages do not account for variable follow-up time.

^eAverage utilization rates for cases correspond to the sum of all months in which there was either a depression-related outpatient visit or filled prescription for a prescribed antidepressant by the total duration of PPO eligibility in years, taking into account prescription duration.

IQR, interquartile range.

Analysis of Gender, Occupational Class, and Treated Depression

We modeled time to first episode of treated depression among blue-collar versus white-collar workers separately for men and women. To examine the combined roles of occupational class and gender, we conducted a pooled analysis of male and female workers in which we examined the time to first episode of treated depression among blue-collar women, blue-collar men, and white-collar women as compared with the referent group of white-collar men.

For both analyses, we used Cox proportional hazards regression with attained age as the underlying time scale. Age of entry was defined as age at the start of follow-up for each worker (on or after 1 January 2003). We allowed for changes in occupational class over the course of follow-up with a time-varying exposure variable. We adjusted for potential confounders, including race/ethnicity, dependent spouse, and number of dependent children. We accounted for regional differences in mental health provider network with fixed effects for plant location. Secular trends in mental healthcare utilization (i.e., before and after the Great Recession) have been studied previously in this study population.⁴⁰ In this analysis, we accounted for secular trends in mental healthcare utilization with fixed effects for calendar year.

Analysis of Monthly Depression-related Service Utilization

We modeled the rate ratio (RR) for monthly depression-related service utilization among blue-collar and white-collar workers for men and women separately and conducted a pooled analysis in which we examined service utilization among blue-collar women, blue-collar men, and white-collar women as compared with white-collar men. We used generalized linear models with the gamma family and log link specified. Generalized gamma regression is an alternative to linear regression with log transformation that is appropriate for positive, right-skewed, and continuous outcomes such as our rate measure.⁴¹ Models were simultaneously adjusted for age, age squared, calendar year, race/ethnicity, number of dependent children, marital status, and plant location. Age was mean-centered and rescaled such that model coefficients correspond to the change in utilization rates for a 10-year increase in age. Values for all covariates were taken at the start of follow-up.

To account for nonindependence of workers within plant locations (i.e., clustering), we used a cluster bootstrap approach to estimate 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and resampled at the level of the plant location in all analyses. All statistical analyses were performed with R version 3.2.3. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards at the University of California, Berkeley and at the Stanford University.

TABLE 2. Adjusted Hazards Ratios Time to First Depression Episode by Occupational Class Among Male and Female Workers^{a,b}

Covariates	Women (N = 7,148)			Men (N = 30,035)		
	Workers	Cases, N (%) ^{c,d}	HRs ^e (95% CI)	Workers	Cases, N (%) ^{c,d}	HRs ^e (95% CI)
Occupational class						
White-collar	1,869	629 (34)	1.0	5,911	1,171 (20)	1.0
Blue-collar	5,279	1,866 (35)	1.4 (1.2, 1.6)	24,124	4,689 (19)	1.3 (1.1, 1.4)
Dependent children						
None	4,486	1,570 (35)	1.0	15,719	2,906 (19)	1.0
One	1,317	482 (36)	1.1 (1.0, 1.2)	5,608	1,111 (20)	1.1 (0.98, 1.2)
Two	886	303 (34)	1.1 (0.91, 1.3)	5,330	1,185 (22)	1.2 (1.1, 1.3)
Three or more	459	140 (31)	1.3 (1.1, 1.5)	3,378	658 (20)	1.2 (1.1, 1.3)
Dependent spouse						
No	4,295	1,400 (33)	1.0	10,335	1,414 (14)	1.0
Yes	2,853	1,095 (38)	0.90 (0.83, 0.97)	19,700	4,446 (23)	1.0 (0.95, 1.1)
Race/ethnicity						
White	4,940	1,990 (40)	1.0	22,565	5,092 (23)	1.0
Black	1,035	245 (24)	0.50 (0.42, 0.60)	2,940	278 (9.5)	0.46 (0.34, 0.62)
Hispanic	839	195 (23)	0.75 (0.63, 0.91)	3,117	387 (12)	0.73 (0.62, 0.87)
Other	334	65 (20)	0.52 (0.32, 0.82)	1,413	103 (7.3)	0.43 (0.29, 0.63)

^aResults correspond to separate analyses among male workers (N = 30,035) and female workers (N = 7,148).

^bAttained age was used as the timescale in Cox proportional hazards models. Separate models for male and female workers were adjusted for occupational class, dependent children, dependent spouse, race/ethnicity (Black, Hispanic, white, and other), and included fixed effects for plant location and calendar year.

^cWe defined the date of the first depression episode within the study period as the second depression-related outpatient visit or the second prescribed antidepressant within 365 days (whichever was first). Depression-related outpatient visits were identified using ICD-9 codes 293.84, 296.2–296.3, 300, 309, and 311; antidepressants included selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRI), selective norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (SNRI), tricyclic antidepressants (TCAs), and monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAOIs).

^dPercentages do not account for variable follow-up time.

^eWe estimated 95% CIs by resampling from plant location using a cluster bootstrap with 1,000 repetitions.

Sensitivity Analyses

Past research suggests reasonable concordance between medical claims, medical records, and self-report.^{42–44} The use of medical insurance claims data to define various health outcomes—including depression and anxiety—have also been described previously for this study population.^{40,45,46} To assess the robustness of outcomes defined using medical claims in the present study, we created six alternative case definitions for treated depression, ranging from very sensitive (i.e., first prescribed antidepressant) to very specific (i.e., two outpatient visits plus one prescription within 365 days). We additionally assessed the robustness of our findings to the inclusion and exclusion of anxiety-related diagnostic codes (ICD-9 = 293.84, 300.00–300.02).

Additional sensitivity analyses included an analysis of time to first episode of treated depression among workers hired after the start of follow-up (i.e., after 1 January 2003) and separate assessment of the counts of unique depression-related outpatient visits and prescriptions by occupational class.

RESULTS

Of the 37,201 workers who satisfied the inclusion criteria, we excluded 17 for whom race/ethnicity was missing. Our final study sample included 7148 women followed for 309,565 person-months and 30,035 men followed for 1,681,394 person-months. Demographic, employment, and health characteristics for the study sample are presented in Table 1. The majority of workers had blue-collar jobs for both women (74%) and men (80%). Examples of blue-collar job titles included material handler, machine operator, and pot tender. White-collar job titles included human resources manager, senior general accountant, and associate electrical engineer. A small fraction of white-collar workers had supervisory roles in the factory environment (i.e., production supervisors). Only a small percentage of workers (3.7%) were promoted from blue-collar to white-collar jobs over the course of the study period.

As compared with blue-collar workers, white-collar workers were more likely to be white with higher median annual wages at baseline. Male workers were more likely to have a dependent spouse and dependent children on their health insurance plan at baseline. Using our primary case definition, there were 1,903 blue-collar women (36%) and 629 white-collar women (34%) who were treated for depression at some point throughout study period. Among men, 4,689 blue-collar workers (19%) and 1,171 white-collar workers (20%) were treated for depression (Table 1). Among the cases, we find that half of workers received treatment for depression through a combination of outpatient visits and prescriptions (50%), although many cases were treated exclusively through prescriptions for antidepressants (37%) and a minority of cases were treated exclusively in outpatient visits. Median rates of depression-related service utilization were higher in white-collar workers for both men and women (Table 1 and eFigures 1 and 2; <http://links.lww.com/EDE/B500>).

Gender, Occupational Class, and Treated Depression

Among men, blue-collar workers were more likely to be treated for depression over the study period compared with white-collar workers (hazard ratio [HR] = 1.3; 95% CI = 1.1, 1.4). Similarly, blue-collar women were more likely to be treated for depression compared with white-collar women (HR = 1.36, 1.7–1.6) (Table 2 and eFigures 1 and 2; <http://links.lww.com/EDE/B500>). In our pooled analysis, we found that blue-collar women were most likely to be treated for depression compared with white-collar men (HR = 3.2; 95% CI = 2.1, 5.0), followed by white-collar women (HR = 2.4; 95% CI = 1.7, 3.7) and blue-collar men (HR = 1.3; 95% CI = 1.1, 1.5). For both men and women, workers with dependent children were more likely to be treated for depression whereas nonwhite workers were less markedly likely to be treated for depression over the study period (Tables 2 and 3).

TABLE 3. Adjusted Hazards Ratios Time to First Depression Episode by Gender and Occupational Class^a

Covariates	All Workers (N = 37,183)		
	Workers (N)	Cases, N (%) ^{b,c}	HRs ^d (95% CI)
Gender and occupational class			
White-collar men	5,911	1,171 (20)	1.0
Blue-collar men	24,124	4,689 (19)	1.3 (1.1, 1.5)
White-collar women	1,869	629 (34)	2.4 (1.7, 3.4)
Blue-collar women	5,279	1,866 (35)	3.2 (2.1, 5.0)
Dependent children			
None	20,205	4,476 (22)	1.00
One	6,925	1,593 (23)	1.1 (1.0, 1.2)
Two	6,216	1,488 (24)	1.2 (1.0, 1.3)
Three or more	3,837	798 (21)	1.2 (1.1, 1.3)
Dependent spouse			
No	14,630	2,814 (19)	1.0
Yes	22,553	5,541 (25)	0.97 (0.92, 1.0)
Race/ethnicity			
White	20,205	7,082 (35)	1.00
Black	3,975	523 (13)	0.48 (0.35, 0.66)
Hispanic	3,966	582 (15)	0.73 (0.61, 0.87)
Other	1,737	168 (9.6)	0.46 (0.30, 0.71)

^aAttained age was the timescale in Cox proportional hazards regression. The model was adjusted for gender and occupational class categories, dependent children, dependent spouse, race/ethnicity (Black, Hispanic, white, and other), and included fixed effects for plant location and calendar year.

^bWe defined the date of the first depression episode within the study period as the second depression-related outpatient visit or the second prescribed antidepressant within 365 days (whichever was first). Depression-related outpatient visits were identified using ICD-9 codes 293.84, 296.2–296.3, 300, 309, and 311; antidepressants included selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), selective norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (SNRIs), tricyclic antidepressants (TCAs), and monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAOIs).

^cPercentages do not account for variable follow-up time.

^dWe estimated 95% CIs by resampling from plant location using a cluster bootstrap with 1,000 repetitions.

Rates of Monthly Depression-related Service Utilization

Among workers treated for depression, blue-collar men and women utilized depression-related healthcare services less frequently than their white-collar counterparts. The rate of monthly depression-related service utilization among blue-collar men was 0.91 times the rate of monthly utilization among white-collar men (95% CI = 0.84, 0.98). Similarly, the rate of monthly depression-related service utilization among blue-collar women was 0.82 times that of white-collar women (95% CI = 0.77, 0.88). As compared with white-collar men, rates of service utilization were lowest among blue-collar men (RR = 0.90; 95% CI = 0.85, 0.97) and highest among white-collar women (RR = 1.3; 95% CI = 1.2, 1.4). Overall, rates were decreased among those with dependent children and among nonwhite workers, and utilization rates were substantially lower for nonwhite workers (Tables 4 and 5, and eFigures 3 and 4; <http://links.lww.com/EDE/B500>).

Sensitivity Analyses

To assess the robustness of the outcome, we created six alternative outcome definitions and further assessed

whether results were sensitive to the exclusion of anxiety-related outpatient visits (Figure). We found that HRs for time to first depression episode were consistent across all case specifications (top panel). Results were similar, though slightly attenuated, with the exclusion of anxiety-related outpatient visits (bottom panel). We summarize our six alternative case definitions and HRs, and 95% CI from Cox proportional hazards regression in the eTable 1; <http://links.lww.com/EDE/B500>.

Next, we modeled time to first episode of treated depression since hire by restricting our analysis to workers hired after the start of follow-up (eTable 2; <http://links.lww.com/EDE/B500>). Consistent with our primary analysis, blue-collar men hired after the start of follow-up were more likely to be treated for depression (1.3; 1.1, 1.5). In contrast with our primary analysis, we found no evidence that blue-collar women were more likely to be treated for depression than white-collar women among the new hires (0.95; 0.80, 1.1). Our analyses of the counts of unique depression-related outpatient visits and prescriptions, respectively, were consistent with findings from our analysis of the rate of monthly depression-related service utilization (eTables 3 and 4; <http://links.lww.com/EDE/B500>).

TABLE 4. Adjusted RRs for Monthly Depression-related Service Utilization by Occupational Class Among Male and Female Workers^{a,b}

Covariates	Women (N = 2,495)		Men (N = 5,860)	
	Workers, N (%)	R Rs (95% CI) ^{d,e}	Workers, N (%)	R Rs (95% CI) ^{d,e}
Age ^c		1.2 (1.1, 1.2)		1.2 (1.2, 1.2)
Age squared		0.99 (0.95, 1.0)		0.99 (0.79, 1.0)
Occupational class				
White-collar	592 (24)	1.0	1,065 (18)	1.0
Blue-collar	1,903 (76)	0.82 (0.77, 0.88)	4,795 (82)	0.91 (0.84, 0.98)
Dependent children				
None	1,433 (57)	1.0	2,566 (44)	1.0
One	514 (21)	0.87 (0.77, 1.0)	1,183 (20)	0.86 (0.79, 0.94)
Two	348 (14)	0.81 (0.72, 0.91)	1,274 (22)	0.91 (0.85, 0.97)
Three or more	200 (8.0)	0.71 (0.61, 0.82)	837 (14)	0.86 (0.80, 0.94)
Dependent spouse				
No	1,412 (57)	1.0	1,506 (26)	1.0
Yes	1,083 (43)	0.97 (0.92, 1.0)	4,354 (74)	2.0 (0.92, 1.1)
Race/ethnicity				
White	1,990 (80)	1.0	5,092 (87)	1.0
Black	245 (9.8)	0.68 (0.61, 0.76)	278 (4.7)	0.63 (0.45, 0.71)
Hispanic	195 (7.8)	0.72 (0.59, 0.89)	387 (6.6)	0.63 (0.55, 0.73)
Other	65 (2.6)	0.85 (0.68, 1.1)	103 (1.8)	0.76 (0.63, 0.93)

^aResults correspond to separate analyses restricted to male workers (N = 5,680) and female workers (N = 2,495) who satisfied our primary case definition for depression.

^bWe used a generalized linear model with the gamma distribution and log link to estimate average RRs. Separate models for male workers and female workers were simultaneously adjusted for age, age squared, occupational class, dependent children, dependent spouse, race/ethnicity (Black, Hispanic, white, and other), and included fixed effects for plant location.

^cAge was mean-centered and rescaled such that average RRs correspond to a 10-year increase in age.

^dAverage utilization rates for cases correspond to the sum of all months in which there was either a depression-related outpatient visit or filled prescription for a prescribed antidepressant by the total duration of PPO eligibility in years, taking into account prescription duration. Depression-related outpatient visits were identified using ICD-9 codes 293.84, 296.2–296.3, 300, 309, and 311; antidepressants included selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), selective norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (SNRIs), tricyclic antidepressants (TCAs), and monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAOIs).

^eWe estimated 95% CIs by resampling from plant location using a cluster bootstrap with 1,000 repetitions.

TABLE 5. Adjusted RRs for Monthly Depression-related Service Utilization by Gender and Occupational Class^a

Covariates	All Cases (N = 8,355)	
	Workers (%)	RRs (95% CI) ^{b,c}
Age ^d		1.2 (1.2, 1.2)
Age squared		0.99 (0.97, 1.0)
Gender and occupational class		
White-collar men	1,065 (13)	1.0
Blue-collar men	4,795 (57)	0.90 (0.85, 0.97)
White-collar women	592 (7.1)	1.3 (1.2, 1.4)
Blue-collar women	1903 (23)	1.0 (0.98, 1.1)
Dependent children		
None	3,999 (48)	1.0
One	1,697 (20)	0.86 (0.81, 0.92)
Two	1,622 (19)	0.88 (0.83, 0.94)
Three or more	1,037 (12)	0.83 (0.76, 0.89)
Dependent spouse		
No	2,918 (35)	1.0
Yes	5,437 (65)	0.98 (0.94, 1.0)
Race/ethnicity		
White	7,082 (85)	1.0
Black	523 (6.3)	0.61 (0.54, 0.69)
Hispanic	582 (7.0)	0.66 (0.57, 0.75)
Other	168 (2.0)	0.79 (0.67, 0.93)

^aWe used a generalized linear model with the gamma distribution and log link to estimate average RRs. The model was simultaneously adjusted for age, age squared, gender and occupational class categories, dependent children, dependent spouse, race/ethnicity (Black, Hispanic, white, and other), and included fixed effects for plant location.

^bAverage utilization rates for cases correspond to the sum of all months in which there was either a depression-related outpatient visit or filled prescription for a prescribed antidepressant by the total duration of PPO eligibility in years, taking into account prescription duration. Depression-related outpatient visits were identified using ICD-9 codes 293.84, 296.2–296.3, 300, 309, and 311; antidepressants included selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), selective norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (SNRIs), tricyclic antidepressants (TCAs), and monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAOIs).

^cWe estimated 95% CIs by resampling from plant location using a cluster bootstrap with 1,000 repetitions.

^dAge was mean-centered and rescaled such that average RRs correspond to a 10-year increase in age.

DISCUSSION

In this retrospective cohort study, we characterized trends in depression by gender and occupational class among >37,000 men and women employed by a single US aluminum manufacturer between 2003 and 2013. We first modeled time to first episode of treated depression by gender and occupational class. We additionally examined trends in monthly depression-related service utilization by gender and occupational class among workers with at least one episode of treated depression within the study period (i.e., cases). All workers in our study population received health insurance from their employer, and psychiatric services were covered through local PPO plans.

We observed that women were substantially more likely to be treated for depression within the study period than men (35% of female workers versus 20% of male workers). This finding is consistent with findings from the general

populations, with women's greater propensity to seek mental health treatment,⁴⁷ and the higher frequency of affective disorders or mental distress that is consistently documented among women in the general population.³⁴ Among both men and women, we found that blue-collar workers were more likely to be treated for depression at least once over the study period as compared with white-collar workers, although examination of the percentages of blue-collar and white-collar workers treated for depression over the study period suggests that the differences between blue-collar and white-collar workers are slight as compared with the differences between men and women overall.

In our pooled analysis of male and female workers, we found that blue-collar women were more than three times as likely to experience an episode of treated depression within the study period as compared with white-collar men, which underscores that women in blue-collar jobs may uniquely susceptible to depression. Nonwhite workers were considerably less likely than white workers to experience depression throughout the study period, which may reflect decreased propensity to seek care in general or greater stigma surrounding mental illness within racial and ethnic minority groups.^{48–50}

These trends in depression by occupational class may reflect a variety of factors, such as the downward social mobility among individuals predisposed to mental illness (i.e., “drift”), the downward selection into lower occupational strata than would otherwise be expected, or an etiologic role of work in onset or exacerbation of underlying depression.^{5–7} Aspects of the blue-collar work environment that may lead to depression onset include physical demand; the monotonous, repetitive nature of production; inflexible and demanding work hours; negative coworker interactions; and requirements to work quickly.^{12–16} Among female blue-collar workers, physical strain, sexual harassment and discrimination, job insecurity and lack of control over work, and work-life conflict may also contribute to onset of depression or exacerbate underlying disease.^{22,24–32} For today's blue-collar worker, these stressors exist within the broader context of economic uncertainty, real or perceived job insecurity, and weakened statutory entitlements and protections.

As a sensitivity analysis, we restricted our analysis to workers hired after the start of follow-up and modeled time to first episode of treated depression since hire. Consistent with findings for all male workers, we find that blue-collar men hired after the start of follow-up are more likely to be treated for depression within the study period as compared with white-collar men. However, we find no evidence that blue-collar women hired after the start of follow-up were more likely to experience depression. Whereas there is no clear, single explanation for the observed heterogeneity among female workers, our findings could reflect a higher burden of depression among newly hired white-collar women, a decreased burden of depression among newly hired blue-collar women, or greater stigma and less permissive norms surrounding




FIGURE. Sensitivity analysis of alternative case definitions for first depression episode. We constructed six alternative case definitions for first depression episode: first outpatient visit (case definition 1); first prescribed antidepressant (case definition 2); second outpatient visit in 365 days (case definition 3); second prescription in 365 days (case definition 4); one outpatient visit and one prescribed antidepressant in 365 days (case definition 5); and two outpatient visits plus one prescribed outpatient visit in 365 days (case definition 6). Depression-related outpatient visits were identified using ICD-9 codes 293.84, 296.2–296.3, 300, 309, and 311; antidepressants included selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRI); selective norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (SNRI); tricyclic antidepressants (TCAs) and monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAOIs). We assessed the robustness of our case-definition to the inclusion (top panel) and exclusion (bottom panel) of anxiety-related ICD-9 codes (293.84, 300.00–300.02). All models used attained age as the timescale, were simultaneously adjusted for race and ethnicity, dependents spouse, number of dependent children, and plant location and calendar year. We included a product term between gender and occupational class in order to estimate separate HRs for men and women. We estimated 95% CIs by resampling from plant location using a cluster bootstrap with 200 repetitions.

mental healthcare utilization among women newly hired into blue-collar jobs.

Finally, we examined rates of monthly depression-related healthcare utilization over the course of the study period among workers treated for depression. Although we hypothesized that blue-collar workers would use depression-related services more frequently, we found that male and female blue-collar workers used depression-related services less

frequently than their white-collar counterparts. As compared with white-collar men, blue-collar men used depression-related services the least frequently and white-collar women utilized services most frequently. In this insured population, patterns of utilization by occupational class and gender cannot be explained by systematic differences in insurance status. Less frequent service use may reflect systematically less severe depression among blue-collar men and women. Perhaps

more plausibly, lower rates among blue-collar workers may reflect barriers to mental healthcare service use other than insurance status, including greater stigma or less permissive norms surrounding mental healthcare use in working class populations; scheduling demands and temporal inflexibility associated with hourly work; blue-collar workers' sensitivity to the out-of-pocket costs associated with service use; or provider behaviors.

Limitations

The present study is not without limitations. First, our study was based on data from a single firm and may therefore have limited generalizability even to other US manufacturers if differences in organizational culture and institutional practices translate to meaningful differences in worker mental health and mental healthcare utilization. No direct measures of household composition were available, and we could only ascertain whether workers had a dependent spouse or child on their health insurance policy each year. These measures are likely to systematically underestimate parity and marital status, especially for women, but nevertheless may be an important indicator of each worker's economic responsibilities towards household members. We were also unable to adjust for several characteristics—including previous employment and educational attainment—that likely confound our analyses. Our analysis of depression-related service utilization is restricted to cases, and therefore be susceptible to collider stratification bias if there are unmeasured common causes of caseness and service utilization rates (such as genetic factors, underlying disease severity, or care-seeking propensity). These unmeasured factors will be negatively correlated with occupational class among the cases even if they are independent of occupational class in the general working population class, thereby confounding our association of interest.

Our analysis entailed comparison of two broad and heterogeneous groups—blue-collar and white-collar workers. Some white-collar jobs may be characterized by work experiences that are similar to blue-collar jobs and vice versa. For example, production managers and supervisors are white-collar workers whose jobs may entail exposure to physical demand, occupational hazards and social environment that is similar or equivalent to those of blue-collar workers. Similarly, clerical workers may be more equivalent to blue-collar workers with respect to their control over work and job security. This heterogeneity inherent in our definition of occupational class is equivalent to exposure misclassification.

Finally, there are at least three notable limitations related to our outcome of interest. First, absent any information on workers' past histories of mental illness, we are unable to differentiate between incident and prevalent depression, even among new hires. Second, we anticipate that outcome misclassification is likely. Because we measured depression outcomes using medical claims, our case definition does not capture untreated depression or treatment

for depression received outside of the worker's PPO network. It is commonly noted that the majority of individuals with psychiatric illness do not receive treatment,⁵¹ and moreover it cannot be assumed that treated depression is more severe than untreated depression given multiple cultural and economic pathways to treatment.^{52,53} Finally, we are unable to identify instances of off-label antidepressant prescriptions (for fibromyalgia, neuropathic pain, or other psychiatric morbidities). Unless these sources of outcome misclassification are collectively differential with respect to occupational class, however, we anticipate that their net effect would be to attenuate study findings.

CONCLUSIONS

For the present study, we found that blue-collar workers were more likely to be treated for depression within study period than white-collar workers. Blue-collar women were most likely to be treated for depression as compared with white-collar men, a finding which underscores that women in blue-collar jobs may uniquely susceptible to depression. Among both men and women, nonwhite workers were less likely to experience depression throughout the study period. In our analysis of depression-related service utilization, we found that blue-collar men and women utilized depression-related services less frequently than their white-collar counterparts. In this insured population, our findings may reflect additional barriers to mental healthcare utilization among blue-collar workers including increased stigma or less permissive norms around mental healthcare utilization; provider behavior; temporal inflexibility; blue-collar workers' greater sensitivity mental healthcare costs. As many of these barriers are potentially modifiable, future public health research may aim to identify the predominant mechanisms that explain systematic differences in mental healthcare utilization by occupational class that we have observed.

REFERENCES

1. Muntaner C, Eaton WW, Diala C, Kessler RC, Sorlie PD. Social class, assets, organizational control and the prevalence of common groups of psychiatric disorders. *Soc Sci Med*. 1998;47:2043–2053.
2. Eaton WW, Muntaner C, Bovasso G, Smith C. Socioeconomic status and depressive syndrome: the role of inter- and intra-generational mobility, government assistance, and work environment. *J Health Soc Behav*. 2001;42:277–294.
3. Eaton WW, Muntaner C. Socioeconomic stratification and mental disorder. In: Horwitz AV, Scheid TL, eds. *Sociology of Mental Health and Illness*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; 1999:259–283.
4. Joensuu M, Väänänen A, Koskinen A, Kivimäki M, Virtanen M, Vahtera J. Psychosocial work environment and hospital admissions due to mental disorders: a 15-year prospective study of industrial employees. *J Affect Disord*. 2010;124:118–125.
5. Eaton WW. *The Sociology of Mental Disorders*. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers; 2001.
6. Dohrenwend BP, Levav I, Shrout PE, et al. Socioeconomic status and psychiatric disorders: the causation-selection issue. *Science*. 1992;255:946–952.
7. Muntaner C, Eaton WW, Miech R, O'Campo P. Socioeconomic position and major mental disorders. *Epidemiol Rev*. 2004;26:53–62.
8. Wheaton B. The sociogenesis of psychological disorder: reexamining the causal issues with longitudinal data. *Am Sociol Rev*. 1978;43:383–403.

9. Johnson JG, Cohen P, Dohrenwend BP, Link BG, Brook JS. A longitudinal investigation of social causation and social selection processes involved in the association between socioeconomic status and psychiatric disorders. *J Abnorm Psychol.* 1999;108:490–499.
10. Miech RA, Caspi A, Moffitt TE, Wright BRE, Silva PA. Low socioeconomic status and mental disorders: a longitudinal study of selection and causation during young adulthood. *Am J Sociol.* 1999;104:1096–1131.
11. Power C, Stansfeld SA, Matthews S, Manor O, Hope S. Childhood and adulthood risk factors for socio-economic differentials in psychological distress: evidence from the 1958 British birth cohort. *Soc Sci Med.* 2002;55:1989–2004.
12. DeSanto Iennaco J, Cullen MR, Cantley L, Slade MD, Fiellin M, Kasl SV. Effects of externally rated job demand and control on depression diagnosis claims in an industrial cohort. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2010;171:303–311.
13. Kawakami N, Haratani T, Araki S. Effects of perceived job stress on depressive symptoms in blue-collar workers of an electrical factory in Japan. *Scand J Work Environ Health.* 1992;18:195–200.
14. Kawakami N, Araki S, Kawashima M, Masumoto T, Hayashi T. Effects of work-related stress reduction on depressive symptoms among Japanese blue-collar workers. *Scand J Work Environ Health.* 1997;23:54–59.
15. d'Errico A, Cardano M, Landriscina T, Marinacci C, Pasian S, Petrelli A, Costa G. Workplace stress and prescription of antidepressant medications: a prospective study on a sample of Italian workers. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health.* 2011;4:413–424.
16. 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. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol.* 2010;45:1135–1147.
17. Arnold D, Bongiovi JR. Precarious, informalizing, and flexible work: transforming concepts and understandings. *Am Behav Sci.* 2012;57:289–308.
18. Berman E, Bound J, Griliches Z. Changes in the demand for skilled labor within US manufacturing: evidence from the annual survey of manufacturers. *Quarterly J Econom.* 1994;109:367–397.
19. Navarro V. The labor process and health: a historical materialist interpretation. *Int J Health Serv.* 1982;12:5–29.
20. Kalleberg AL. Job quality and precarious work: clarifications, controversies, and challenges. *Work Occup.* 2012;39:427–448.
21. Kalleberg AL. Precarious work, insecure workers: employment relations in transition. *Am Sociol Rev.* 2009;74:1–22.
22. Messing K, Dumais L, Courville J, Seifert AM, Boucher M. Evaluation of exposure data from men and women with the same job title. *J Occup Med.* 1994;36:913–917.
23. Reskin BF, Padavic I. *Men and Women at Work.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press; 1994.
24. Courville J, Vézina N, Messing K. Comparison of the work activity of two mechanics: a woman and a man. *Int J Ind Ergon.* 1991;7:163–174.
25. Messing K, Lippel K, Demers D, Mergler D. Equality and difference in the workplace: Physical job demands, occupational illnesses, and sex differences. *NWSA J.* 2000:21–49.
26. Mansfield PK, Koch PB, Henderson J, Vicary JR, Cohn M, Young EW. The job climate for women in traditionally male blue-collar occupations. *Sex Roles.* 1991;25:63–79.
27. Gruber JE. The impact of male work environments and organizational policies on women's experiences of sexual harassment. *Gender Soc.* 1998;12:301–320.
28. Gruber JE, Bjorn L. Blue-collar blues: the sexual harassment of women autoworkers. *Work Occup.* 1982;9:271–298.
29. Maypole DE, Skaine R. Sexual harassment of blue collar workers. *J Soc Sci Welfare.* 1982;9:682.
30. Harrell WA. Perceived risk of occupational injury: control over pace of work and blue-collar versus white-collar work. *Percept Mot Skills.* 1990;70(3 pt 2):1351–1359.
31. Hoelschild A, Machung A. *The Second Shift: Working Families and the Revolution at Home.* New York, NY: Penguin Books; 2012.
32. Messing K, Punnett L, Bond M, et al. Be the fairest of them all: challenges and recommendations for the treatment of gender in occupational health research. *Am J Ind Med.* 2003;43:618–629.
33. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Women in the Labor Force: A Databook.* Available at: <https://www.bls.gov/opub/reports/womens-databook/2016/home.htm>. Accessed 31 July 2018.
34. Kessler RC, Berglund P, Demler O, et al; National Comorbidity Survey Replication. The epidemiology of major depressive disorder: results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication (NCS-R). *JAMA.* 2003;289:3095–3105.
35. Kessler RC. Epidemiology of women and depression. *J Affect Disord.* 2003;74:5–13.
36. Rutter M, Caspi A, Moffitt TE. Using sex differences in psychopathology to study causal mechanisms: unifying issues and research strategies. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry.* 2003;44:1092–1115.
37. Einav L, Finkelstein A, Pascu I, Cullen MR. How general are risk preferences? Choices under uncertainty in different domains. *Am Econ Rev.* 2012;102:2606–2038.
38. Clougherty JE, Eisen EA, Slade MD, Kawachi I, Cullen MR. Gender and sex differences in job status and hypertension. *Occup Environ Med.* 2011;68:16–23.
39. Clougherty JE, Eisen EA, Slade MD, Kawachi I, Cullen MR. Workplace status and risk of hypertension among hourly and salaried aluminum manufacturing employees. *Soc Sci Med.* 2009;68:304–313.
40. Modrek S, Hamad R, Cullen MR. Psychological well-being during the great recession: changes in mental health care utilization in an occupational cohort. *Am J Public Health.* 2015;105:304–310.
41. Faraway JJ. *Extending the Linear Model with R: Generalized Linear, Mixed Effects and Nonparametric Regression Models.* Vol. 124. Boca Raton, FL: CRC press; 2016.
42. Quam L, Ellis LB, Venus P, Clouse J, Taylor CG, Leatherman S. Using claims data for epidemiologic research. The concordance of claims-based criteria with the medical record and patient survey for identifying a hypertensive population. *Med Care.* 1993;31:498–507.
43. Fowles JB, Fowler EJ, Craft C. Validation of claims diagnoses and self-reported conditions compared with medical records for selected chronic diseases. *J Ambul Care Manage.* 1998;21:24–34.
44. Jiang L, Zhang B, Smith ML, et al. Concordance between self-reports and medicare claims among participants in a National Study of Chronic Disease Self-Management Program. *Front Public Health.* 2015;3:222.
45. Cullen MR, Vegso S, Cantley L, et al. Use of medical insurance claims data for occupational health research. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2006;48:1054–1061.
46. Modrek S, Cullen MR. Health consequences of the “Great Recession” on the employed: evidence from an industrial cohort in aluminum manufacturing. *Soc Sci Med.* 2013;92:105–113.
47. Mojtabai R. Use of specialty substance abuse and mental health services in adults with substance use disorders in the community. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2005;78:345–354.
48. Gary FA. Stigma: barrier to mental health care among ethnic minorities. *Issues Ment Health Nurs.* 2005;26:979–999.
49. Yeh M, McCabe K, Hurlburt M, et al. Referral sources, diagnoses, and service types of youth in public outpatient mental health care: a focus on ethnic minorities. *J Behav Health Serv Res.* 2002;29:45–60.
50. Wells K, Klap R, Koike A, Sherbourne C. Ethnic disparities in unmet need for alcoholism, drug abuse, and mental health care. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2001;158:2027–2032.
51. Wang PS, Lane M, Olfson M, Pincus HA, Wells KB, Kessler RC. Twelve-month use of mental health services in the United States: results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 2005;62:629–640.
52. Pescosolido BA, Gardner CB, Lubell KM. How people get into mental health services: stories of choice, coercion and “muddling through” from “first-timers”. *Soc Sci Med.* 1998;46:275–286.
53. Pescosolido BA, Martin JK, Long JS, Medina TR, Phelan JC, Link BG. “A disease like any other”? A decade of change in public reactions to schizophrenia, depression, and alcohol dependence. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2010;167:1321–1330.