

1 Industry differences in managers' 2 experiences of work capacity in 3 employees with common mental 4 disorders: a cross-sectional study on the 5 Swedish labour market

6 Lisa Björk^{1,2*}, Jenny Hultquist³, Gunnel Hensing⁴, Monica Bertilsson⁴

7 ¹Department of Work Science and Sociology, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

8 ²Institute of Stress Medicine, Region Västra Götaland, Gothenburg, Sweden

9 ³Department of Health and Rehabilitation, Institute of Neuroscience and Physiology, The Sahlgrenska
10 Academy, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

11 ⁴School of Public Health and Community Medicine, Institute of Medicine, The Sahlgrenska Academy,
12 University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

13 *Corresponding author

14 lisa.m.bjork@vgregion.se (LB)

15 **Author contributions**

16 LB, JH, GH and MB designed the study. MB was responsible for data collection. JH ran
17 the data analysis. LB drafted the manuscript. All authors have been involved in the
18 completion of the manuscript.

19

20 **Abstract**

21 The aim of this study was to assess industry differences in managers' experiences and ratings of work
22 capacity in employees with common mental disorders (CMDs). Swedish managers (N=1819) were
23 grouped into three industry classifications. Differences between industries in managers' experiences
24 were investigated by chi-squared tests. The managers' ratings of how work capacity was affected by
25 CMDs were analysed using MANCOVA, adjusted for organizational size and managers' span of
26 control. The proportion of managers who had experienced several employees with CMDs was higher
27 in municipalities and counties, and in pink-collar work, education, health and social care settings
28 compared with other industries. There was no significant effect of industry on managers' ratings of
29 how work capacity may be affected by CMDs. Contrary to assumptions, there were no differences in
30 how managers perceived capacity to work between industries. Therefore, it is more urgent that
31 managers receive the support they need to handle employees with reduced work capacity due to CMDs
32 rather than to tailor such support to different industries.

33 **Introduction**

34 Employers are responsible for workers' health and safety. This responsibility is executed by
35 managers through universal preventive efforts regarding the work environment and through
36 individual support to workers in vocational rehabilitation [1-5]. In particular, managers
37 highlight vocational support as challenging in the case of CMDs [6].

38 The World Health Organization has estimated the prevalence of mental disorders to be
39 approximately 15% among working adults [7, 8]; depression and anxiety are the most
40 widespread disorders. Most people with these disorders remain at work, but others experience
41 decreased work capacity and become sick-listed. In Sweden, sickness absence (SA) with
42 psychiatric disorders tends to be longer than in other diagnostic groups, and recurrence of

43 sickness absence is higher [9-11]. Length of SA and recurrence is related to the severity of the
44 disorder but also to the adaptability of the work situation. Thus, work accommodation is
45 important to prevent SA but also for vocational rehabilitation [5]. However, qualitative
46 studies have shown that managers find it difficult to accommodate work for employees with
47 CMDs [6, 12]. This is not surprising because work capacity in relation to CMDs is a complex
48 phenomenon [13]. In their review, Lederer et al. [14] concluded that work capacity is
49 determined by individual characteristics as well as by dimensions in the environment. Work
50 capacity has been described as the result of a dynamic interaction between the individual, the
51 work environment and the work tasks [15]. In earlier qualitative studies of people with lived
52 experiences, work capacity is described as multifaceted and not limited to paid work only [16,
53 17]. To reach the optimal level of an individual's work capacity, work adjustments are often
54 necessary in terms of changes in work tasks and the work environment, or both.

55 In the present study, we investigate whether managers in different industrial sectors
56 perceive work capacity in employees with CMDs differently. This approach was based on the
57 uneven distribution of SA across the labour market. Most prominent are the differences
58 between female- and male-dominated sectors, with higher CMD-induced SA levels in both
59 women and men in the female-dominated sectors. We assumed that the varying characteristics
60 of different industries may affect work capacity of employees with CMD differently. If so,
61 managers in different industries might encounter dissimilar aspects of a reduced work
62 capacity among their employees. As an example, managers in the health care sector might
63 notice reductions in social capacity, whereas managers in the IT sector might encounter
64 reductions in cognitive capacities.

65 Given the uneven distribution of SA across industries, the key role of managers in
66 vocational rehabilitation and the lack of studies in this field, the aim of this study is to assess

67 industry differences in managers' experiences and ratings of work capacity in employees with
68 CMDs. More specifically, we analyse two research questions:

69 Q1 What proportion of managers had experienced one or more employees with a CMD during
70 the last 2 years in different industrial sectors categorized by (i) ownership, (ii) work
71 object and (iii) work object + gender composition?

72 Q2 Are there any differences in managers' ratings of how work capacity is affected in
73 employees with CMDs in different industrial sectors categorized by (i) ownership, (ii)
74 work object and (iii) work object + gender composition?

75 **Materials and methods**

76 This explorative, cross-sectional study is a part of the New Ways - Mental Health at Work
77 research programme and the specific project "Managers' Perspective - A Missing Piece". The
78 project focuses on Swedish managers' attitudes towards knowledge and experiences of
79 employees with CMDs. This study was designed as a cross-sectional survey study, with data
80 collected between June 14 and August 8 in 2017.

81 **Sample**

82 Participants were recruited from the Swedish Citizen Panel at the SOM Institute, University
83 of Gothenburg, and through the HELIX Competence Centre at Linköping University,
84 Sweden. The Citizen Panel consists of self-recruited participants and the HELIX Centre is a
85 collaboration between 22 private and public organizations. Identification of managers in the
86 Citizen Panel was done using two questions on managerial position included in the 26th panel
87 survey in 2017 [18]. Five thousand managers were invited to participate in the study (Fig 1).
88 The HELIX Competence Centre provided additional email addresses for managers (n=556)
89 from eight of the collaborating organizations. The response rate was 71%. The final sample in

90 this study consisted of 1819 managers who had experienced at least one employee with a
91 CMD during the last 2 years. The questionnaire was pilot-tested on ten managers before
92 distribution.

93 **Fig 1. Flowchart of the sampling process.**

94 **Measures**

95 **Managers' experience of employees with CMDs**

96 To measure managers' experience of employees with CMDs, the participants were asked:
97 "In the past two years, have you had employees at your current workplace who have had
98 depression and/or anxiety disorder?". Of the 1819 managers included in this study, 927 (51%)
99 answered "Yes, one staff member" and 892 (49%) "Yes, several staff members".

100 **Managers' experience of work capacity in employees with CMDs**

101 The managers were also asked: "Think back to those employees who have had depression
102 and/or anxiety disorders in the past two years at your current workplace. Based on your
103 opinion, how was the work capacity of these employees affected?". This question was
104 followed by nine items on how work capacity can be affected (Table 1). The nine items were
105 derived from an instrument measuring work capacity in workers with CMD [19]. The nine
106 items constitute two indices: task-oriented work capacity (Cronbach's alpha, 0.81) and
107 relational work capacity (Cronbach's alpha, 0.70). Construction of the indices was preceded
108 by a principal component factor analysis (see S1 Table).

109 **Table 1. Swedish managers' ratings of how they thought CMDs affected work capacity**
110 **in their employees: frequencies and proportions from a cross-sectional web survey,**
111 **2017.**

How was the employee's work capacity affected regarding:	Answer options, n (%)					Total, n (%)
	Not affected at all	Became somewhat more difficult	Became more difficult	Became much more difficult	Do not know	
Task-oriented work capacity						
Getting started on work assignments	59 (3.3)	436 (24.4)	620 (34.7)	591 (33.1)	81 (4.6)	1787 (100)
Being able to prioritize among work tasks	41 (2.3)	262 (14.7)	495 (27.7)	909 (50.9)	80 (4.5)	1787 (100)
Being able to concentrate	26 (1.5)	276 (15.4)	583 (32.6)	799 (44.7)	103 (5.8)	1787 (100)
Remembering	79 (4.4)	395 (22.1)	561 (31.4)	556 (31.1)	195 (10.9)	1786 (100)
Maintaining the work pace	54 (3.0)	376 (21.0)	576 (32.2)	724 (40.5)	57 (3.2)	1787 (100)
Relational work capacity						
Interacting with other people	79 (4.4)	553 (31.0)	576 (32.3)	541 (30.3)	37 (2.1)	1786 (100)
Participating in social work environments (such as coffee breaks)	187 (10.5)	551 (30.8)	475 (26.6)	461 (25.8)	113 (6.3)	1787 (100)
Keeping calm and not getting upset	130 (7.3)	415 (23.2)	479 (26.8)	649 (36.3)	114 (6.4)	1787 (100)
Coping with external disturbances (such as nearby conversations)	103 (5.8)	350 (19.6)	503 (28.2)	565 (31.6)	265 (14.8)	1786 (100)

112 Industry breakdown

113 The respondents selected the ownership of their company/organization from five options
 114 (governmental, county council/regional, municipal, private, non-profit)

115 organization/foundation). They also reported which industry the company/organization's
116 main activity belonged to by selecting one of the 16 categories of the Swedish Standard
117 Industrial Classification (SNI) from 2007, which is based on the recommended standards from
118 the European Union, NACE Rev.2 [20].

119 Different ways to categorize labour market sectors may result in different assumptions
120 about managers' opportunities to understand employee work capacity. The present study
121 adopted an explorative approach rather than testing such assumptions. We used three different
122 classifications to get as broad a picture as possible.

123 Classification 1: Ownership. Respondents were classified into the following groups:
124 governmental, county council/regional and municipal, and private and non-profit
125 organization/foundation based on their responses to the question about ownership in the
126 survey.

127 Classification 2: Work object. The main work object (data, things or people) was used to
128 classify respondents into the following groups: white-collar work (data), blue-collar work
129 (things), pink-collar work (people) and other work (Table 2) [21]. The classification was done
130 using the 16 categories of the SNI. The division into these four categories is a crude division
131 because most occupations and jobs within an industry contain tasks related to all three objects.
132 However, the significance of the main work object for job content has been recognized in
133 research for decades, as well as the generalizations it may foster [22].

134 **Table 2. Classification of industries for classification 2: work object.**

Work object	The Swedish Standard Industrial classification from 2007
White-collar	IT, information, and communications activities
	Financial and insurance activities
	Public administration and defence

	Legal, economic, scientific, and technological activities
Blue-collar	Agriculture, forestry, fishing
	Mining and quarrying
	Manufacturing industry
	Construction and craftsmanship
	Provision of electricity, heat, water, sewage, waste
	Transport
Pink-collar	Trade/commerce
	Hotel and restaurant operations
	Education
	Health care, social services
Other	Culture, entertainment, recreation
	Other type of activity

135 Classification 3: Work object + gender composition. As a more fine-grained way of
 136 breaking down industries, we added the gender composition of the industry (female-
 137 dominated, male-dominated or gender-mixed). Following Cerdas et al. [23], both the main
 138 work object and the proportion of men and women employed in the industry were considered
 139 to classify the respondents into two male-dominated industries handling things (goods and
 140 energy production and machinery operations), three gender-mixed industries handling things,
 141 data and people (labour-intensive services, knowledge-intensive services, and public
 142 administration) and two female-dominated industries handling people (education and health
 143 and social care) (Table 3). The answer option “other type of activity” was excluded in this
 144 classification.

145 **Table 3. Classification of industries for classification 3: Work object + gender**
 146 **composition.**

Work object + gender composition	The Swedish Standard Industrial classification from 2007 ^a
Machinery operations	Agriculture, forestry, fishing

	Construction and craftsmanship
	Transport
Goods and energy production	Mining and quarrying
	Manufacturing industry
	Provision of electricity, heat, water, sewage, waste
Labour-intensive services	Trade/commerce
	Hotel and restaurant operations
	Culture, entertainment, recreation
Knowledge-intensive services	IT, information and communications activities
	Financial and insurance activities
	Legal, economic, scientific, and technological activities
Education	Education
Health and social care	Health care, social services
Public administration	Public administration and defence

147 ^aThe category, other type of activity, was excluded.

148 **Size of the organization and span of control**

149 It could be argued that the prospects for managers to rate how work capacity is affected are,
 150 to some extent, dependent on contextual factors, such as organizational size [24, 25] and span
 151 of control [26], i.e. the number of employees per manager. With large numbers of employees,
 152 it is plausible that managers have less insight into everyone’s work capacity. Organizational
 153 size was measured by the number of staff, collapsed into two categories: small and medium-
 154 sized organizations (0–250 staff members) and large organizations (>250 staff members) [27].
 155 The span of control was collapsed into two groups: 0–30 and ≥ 31 employees per manager. In
 156 Sweden, 30 employees per manager is the average in the health and social sector, the sector
 157 with the largest span of control on the labour market [28]; more than 31 employees per
 158 manager is thus considered to be a large span of control. Descriptive statistics of the study
 159 sample, including demographics, are shown in Table 4.

160 **Table 4. Descriptive statistics of the study sample (N = 1819).**

Variable	Number (%)	Missing
Sex		8
Women	694 (38)	
Men	1117 (62)	
Age		1
20–29 years	29 (2)	
30–39 years	266 (15)	
40–49 years	590 (32)	
50–59 years	676 (37)	
>60 years	257 (14)	
Level of education		2
Upper secondary school	247 (14)	
Degree from college/university	1172 (64)	
Other post-secondary education	398 (22)	
Span of control^a		7
0	135 (8)	
1–5	485 (27)	
6–10	408 (22)	
11–20	366 (20)	
21–30	147 (8)	
31–40	108 (6)	
41–50	65 (4)	
>50	98 (5)	
Organizational size^b		1
0–9	175 (10)	
10–49	335 (18)	
50–250	359 (20)	
251–1000	281 (15)	
>1000	668 (37)	

161 ^aNumber of staff members per manager.

162 ^bNumber of staff members in the organization.

163 **Data analysis**

164 Descriptive statistics were applied to address the first research question. Differences in
165 proportions between categories of industries regarding managers' experience of one versus
166 several employees with CMDs were explored using the chi-squared test. To address the
167 second research question, three separate multivariate analyses of covariance (MANCOVAs),
168 one per industry classification, were performed to investigate whether the industry was
169 associated with managers' ratings of how employees' work capacity was affected by a CMD,
170 controlling for organizational size and the managers' span of control. County
171 councils/regional and municipal, pink collar and health and social care were the reference
172 categories in the MANCOVAs. The MANCOVAs were also performed using the full
173 variance of the covariate, but because the results from these analyses did not differ from the
174 analysis with dichotomized covariates, only the latter are presented in the results. All analysis
175 was performed using IBM-SPSS software, version 26 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA). The level
176 of significance was set at <0.05.

177 **Results**

178 **Managers' experience of employees with CMDs**

179 Managers' experiences of employees with CMDs in different parts of the labour market
180 where the industry is viewed according to ownership, work object and work object + gender
181 composition are presented in Table 5. Table 5 also shows the results of the chi-squared tests
182 of differences in managers' experiences of staff members with a CMD, adjusted for the size
183 of the organization and the span of control.

184 **Table 5. Managers' experience of employees with CMDs per industry.**

Industry breakdown	Experience of one employee with a CMD, n (%)	Experience of several employees with a CMD, n (%)	p value derived from the chi-squared test^a
Ownership^b			
Governmental	119 (43.4)	155 (56.6)	<0.001
Non-profit	58 (43.6)	75 (56.4)	
Private	543 (57.8)	397 (42.2)	
Municipal+ county councils	207 (43.9)	264 (56.1)	
Work object			
Other	141 (48.8)	148 (51.2)	<0.001
Blue	279 (52.2)	255 (47.8)	
White	215 (60.2)	142 (39.8)	
Pink	292 (51.0)	892 (49.0)	
Work object + gender composition^c			
Machinery operations	89 (58.2)	64 (41.8)	<0.001
Goods and energy production	126 (61.8)	78 (38.2)	
Labour-intensive services	110 (52.1)	101 (47.9)	
Knowledge intense services	181 (55.0)	148 (45.0)	
Education	101 (43.7)	130 (56.3)	
Public administration	98 (47.8)	107 (52.2)	
Health and social care	123 (43.3)	161 (56.7)	

185 ^aChi-squared test regarding differences in proportions between classification categories of industries regarding managers'
 186 experience of one versus several employees with CMD controlled for the number of staff in the organization and number
 187 of employees per manager.

188 ^bOne missing case,

189 ^c161 cases were excluded (the “other” category was excluded).

190 There was a difference between industries in the proportion (%) of managers with
 191 experiences of one versus several staff members with CMDs, irrespective of the classification.
 192 When the industries were defined according to ownership, the difference was due to one

193 deviating industry; private companies had a lower proportion (42%) of managers who had
194 experienced several staff members with CMDs, compared with the managers in other
195 industries (56%–57%). We found a similar pattern when the industries were categorized in
196 terms of the main work object; in white-collar industries, 40% of the managers had several
197 employees with CMDs, whereas this proportion in other industries varied between 48% and
198 51%. For the third type of industry breakdown, work object + gender composition, the highest
199 proportion of managers with several experiences of CMDs was found among health and social
200 care and education (57%), followed by managers in public administration (52%), labour-
201 intensive services (48%), knowledge-intensive services (45%), machinery operations (42%)
202 and goods and energy production (38%).

203 **Managers' ratings by industry classification**

204 Three MANCOVAs were performed to assess the managers' ratings of how work capacity
205 was affected by CMDs (one for each industry breakdown: ownership, work object and work
206 object + gender composition) with organizational size and span of control as covariates, and
207 with task-oriented work capacity and relational work capacity as dependent variables. When
208 industry was classified according to ownership, the results were $F(6, 3518)=1.458$, $p=0.189$,
209 Wilks' $\Lambda=0.995$, partial $\eta^2=0.002$. For work object, the analysis resulted in $F(6, 3518)=1.067$,
210 $p=0.380$, Wilks' $\Lambda=0.996$, partial $\eta^2=0.002$, and for work object + gender composition, $F(12,$
211 $3118)=1.582$, $p=0.089$, Wilks' $\Lambda=0.988$, partial $\eta^2=0.006$. Thus, no statistical differences
212 could be found between industries on the combined measures of managers' ratings of how
213 work capacity is affected by a CMD, regardless of how the industry is classified.

214 **Discussion**

215 We found that the proportion of managers who had experienced several staff members with
216 CMDs was higher in industries where many women work: municipalities and counties, pink
217 collar and education and health and social care. Differences attenuated when the classification
218 of industries was based on work object. However, in contrast to our assumption, we did not
219 find differences in how managers rated work capacity in employees with a CMD across
220 industries.

221 **Managers' experience of employees with CMDs**

222 The finding that managers in industries where many women work encounter employees
223 with CMDs to a greater degree than managers in other industries is in line with earlier
224 research in which outcomes such as prescription of psychotropic drugs and psychiatric care
225 [29], SA [9], and disability pension [30] with a CMD were found to be more prominent in
226 female-dominated industries. Two systematic reviews have suggested a causal link between a
227 detrimental psychosocial work environment and depression and burnout [31, 32]. Both
228 reviews concluded that the negative consequences of work seem to affect women and men
229 working in these environments in similar ways. This suggests that more women are affected
230 because they often work in environments where factors that affect mental health negatively
231 (e.g. job insecurity, high demands, high workload, low job control and low reward) are
232 common [32].

233 Another reason for these differences is a possible underreporting of experiences. Managers
234 are largely dependent on employee disclosure. Disclosure is a problematic issue, and workers
235 avoid disclosure due to fear of stigmatization [33, 34]. In a recent qualitative study, managers
236 reported that a masculine culture with traditional male ideals of being strong and enduring

237 may contribute to stigma and hamper disclosure [35]. In another study, we found a difference
238 in negative attitudes to depression between female and male managers; the proportion of
239 women with negative attitudes was significantly lower than among men [36]. These two
240 studies support the assumption that CMDs may be underestimated in male-dominated sectors.
241 However, having employees with CMDs seems to be a rare experience for most managers; of
242 the total study population (3358), 73% reported none or only one event in the last 2 years. The
243 assumption regarding underreporting in male-dominated sectors must be confirmed in future
244 studies.

245 **Managers' ratings of how work capacity is affected by CMDs**

246 Our next research question concerned differences in how managers in different industries in
247 the labour market rate their employees' work capacity in relation to CMDs. We know that
248 organizational size and span of control vary between industries and that this can affect the
249 managers' possibilities to be attentive to their employees' needs; therefore, we adjusted the
250 analysis for these covariates. However, no main effect of industry, regardless of how the
251 industry was measured, was found. The finding was a bit surprising because SA, which is a
252 result of reduced work capacity, varies between industries. We suggest some possible
253 explanations. First, the finding may imply that CMDs affect work capacity in similar ways
254 across industries, at least from the managers' perspective. Second, the nine items we used to
255 illustrate possible effects of CMDs on work capacity did not correctly reflect different
256 managers' perspectives; other effects might be more visible or important to managers
257 depending on the sector. Third, work capacity is a complex phenomenon that might be
258 difficult to separate from symptoms such as fatigue, cognitive impairment, emotional
259 instability, etc.

260 Our first possible explanation was that CMDs may affect work capacity in similar ways,
261 irrespective of industry. This might be due to an alignment of work tasks in different sectors
262 related to automation of repeated and/or heavy work tasks and digitalization. From theory, we
263 know that work capacity is dependent on the environment, the work tasks, the demands and
264 the resources of different workplaces [15]. If we narrow the perspective down to the
265 individual employee, experiences of symptoms vary and affect capacity in different ways [16,
266 37, 38]. We therefore consider it unlikely that the absence of differences between sectors is
267 due to alignment of work tasks or, for that matter, similar expressions of CMD-related work
268 capacity, independent of the work situation. Rather, we acknowledge that the chosen macro
269 level of comparison was too comprehensive to find variations in manager ratings. We suggest
270 that future studies should be performed at lower structural levels to allow more specific
271 comparisons. The challenge for that kind of study might be to find a large enough number for
272 the analysis because employees with CMDs according to this study are a rare experience for
273 managers.

274 Our second explanation concerns the nine items used in the survey to measure how
275 managers rate work capacity in employees with CMDs. The items capture two aspects of
276 work capacity: one on the relational aspects of work and one that was more task-oriented. It
277 could be argued that this division of work capacity may be too fine-tuned for the managers. It
278 is plausible that managers have a more general conception of work capacity among their
279 employees. They may be able to conceive that work capacity is reduced, without being able to
280 identify specific aspects that are problematic. However, in an earlier focus group study,
281 managers from a variety of male- and female-dominated sectors were able to describe
282 different components of their employees' work capacity [39]. Thus, we have no particular
283 reason to believe that the failure to find differences between industries was related to
284 managers' inability to identify specific aspects of reduced work capacity in their employees.

285 Although some managers may find it difficult to conceive different components of a reduced
286 work capacity, we assume that they are randomly distributed over the industries. However,
287 the items might be difficult to understand or to transfer into practical work experiences.

288 The third explanation for the lack of differences between sectors is the complexity of work
289 capacity as a phenomenon. The complexity has been highlighted in several studies on clinical
290 experience, where physicians state that the assessment of work capacity is difficult due to
291 individual variations in symptoms and symptom management within similar groups of
292 disorders [40, 41]. Also, persons affected by CMDs and reduced work capacity find it difficult
293 to articulate their reduced work capacity. A qualitative study testing the Capacity Note, a
294 communication facilitator in Swedish primary health care, found that patients thought it was
295 helpful to get more precise wording of their experiences [42]. It made it easier to explain to
296 their managers what they experienced as difficult in their work situation. Thus, the capacity to
297 work concept might be less familiar to managers and employees with CMDs.

298 **Methodological considerations**

299 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to consider managers' perceptions of
300 the work capacity of employees with CMDs across the labour market. One strength is that we
301 tested three ways to classify managers according to industry, based on three logics, or theories
302 (ownership, work object and work object + gender composition), with four, four and seven
303 categories, respectively. Even though the sample was large, a single classification with seven
304 categories could have hidden differences between industries. This risk of too many categories
305 hiding possible differences was thus avoided.

306 To differentiate between managers with little and more extensive experience, we compared
307 managers who had experienced one employee with a CMD with those who had experienced
308 several staff members with CMDs in the past 2 years. The difference between the two

309 categories can be disputed; the category “several staff members” includes both managers with
310 extensive experience and those with just one more experience than the managers in the first
311 category. Even with this crude division of managers’ experience, we managed to find
312 differences between industries in the proportion of managers who had experienced employees
313 with CMDs.

314 We were not in control of what kind of case the managers thought of when they were asked
315 about their experience of employees with CMDs. Some might have thought about severe
316 cases where employees were sick-listed and incapable of work, and others about cases when
317 employees simply shared their health-related worries. The terms “depression and anxiety
318 disorders” were used repeatedly throughout the survey to guide the managers’ understanding.
319 However, we cannot be sure how the managers defined “employees with CMDs”. Managers
320 from health care and social services may be better prepared due to formal training and
321 experience to understand this concept than managers from other sectors. However, they did
322 not rate work capacity differently. Furthermore, rating of work capacity among those with
323 experience of several employees meant they had to rate an overall or general perception,
324 which limits a nuanced rating.

325 **Implications**

326 Managers rate capacity to work in employees with CMDs similarly, irrespective of the
327 industrial sector. If the findings had supported our assumption about industry differences,
328 tailored training programmes would have been warranted. However, the findings imply that
329 the industrial context does not need to be considered in measures taken to support managers in
330 the challenging management task of meeting employees with CMDs. The important issue is
331 that managers across the labour market do receive support so that they can function as

332 important actors in reducing work-related risk factors for CMDs and supporting sick-listed
333 staff members to get back to work.

334 **Conclusion**

335 This study aimed to investigate whether there were differences among managers in the
336 various industries in the Swedish labour market regarding experiences of CMDs in
337 employees, and how managers rated the effect of CMDs on employees' work capacity. It was
338 found that the proportion of managers who had experienced several staff members with
339 CMDs in the past 2 years was higher in industries where many women work, regardless of
340 whether the industry was classified according to ownership, work object or work object in
341 combination with gender composition. However, no difference could be found in how
342 managers from different industries rated how the employees' work capacity was affected by
343 CMDs.

344 **References**

- 345 1. Dewa CS, Trojanowski L, Joosen MC, Bonato S. Employer best practice guidelines for
346 the return to work of workers on mental disorder-related disability leave: a systematic
347 review. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2016;61:176–185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743716632515>
- 348 2. Swedish Work Environment Authority. Job modification. Available from: [Job
349 modification \(AFS 2020:5Eng\), provisions - Arbetsmiljöverket \(av.se\)](https://www.arbetsmiljoverket.se/om-arbetsmiljoverket/arbetsmiljoverket-afs-2020-5-eng/provisions)
- 350 3. Dimoff J, Kelloway EK. Mental health problems are management problems: exploring
351 the critical role of managers in supporting employee mental health. *Organ Dyn*.
352 2019;48:105–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2018.11.003>

- 353 4. Corbière M, Mazaniello-Chézol M, Bastien MF, Wathieu E, Bouchard R, Panaccio A, et
354 al. Stakeholders' role and actions in the return-to-work process of workers on sick-leave
355 due to common mental disorders: a scoping review. *J Occup Rehabil.* 2020;30:381–419.
356 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-019-09861-2>
- 357 5. Van Hees SG, Carlier BE, Vossen E, Blonk RW, Oomens S. Towards a better
358 understanding of work participation among employees with common mental health
359 problems: a systematic realist review. *Scand J Work Environ Health.* 2022;48:173–189.
360 <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.4005>
- 361 6. Johnston V, Way K, Long MH, Wyatt M, Gibson L, Shaw WS. Supervisor competencies
362 for supporting return to work: a mixed-methods study. *J Occup Rehabil.* 2015;25:3–17.
363 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-014-9511-z>
- 364 7. GBD 2019 Mental Disorders Collaborators. Global, regional, and national burden of 12
365 mental disorders in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for
366 the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet Psychiatry.* 2022;9:137–150.
367 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(21\)00395-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(21)00395-3)
- 368 8. World Health Organization/International Labor Organization. Joint Policy Brief: Mental
369 Health at Work. 2022. Available from:
370 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240057944>
- 371 9. Swedish Social Insurance Agency. [Psychiatric diagnoses.] Korta analyser 2017:1.
372 Swedish.
- 373 10. Swedish Social Insurance Agency. [Sick leave due to psychiatric diagnoses].
374 Socialförsäkringsrapport 2020:8. Swedish.

- 375 11. Swedish Social Insurance Agency. [Mental illness in today's working life.] Korta
376 analyser 2023:6. Swedish.
- 377 12. Lemieux P, Durand MJ, Hong QN. Supervisors' perception of the factors influencing the
378 return to work of workers with common mental disorders. *J Occup Rehabil.*
379 2011;21:293–303. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-011-9316-2>
- 380 13. Cadiz DM, Brady G, Rineer JR, Truxillo DM. A review and synthesis of the work ability
381 literature. *Work Aging Retire.* 2019;5:114–138. <https://doi.org/10.1093/workar/way010>
- 382 14. Lederer V, Loisel P, Rivard M, Champagne F. Exploring the diversity of
383 conceptualizations of work(dis)ability: a scoping review of published definitions. *J*
384 *Occup Rehabil.* 2014;24:242–267. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-013-9459-4>
- 385 15. Law M, Cooper B, Strong S, Stewart D, Rigby P, Letts L. The person-environment-
386 occupation model: A transactive approach to occupational performance. *Can J Occup*
387 *Ther.* 1996;63:9–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000841749606300103>
- 388 16. Bertilsson M, Petersson E-L, Östlund G, Waern M, Hensing G. Capacity to work while
389 depressed and anxious – a phenomenological study. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2013;35:1705–
390 1711. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09638288.2012.751135>
- 391 17. Danielsson L, Bertilsson M, Holmgren K, Hensing G. Working in dissonance:
392 experiences of work instability in workers with common mental disorders. *BMC Public*
393 *Health,* 2017;17(1):472. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4388-3>
- 394 18. Martinsson J, Andreasson M, Lindgren E. Technical Report Citizen Panel 26-2017.
395 Gothenburg: LORE. Available from: [Technical Report Citizen Panel 5 \(gu.se\)](https://www.gu.se/tekniska-rapporter/citizen-panel-26-2017)
- 396 19. Hensing G, van Diepen C, Boström M, Bertilsson, M. (2023). Validity of the capacity to
397 Work Index: development of an instrument to measure work capacity in relation to

- 398 depression and anxiety in the General Working Population. *J Occup Rehab.* 2023;1-12.
- 399 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-023-10150-2>
- 400 20. Statistics Sweden. Swedish Standard Industrial Classification (SNI). Available from:
- 401 [https://www.scb.se/en/documentation/classifications-and-standards/swedish-standard-](https://www.scb.se/en/documentation/classifications-and-standards/swedish-standard-industrial-classification-sni/)
- 402 [industrial-classification-sni/](https://www.scb.se/en/documentation/classifications-and-standards/swedish-standard-industrial-classification-sni/)
- 403 21. Fine S. A structure of workers functions. *Person Guide J.* 1955;34:66–73.
- 404 <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2164-4918.1955.tb01295.x>
- 405 22. Kohn ML, Schooler C. *Work and personality: an inquiry into the impact of social*
- 406 *stratification.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex; 1983.
- 407 23. Cerdas S, Härenstam A, Johansson G, Nyberg A. Development of job demands,
- 408 decision authority, and social support in industries with different gender composition –
- 409 Sweden, 1991–2013. *BMC Public Health.* 2019;19:758. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6917-8)
- 410 [019-6917-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6917-8)
- 411 24. Bertilsson M, Niederberger R, de Rijk A. Which managers make which work
- 412 accommodations for employees with common mental disorders? *Eur J Public Health.*
- 413 2021;31(Suppl 3):ckab165–317. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckab165.317>
- 414 25. European Commission, Directorate-General for Internal Market, Industry,
- 415 Entrepreneurship and SMEs. *User Guide to the SME Definition,* Publications Office,
- 416 2017. Available from: <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2873/620234>
- 417 26. Corin L, Babapour Chafi M. [The Significance of span of control. A knowledge
- 418 compilation]. Institutet för stressmedicin, Region Västra Götaland, Sweden; 2022.
- 419 Swedish.

- 420 27. Nordlöf H, Wijk K, Westergren KE. Perceptions of work environment priorities: are
421 there any differences by company size? An ecological study. *Work*. 2015;52:697–706.
422 <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-152123>
- 423 28. Swedish Social Insurance Agency. [Sick-leave, sector and firm size].
424 Socialförsäkringsrapport 2018:1. Swedish.
- 425 29. Björkenstam E, Helgesson M, Gustafsson K, Virtanen M, Hanson LL, Mittendorfer-Rutz
426 E. Occupational class and employment sector differences in common mental disorders: a
427 longitudinal Swedish cohort study. *Eur J Public Health*. 2021;31:809–815.
428 <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckab091>
- 429 30. Samuelsson A, Ropponen A, Alexanderson K, Svedberg P. Psychosocial working
430 conditions, occupational groups, and risk of disability pension due to mental diagnoses: a
431 cohort study of 43,000 Swedish twins. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2013;39:351–360.
432 <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.3338>
- 433 31. Theorell T, Hammarström A, Aronsson G, Träskman Bendz L, Grape T, Hogstedt C, et
434 al. A systematic review including meta-analysis of work environment and depressive
435 symptoms. *BMC Public Health*. 2015;15:738. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1954-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1954-4)
436 [4](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1954-4)
- 437 32. Aronsson G, Theorell T, Grape T, Hammarström A, Hogstedt C, Marteinsdottir I, et al.
438 A systematic review including meta-analysis of work environment and burnout
439 symptoms. *BMC Public Health*. 2017;17:264. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4153-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4153-7)
440 [7](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4153-7)
- 441 33. Hastuti R, Timming AR. An inter-disciplinary review of the literature on mental illness
442 disclosure in the workplace: implications for human resource management. *Int J Hum*
443 *Resour Manag*. 2021;32:3302–3338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1875494>

- 444 34. Brohan E, Henderson C, Wheat K, Malcolm E, Clement S, Barley EA, et al. Systematic
445 review of beliefs, behaviours and influencing factors associated with disclosure of a
446 mental health problem in the workplace. BMC Psychiatry. 2012;12:11.
447 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-12-11>
- 448 35. Brouwers E, Joosen M, Van Zelst C, Van Weeghel J. To disclose or not to disclose: a
449 multi-stakeholder focus group study on mental health issues in the work environment. J
450 Occup Rehabil. 2020;30:84–92. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-019-09848-z>
- 451 36. Mangerini I, Bertilsson M, de Rijk A, Hensing G. Gender differences in managers’
452 attitudes towards employees with depression: a cross-sectional study in Sweden. BMC
453 Public Health. 2020;19:1744. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09848-2>
- 454 37. Danielsson L, Elf M, Hensing G. Strategies to keep working among workers with
455 common mental disorders – a grounded theory study. Disabil Rehabil. 2019;41:786–795.
456 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2017.1408711>
- 457 38. Adler DA, McLaughlin TJ, Rogers WH, Chang H, Lapitsky L, Lerner D. Job
458 performance deficits due to depression. Am J Psychiatry. 2006;163:1569–1576.
459 <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.2006.163.9.1569>
- 460 39. Tengelin E, Hensing G, Holmgren K, Ståhl C, Bertilsson M. Swedish managers’
461 experience-based understanding of the capacity to work in employees with common
462 mental disorders: a focus group study. J Occup Rehabil. 2022;32:685–696.
463 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-022-10029-8>
- 464 40. Nordling P, Priebe G, Björkelund C, Hensing G. Assessing work capacity - reviewing
465 the what and how of physicians' clinical practice. BMC Fam Pract. 2020;21:72.
466 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-020-01134-9>

- 467 41. Bertilsson M, Maeland S, Löve J, Ahlborg Jr G, Werner E, Hensing G. The capacity to
468 work puzzle - a qualitative study of physicians' assessments in patients with common
469 mental disorders. BMC Fam Pract. 2018;19:133. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-018-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-018-0815-5)
470 [0815-5](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-018-0815-5)
- 471 42. Nordling P, Jakobsson A, Hensing G. The Capacity Note - a communication facilitator in
472 the sick leave process of patients with common mental disorders. A qualitative study of
473 user perceptions. BMJ Open. 2022;12(4):e054436. [https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-054436)
474 [2021-054436](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-054436)


475 Supporting information

476 **S1 Table. The results of the principal component factor analysis with the rotated**
477 **component matrix.**

Variable	Was the employee's work capacity affected regarding	Component	
		1	2
1	Getting started on work tasks	0.792	0.085
2	Being able to prioritize among work tasks	0.770	0.215
3	Interacting with other people	0.223	0.684
4	Being able to concentrate	0.701	0.361
5	Remembering	0.637	0.363
6	Maintaining the work pace	0.714	0.177
7	Participating in social work environments (such as coffee breaks)	0.106	0.768
8	Keeping calm and not be upset	0.184	0.679
9	Coping with external disturbances (such as nearby conversations)	0.323	0.640

478

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.06.24313226>; this version posted September 7, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).



Figure