

# Peers, Gender, and Long-Term Depression\*

Corrado Giulietti<sup>†</sup> Michael Vlassopoulos<sup>‡</sup> Yves Zenou<sup>§</sup>

February 9, 2022

Version Accepted at the European Economic Review  
on 08 February 2022

## Abstract

This study investigates whether exposure to peer depression in adolescence affects own depression in adulthood. We find a significant long-term depression peer effect for females but not for males in a sample of U.S. adolescents who are followed into adulthood. An increase of one standard deviation of the share of own-gender peers (schoolmates) who are depressed increases the probability of depression in adulthood by 2.6 percentage points for females (or 11.5% of mean depression). We also find that the peer effect is already present in the short term when girls are still in school and provide suggestive evidence for why it persists over time. In particular, we show that peer depression negatively affects the probability of college attendance and the likelihood of working, and leads to a reduction in income of adult females. Further analysis reveals that individuals from families with a lower socioeconomic background are more susceptible to peer influence, thereby suggesting that family can function as a buffer.

**JEL Codes:** I12, Z13.

**Keywords:** Peer effects, depression, contagion, gender, family background, adolescence, policy.

---

\*We thank the editor as well as two anonymous referees for helpful comments. This research uses data from Add Health, a program project directed by Kathleen Mullan Harris and designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and funded by grant P01-HD31921 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. Special acknowledgment is due to Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Information on how to obtain the Add Health data files is available on the Add Health website (<http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth>). No direct support was received from grant P01-HD31921 for this analysis.

<sup>†</sup>University of Southampton, UK, Centre for Population Change, and the Global Labor Organization; e-mail: [c.giulietti@soton.ac.uk](mailto:c.giulietti@soton.ac.uk).

<sup>‡</sup>University of Southampton, UK, and IZA; e-mail: [m.vlassopoulos@soton.ac.uk](mailto:m.vlassopoulos@soton.ac.uk).

<sup>§</sup>Monash University, Australia, IZA, and CEPR; email: [yves.zenou@monash.edu](mailto:yves.zenou@monash.edu).

# 1 Introduction

Depression is a common mental disorder leaving a large economic footprint: it is estimated to cost society \$210 billion per year in the United States (?). Adolescents are particularly vulnerable to depression. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), 10% to 20% of adolescents globally experience mental health conditions, with depression being a leading cause of illness and disability among this group.<sup>1</sup> In the United States, 13.3% of the population aged 12 to 17 years had at least one major depressive episode in 2017, with females being significantly more prone (20.0%) than males (6.8%).<sup>2</sup> Teenage depression in the United States is on the rise, having increased by approximately 50% in the period 2005-2017 (?).

The development of adolescent depression has been linked to genetic, biological, emotional, and other vulnerabilities (??). There is also ample evidence that depression has different effects on adolescent boys and girls (???). Indeed, girls begin to exhibit more internalized emotional problems—especially symptoms of depression—than boys starting in early adolescence and lasting throughout most of adulthood (?).<sup>3</sup> Further, adolescence is a period in which the influence of peers begins to have a more pronounced impact, as adolescents seek to gain social approval (?). Child psychologists have argued that apart from the positive effects of peer relationships in adolescence on emotional and behavioral development, peer networks can facilitate the transmission of depressive symptoms as well (?).

The aim of this paper is to investigate the long-term effect of having same-gender depressed peers in adolescence on own-depression in adulthood (14 years later) and to provide suggestive evidence about the mechanisms underlying this relationship. We use longitudinal data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), which enables us to investigate the impact of depression among adolescent peers when individuals are between 12 and 18 years of age (grades 7 through 12) on own-depression several years later (when they are between 24 and 32 years of age). Identifying peer effects poses some well-known empirical challenges (?)—the reflection problem, correlated effects, and the endogenous selection into groups. Testing for long-term peer effects using the longitudinal aspect of our data enables us to circumvent the reflection problem, which arises due to the simultaneity inherent in estimating *contemporaneous* peer effects. Further, we exploit the quasi-random variation in the proportion of depressed peers (schoolmates) within school and across cohorts, following an established approach developed to estimate gender and race peer

---

<sup>1</sup>See <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/adolescent-mental-health>, accessed on March 18, 2020.

<sup>2</sup>These statistics are based on data from the 2017 National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH), as reported by the National Institute of Mental Health (<https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/statistics/major-depression.shtml>), accessed on March 18, 2020.

<sup>3</sup>In our sample of 12,400 individuals, in adolescence, girls are more depressed than boys (24.8% versus 14.1%); in adulthood, women are more depressed than men (22.8% versus 16.5%).

effects on student achievement (?), thereby addressing the problem of endogenous selection of peer groups.<sup>4</sup> The key idea underlying the identification strategy exploits the fact that parents may be selecting a school by taking into account the average depression level of pupils in schools; however, the within-school sorting into grade is unlikely to be driven by parents' knowledge of across-cohort differences in the share of depressed schoolmates. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the latter is not correlated with any unobserved determinants of depression, once school fixed effects as well as cohort/grade fixed effects have been accounted for. We also include a school-specific linear time trend, which captures any remaining time-variant influences that are specific to the school. These fixed effects and the time trend also account for the correlated-effect issue because they wash out anything that is specific to the grade or school. In our analysis, we perform a series of balancing and placebo tests that provide support for the identification strategy.

We find evidence of significant long-term peer effects on depression for females but *not* for males. In particular, a one standard deviation increase in the share of female peers who are depressed in adolescence increases the probability of own-depression in adulthood by 2.6 percentage points for females (or 11.5% of mean depression). This effect is more pronounced for females with low-initial mental health status in adolescence and is stronger for individuals who were exposed to a high proportion of depressed peers. Our estimates suggest that a girl who has a large share of depressed peers in high school (top quartile) will have a probability of being depressed in adulthood that is eight percentage points higher than one whose peer group has a low share of depressed peers (bottom quartile). This differential effect corresponds to an increase of over one-third of the average likelihood of female depression.

We explore the possible mechanisms underlying our main result. First, we investigate whether peer depression has an impact in adolescence (short-term effect). This is what we would expect for females—given the presence of a long-term effect—while for males a short-term effect may or may not be present. We find that an increase of one standard deviation in female peer depression in Wave I (1994-1995) is associated with an increase of 2.9 percentage points in own-depression in Wave II (1996)—that is 11.8% of mean depression. There is no significant effect of peer depression on own-depression for males in adolescence. In other words, peer depression has a strong and immediate impact on own-depression only for females.

Second, considering that adolescents spend considerable amount of time with their peers, we investigate the role of gender differences in friendship and socialization as an explanation for the finding that peer depression influences only females. Child psychologists have argued that peer and friendship relationships differ substantially between genders (?), with females being more likely to share their negative feelings and stressful experiences. One channel

---

<sup>4</sup>Ever since, the approach has been applied extensively to study peer effects in educational and other outcomes (??????????).

through which this may occur is *co-rumination*, which refers to the tendency to extensively discuss and revisit problems without coming up with solutions, thereby leading to symptoms of anxiety and depression (??). We investigate this channel in our data by examining how females and males interact with same-gender peers. We find a marked gender difference in our two measures of co-rumination: girls report to have discussed a problem with 69% of their nominated female friends, while boys report discussing their problems with 39% of their nominated male friends. Girls also report to have talked on the phone with a larger proportion of their female friends than boys have with male friends (81% versus 69%).

We subsequently investigate possible channels underlying the long-term effects—that is, why peer depression in adolescence has still an impact when individuals are adults. We conjecture that peer depression in adolescence amplifies own-depression, affecting the likelihood of attending college, which is a decision made just after high school when peers have still an influence on own-depression. Reduced opportunities to accumulate human capital might imply, in turn, that girls who are exposed to depressed peers in adolescence have a lower likelihood of working and/or earning a high income. We provide suggestive evidence for this channel by examining the effect of peer depression in adolescence on college attendance, employment, and income. We find a significant and negative effect on all these outcomes only for women. In particular, an increase of one standard deviation in peer depression is associated with a lower probability of college attendance by 3.5 percentage points, a lower likelihood of working by 2.8 percentage points, and a reduction in income by \$1,870, which translates into a reduction in income by 6.22% at baseline. For males, there is no evidence of a long-term effect of peer depression on these outcomes.

Finally, in order to better understand the role of family, we study how family income and occupational status of the parents might mitigate the long-term impact of peer effects. We find that the lower the income of the family and the lower the occupational status of the mother, the more females are influenced by the depression of their peers in adolescence. This suggests that parental background could play an important role in absorbing the negative peer effect on mental health as females from families with a lower socioeconomic background are more susceptible to influence from peer depression.

Our paper is linked to several literature strands. First, our work relates to research on the determinants of mental health. Recent studies have indicated the importance of the quality of the neighborhood (?), the degree of religiosity (?), and early-life circumstances, malnutrition, and stress in utero (??) for mental health. There is also an important non-economic (mostly psychology and medical) literature stream (see e.g. ? or ?) that examines the influence of peers on mental health (such as depression, suicide, etc.) and reveals a positive correlation between the two; however, the question remains whether this relationship is causal. To the best of our knowledge, in economics, only two papers—? and ?— have examined the causal

effect of peers' mental health on own mental health by exploiting natural experiments of college roommate and classroom assignments. Both find no peer effects in mental health but they only examine short-run effects. Also, given the scarce evidence on the causal links between mental health and economic outcomes (?), our findings on the long-term impact of peer depression in adolescence on various socioeconomic outcomes in adulthood are interesting in their own right and constitute an additional contribution of the current study. Finally, two other recent studies investigate the impact of peers' characteristics in school on mental health: ? focus on the role of peers' gender finding that it affects the mental health of boys, and ? show that peers' ability has a persistent effect on mental health.

Our paper is also linked to the literature that examines the impact of depression on different outcomes. It has been shown that depression affects school attainment and other short-term outcomes and can also have long-term effects on various dimensions, such as, employment and earnings, educational attainment, and criminal activity (?????), thereby having important consequences for the quality of life of those who suffer from it and for their environment.

Finally, our study is related to the literature that examines the long-term effects of peers at school. Researchers have examined the effect of adolescent peers on post-secondary education, college major, and occupation choices (????), on after-school graduation outcomes—such as IQ scores, teenage childbearing, education, and labor market outcomes (????)—and on adult interracial relationships (?).

To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first to document a causal link between the depression of one's peers in adolescence and depression later in life. We also provide suggestive evidence of mechanisms that explain why peer depression has a short-term effect only for girls and why it persists over time. One implication of our findings is that changing from a peer group with high incidence of depression to one with a low incidence of depression would have a big impact on long-term depression and capacity to go to college and work among females. For example, this could be achieved through targeted mental health support and counseling services provided at the school level. We further discuss the policy implications of our findings in the last section.

## 2 Data

We use data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (AddHealth). AddHealth is a school-based, nationally representative survey of U.S. adolescents conducted over multiple waves, tracking respondents as they progressed in school and transitioned to adulthood. Wave I took place in the 1994-95 school year and involved an In-School survey administered to over 90,000 students in grades 7 to 12 and an In-Home follow-up that was

administered to a sample of 20,745 adolescents and also included an interview of a parent. Our paper is based on the In-Home follow-up survey, as it collected information on our main variable of interest—depression. The Wave I In-Home sample is the basis for four subsequent longitudinal follow-up interviews on the social, economic, psychological, and health circumstances of respondents. In particular, the AddHealth cohort was reinterviewed in 1996 (Wave II), 2001-02 (Wave III), and 2008-09 (Wave IV) when respondents had transitioned into young adulthood (ages 24 to 32). Thus, by linking data from the various AddHealth waves, one can construct a longitudinal sample that spans 14 years from adolescence into early adulthood. In our analysis, we combine data from Waves I and IV of the In-Home sample, thereby enabling us to link information on depression and family characteristics measured at the time when respondents were in school to depression measured at the time when respondents were young adults. We also use data from Wave II of the In-Home sample when we investigate short-term peer effects.

## 2.1 Sample selection

Our sample is constructed in several steps. The Wave I In-Home sample is our starting point, from which we derive the measures of individual and peer depression (explained in the next subsection) as well as all the pre-determined individual and family characteristics that we use as covariates in our regression analysis. The initial sample of the Wave I In-Home survey is 20,745. From this, we first exclude observations for which the anonymous school/student identifiers are missing, the few students who are in grade 6, and those with missing information on grade or depression, leaving us with 19,865 observations. We then also exclude observations where the peer group is too small to permit meaningful analysis, that is, grades for which there are less than 10 students. We use the remaining sample of 18,970 to construct the key explanatory variable of our analysis—that is, the within-gender share of depressed peers in a given school/grade, among the students that we observe in this subsample. The resulting average number of own-gender students in one’s peer group is 15.8 for females and 13.7 for males. We also extract additional information regarding the students (e.g., self-reported depression, race, number of siblings, and average picture vocabulary score), their parents, and the household (presence of father in the household, mother’s education and occupation, and household income).<sup>5</sup> Thereafter, we match data between Waves I and IV, when it is possible.<sup>6</sup> The final sample used in our core analysis comprises 12,400 individuals

---

<sup>5</sup>A number of observations are missing information on household income and mother’s education. Thus, in order not to exclude these observations from our sample, we opted to impute household income (also adding an indicator variable to account for the imputation) and introduce a separate category for cases where mother’s education is missing.

<sup>6</sup>Note that in Wave IV, 15,701 out of the 20,745 original Wave I respondents were reinterviewed. However, according to ?, “Wave IV non-response bias is negligible and the Wave IV sample adequately represents the

(6,663 females and 5,737 males) drawn from 128 schools.

In Table A1 in the Online Appendix, we assess whether attrition from Wave I to Wave IV biases our analysis. This could be an issue if, for example, individuals who are more likely to be depressed or have a larger proportion of depressed peers drop out of the sample. We regress an indicator variable on whether an observation attrites from Wave I to Wave IV using the full set of covariates that we include in our baseline regression. The results indicate that own-depression and peer depression are not significant predictors of attrition, thereby allaying concerns regarding attrition bias.<sup>7</sup>

## 2.2 Construction of main variables

We obtain our outcome variable, self-reported depression, from Waves I and IV. The depression variable is constructed using the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D), which is a brief, self-reported scale designed to assess the presence of depressive symptoms. It has been used extensively in research settings, but is also used by clinicians as first-stage screening instrument of patients in primary care. Studies have validated the scale as a screener for clinical depression (???), and have found it appropriate to use in samples of adolescents and young adults (??). Thus, the CES-D scale is a well-established and reliable measure of severity of depressive symptoms, albeit it does not constitute a clinical diagnosis of depression.

In Wave I, students completed the 20-questions version of the questionnaire (CES-D-20), while in Wave IV, students completed the 10-item version (CES-D-10). For constructing our variable of depression, we use the CES-D-10 both for Waves I and IV. This enables us to obtain a measure of depression that is based on identical questions over time. The CES-D includes questions regarding whether students feel depressed, blue, happy, etc. As a first step, we constructed a score by adding up the answers to the 10 items. All answers vary from 0 (never or rarely) to 3 (most of the time or all of the time). Questions that have a positive affect (e.g. happiness) are reverse coded (i.e., a 3 would indicate a low level of depression). After adding up all 10 items, the score of CES-D-10 ranges from 0 to 30. Table A2 in the Online Appendix reports the questions of the CES-D-10 questionnaire.<sup>8</sup> As a second step and following the literature (see e.g. ?), we define a person as depressed when the CES-

---

same population surveyed at Wave I' (p. 7).

<sup>7</sup>In the same table, we also analyse another type of attrition, namely whether depressed students are more likely to drop-out from the peer group. We do so by checking whether the depression status reported in Wave I is associated with the probability of repeating the grade in Wave II. We estimate a regression model where the outcome variable is an indicator variable for whether the student is repeating the grade. The explanatory variables are the same as in our baseline specification, including own depression in Wave I. We find that being depressed in Wave I is uncorrelated with the probability of repeating the grade.

<sup>8</sup>Note that the CES-D-10 and CES-D-20 scores are highly correlated. Indeed, using our sample in Wave I, we observe that the correlation of the two scores is above 0.9.

D-10 score is 11 or higher and 0 otherwise. We construct our main independent variable of interest, the within-gender and grade share of depressed peers (excluding oneself), using the above definition of depression. Further, Figure A1 in the Online Appendix displays the distribution of the percentage of depressed peers for males (dashed curve) and females (solid curve). The figure reveals that peer depression is more spread out for females, while for males the distribution is slightly skewed to the right.

### 2.3 Summary statistics

Table 1 presents the summary statistics for the variables that we use in the analysis. On average, individuals are 15 years old in Wave I and 28 years old in Wave IV. Approximately 60% of the sample is White, 23% Black and 16% are of Hispanic ethnicity. In terms of family characteristics, approximately 27% of the sample’s mothers have college education and approximately 26% are professionals, while approximately 30% are single-parent families (father is absent) and average household income is above \$46,000.

The prevalence of depression in Wave IV (main outcome) is 22.8% for females and 16.5% for males, that is, depression is more prevalent among females than males in the sample, which is consistent with the broad evidence. The gender difference in depression is also reflected by the main explanatory variable of interest, the share of own-gender peers who are depressed in Wave I. For females, this share is 25.6%, while for males it is 15%. Table A3 in the Online Appendix presents the depression transition matrix across the two waves. It is noteworthy that approximately 41% of the females who are depressed in Wave IV were also depressed in Wave I. For males, the corresponding figure is only 27%.

## 3 Empirical Framework

### 3.1 Empirical strategy

We are interested in estimating whether peer depression in adolescence has an effect on own-depression in adulthood. We formulate the baseline regression specification in the following manner:

$$y_{isgt+1} = \alpha_s + \theta_g + \beta \bar{y}_{-isgt} + \gamma y_{isgt} + \delta X_{isgt} + \rho_s g + \epsilon_{isgt+1}, \quad (1)$$

where  $y_{isgt+1}$  is an indicator variable for whether individual  $i$  who was in school  $s$  and grade/cohort  $g$  at time  $t$  (Wave I) is depressed as an adult at time  $t + 1$  (Wave IV),  $\bar{y}_{-isgt}$  is the within In-Home survey sample share of own-gender students (excluding individual  $i$ ) in individual  $i$ ’s school and grade who were depressed in adolescence at time  $t$ .  $\beta$  is our main parameter of interest. We control for whether an individual was depressed at time  $t$  to proxy

Table 1: Summary statistics

	Females		Males	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Depressed in Wave IV	0.228	0.419	0.165	0.372
Depressed in Wave I	0.248	0.432	0.141	0.348
% own-gender peers depressed	0.256	0.117	0.150	0.088
% other gender peers depressed	0.152	0.088	0.259	0.114
Age in Wave I	15.519	1.692	15.680	1.687
Age in Wave IV	28.39	1.73	28.60	1.73
Race: White	0.59	0.49	0.60	0.49
Race: African American	0.234	0.423	0.200	0.400
Race: Asian	0.062	0.241	0.073	0.261
Ethnicity: Hispanic	0.160	0.366	0.165	0.371
Number of siblings	2.576	1.413	2.621	1.420
Picture Vocabulary Test score	100.262	14.362	101.809	14.289
Mother’s educ: Missing	0.04	0.20	0.05	0.22
Mother’s educ: High school / some college	0.526	0.499	0.519	0.500
Mother’s educ: College degree or above	0.261	0.439	0.285	0.452
Mother’s occup: Managerial / professional	0.250	0.433	0.269	0.443
Mother’s occup: Technical / office / sales	0.256	0.437	0.259	0.438
Mother’s occup: Blue collar	0.342	0.474	0.326	0.469
Father not present	0.306	0.461	0.261	0.439
Household income (thousand dollars)	46.888	51.472	46.958	45.002
Observations	6663		5737	

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV.

Depressed in Wave I and Depressed in Wave IV are defined as a dummy variable for whether the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 11.

% own-gender peers depressed is the proportion of students who are depressed among all students of the same gender and in the same school and grade of the respondent. The respondent is excluded from the calculations of the % own gender peers depressed.

Excluded category for race is: Other races (American Indian and Other Race).

Excluded category for mother’s education is: Less than high school. Excluded category for mother’s occupation is: Homemaker. Occupation categories are defined as follows: Homemaker identifies individuals working at home. Managerial / professional includes professions such as doctor, lawyer, scientist, teacher, librarian, nurse; and managerial includes positions such as executive, director. Technical / office / sales includes technical, such as computer specialist, radiologist; office worker, such as bookkeeper, office clerk, secretary; sales worker, such as insurance agent, store clerk. Blue collar includes: craftsperson, such as toolmaker, woodworker; construction worker, such as carpenter, crane operator; mechanic, such as electrician, plumber, machinist; factory worker or laborer, such as assembler, janitor; transportation, such as bus driver, taxi driver; military or security, such as police officer, soldier, fire fighter; farm or fishery worker; other.

for genetic or environmental time-invariant determinants of depression at the individual level. We also use a set of covariates  $X_{isgt}$  measured at time  $t$  to capture observable individual and family pre-determined characteristics. These include race, number of siblings, the Picture Vocabulary Test (PVT) score that measures basic cognitive skills, whether the father was present, mother’s education, and household income. In a robustness analysis, we also control for additional peer characteristics—drawing from the full set of individual, parental and household characteristics.  $\alpha_s$  and  $\theta_g$  are school and grade fixed effects, while  $\rho_{sg}$  is a school-specific linear time trend. School fixed effects absorb the influence of any factors that

are common to all students within the same school, including the effect of the school itself. Grade fixed effects absorb any influences that are specific to the cohort that are common across all students in the sample. Note that our sample spans 128 schools and 6 grades. The school-specific linear time trend captures any remaining time-variant influences that relate to the school. Finally,  $\epsilon_{isgt+1}$  is the error term. We cluster standard errors at the school level and apply survey weights throughout the regression analysis.

In our specification, identification of the main parameter of interest,  $\beta$ , relies on comparing individuals within the same school, with the same own and family characteristics who are exposed to a different proportion of own-gendered depressed peers on account of being in a different grade in school. Formally, our identification relies on assuming strict exogeneity conditioning on school fixed effects, cohort fixed effects, and school-specific time trends—that is,  $E(\epsilon_{isgt+1}|X_{isgt}, \alpha_s, \theta_g, \rho_s g) = 0$ . Put simply, our identifying assumption is that while parents may be choosing school for their children on the basis of the mental health and other characteristics of the student body, they are unlikely to be aware of and to act upon year-by-year differences in the share of pupils of each gender who are depressed. One limitation of our identification strategy is that we cannot directly account for unobservable environmental factors at the peer-group level (grade within a certain school), such as teacher characteristics and classroom environment, as information about such characteristics is not available in the data. However, in one of our robustness checks, we include depression of other-gender peers in one’s grade and school, which should at least partially capture any omitted peer-group level shocks to mental health.

### 3.2 Evidence of the validity of the identification strategy

We follow the previous literature that has utilized this identification strategy and provide evidence for its validity (??). We perform several checks.

First, we corroborate that there is sufficient variation in the main variable (peer depression) after controlling for grade/school fixed effects and school-specific trends. Table A4 in the Online Appendix indicates that the standard deviation of the residual peer depression for females, after eliminating grade/school fixed effects and school trends, is more than half of the raw standard deviation. For males, the residual standard deviation is approximately 60% of the raw standard deviation, thereby indicating that, for both genders, the fixed effects do not absorb all the variation in the main explanatory variable of interest.

Second, we perform balancing tests that provide evidence for the identifying assumption that peer depression is quasi-randomly assigned conditioning on school fixed effects. These tests amount to estimating a series of regressions in which we regress the main variable of interest—share of depressed peers—on the various student and family characteristics. In prac-

tice, we estimate one regression model for each characteristic, controlling for own-depression and the usual grade and school fixed effects and school-specific time trends. These results are presented in Table 2, where each row reports the estimated coefficient on the characteristic indicated on the left column. As is evident, only one characteristic is statistically significant at 5% in the female sample and none in the male sample, which provides support for our identifying assumption.

Table 2: Balancing tests

	Females	Males
Race: White	.003 (.002)	.001 (.003)
Race: African American	-.001 (.003)	-.000 (.004)
Race: Asian	-.005 (.006)	-.008 (.006)
Ethnicity: Hispanic	-.002 (.003)	-.001 (.003)
Number of siblings	.001 (.001)	-.000 (.001)
Picture Vocabulary Test score	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)
Mother's educ: Missing	.003 (.004)	.005 (.006)
Mother's educ: High school / some college	.004** (.002)	.002 (.002)
Mother's educ: College degree or above	-.003 (.002)	-.002 (.002)
Mother's occup: Managerial / professional	.000 (.002)	-.001 (.002)
Mother's occup: Technical / office / sales	-.001 (.002)	-.000 (.002)
Mother's occup: Blue collar	.001 (.002)	-.001 (.001)
Father not present	-.003 (.002)	.001 (.002)
Household income (thousand dollars)	.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)
Grade fixed effects	Yes	Yes
School fixed effects	Yes	Yes
School time trends	Yes	Yes

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV.

Each coefficient corresponds to a regression of own-gender peer depression on the indicated variable controlling for own depression.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*\*  $p < 0.05$ .

As a further check, we visually inspect whether the variation in the share of depressed peers that we leverage for identification is random. This is illustrated in Figure A2 in the Online Appendix, which indicates that the residual distribution of peer depression, after accounting for fixed effects and school trends, is indeed symmetric and centered around zero.

In addition to these identification checks, we perform placebo tests in which we estimate versions of equation (1) replacing actual peer groups with placebo peer groups randomly selected within the same school, which we discuss further on in Section 4.2 after presenting the baseline results.

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Baseline findings

Table 3 presents the regression results of the baseline specification (1) by gender—columns 1-3 for females and columns 4-6 for males.<sup>9</sup> Columns 1 and 4 include the main explanatory variables, own and peer depression in adolescence, as well as school and grade fixed effects and a school trend. Columns 2 and 5 further include student controls (race, ethnicity, number of siblings and PVT test score), while columns 3 and 6 also include parental and household characteristics (i.e., mother’s education and occupation, presence of father, and household income).

Beginning with the results in columns 1 and 4, we find that, consistent with previous evidence, *own-depression* in adolescence is a strong and statistically significant predictor of the risk of depression in adulthood, for both females and males. More importantly, we find that *own-gender peer depression* in adolescence positively affects the incidence of depression in adulthood, for both females and males. However, the coefficient is larger and statistically significant *only* for females. Addition of individual and family characteristics in the remaining columns does not substantially change the picture. Taking the estimates in our preferred specification (column 3 for females and 6 for males), the size of the effect indicates that an increase by one standard deviation in the proportion of depressed female peers (11.7 percentage points) increases the incidence of depression in adulthood by 2.6 percentage points for females (or 11.5% of baseline depression incidence) and does not have a significant effect for males. A test of equality of the coefficient on peer depression across the female and male samples indicates that they are not statistically distinguishable.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Throughout the paper, we present separate analysis by gender. This choice is motivated by the evidence cited in the introduction of gender differences in depression and is also supported by a Chow-test performed in a specification that uses all controls and fixed effects included in our baseline specification.

<sup>10</sup>If we pool the data across genders and estimate a regression that includes all controls used above, the coefficient on “own-gender depression” is 0.137 with standard error 0.058 and a p-value of 0.020.

Table 3: Effect of peers' depression on depression in adulthood

	Females			Males		
% own-gender peers depressed	.211** (.099)	.215** (.100)	.224** (.101)	.111 (.133)	.111 (.132)	.098 (.131)
Depressed in Wave I	.222*** (.019)	.209*** (.020)	.203*** (.019)	.207*** (.025)	.193*** (.025)	.191*** (.025)
Race: White		-.045 (.036)	-.041 (.036)		-.056** (.028)	-.057** (.028)
Race: African American		-.019 (.039)	-.027 (.039)		-.011 (.035)	-.021 (.035)
Race: Asian		-.014 (.053)	-.018 (.052)		-.029 (.050)	-.028 (.050)
Ethnicity: Hispanic		.003 (.036)	-.008 (.037)		-.058* (.030)	-.065** (.031)
Number of siblings		.006 (.005)	.006 (.005)		-.005 (.006)	-.005 (.006)
Picture Vocabulary Test score		-.003*** (.001)	-.002*** (.001)		-.002*** (.001)	-.002*** (.001)
Mother's educ: Missing			.007 (.048)			.042 (.047)
Mother's educ: High school / some college			-.039* (.021)			-.005 (.024)
Mother's educ: College degree or above			-.055** (.026)			-.018 (.025)
Mother's occup: Managerial / professional			-.012 (.025)			-.029 (.023)
Mother's occup: Technical / office / sales			-.010 (.024)			-.025 (.021)
Mother's occup: Blue collar			.004 (.019)			-.032 (.020)
Father not present			.036** (.017)			.026 (.018)
Household income (thousand dollars)			-.000 (.000)			-.000 (.000)
Grade fixed effects	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
School fixed effects	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
School time trends	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
N	6663	6663	6663	5737	5737	5737
R <sup>2</sup>	.12	.13	.13	.13	.14	.14

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV.

The dependent variable is depression, defined as a dummy variable for whether the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 11.

% own-gender peers depressed is the share of students who are depressed among all students of the same gender and in the same school and grade as that of the respondent. The respondent is excluded from the calculations of the % own-gender peers depressed.

The dependent variable is measured at the time of Wave IV; all control variables are measured at the time of Wave I. The excluded category for race is: Other races (American Indian and Other Race). The excluded category for mother's education is: Less than high school. Excluded category for mother's occupation is: Homemaker.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

In Table A5 in the Online Appendix, we investigate the robustness of our findings to the inclusion of additional peer contextual effects by including a full set of individual, parental and household characteristics across peers. As can be gleaned from this table, inclusion of these peer controls does not affect the estimate of our main coefficient of interest, for both genders.

We believe that the size of the peer effect we find is sizeable and plausible. In order to promptly gauge the magnitude of the estimates, it is instructive to compare the peer effect to the estimated impact that other covariates have on adult depression. Our results indicate that the peer effect has quantitatively a similar effect to that of the PVT score: an increase of one standard deviation in the PVT score is associated with a reduction of 3.3 percentage points in the likelihood of depression for females, or the effect of growing up in a family with a missing father, which is associated with an increase of 3.6 percentage points in the likelihood of being depressed for females.

In Table 4, we explore several possible sources of heterogeneity in the peer-depression effect. In panel I, we estimate two specifications that enable us to examine whether the impact of peer depression varies with the intensity of exposure. In the first specification, we include an indicator variable for whether an individual is exposed to an above median share of peers who are depressed. In the second specification, we include three indicator variables for the three top quartiles of the share of depressed peers distribution. All the regressions in the table contain the same control variables as in our preferred specification in Table 3 (Columns 3 and 6), including grade fixed effects, school fixed effects, and school time trends. The results suggest that, for females, having an above-the-median share of peers who are depressed is associated with a significant increase (5.9 percentage points) in the likelihood of being depressed in adulthood relative to having below-the-median share of peers who are depressed. For males, the effect is positive but smaller and statistically insignificant. With regard to the results of the specification involving quartile dummies, we again find a marked gender difference. For females, all coefficients are positive and increasing along the quartiles, with the third and fourth quartiles being statistically distinguishable from the first.<sup>11</sup> Having a proportion of peers who are depressed and in the fourth (third) quartile is associated with an increase of 8.3 (5.2) percentage points in the likelihood of being depressed in adulthood for females, relative to being in the first quartile. This implies that moving a girl from a school peer group in which 40% of peers are depressed (average share in 4th quartile) to one in which 11% of peers are depressed (average share in 1st quartile) will reduce the likelihood of the girl being depressed in adulthood by more than one-third of the average likelihood of depression of females.

---

<sup>11</sup>We fail to reject equality of coefficients of contiguous quartiles for both genders, with the exception of comparing second to third quartiles of females (p-value = 0.07).

Table 4: Effect of peers' depression on depression in adulthood: Heterogeneity

	Females		Males	
	Panel I: non-linear peer-effects			
Above median	.059***		.023	
	(.019)		(.022)	
2nd quartile		.006		.001
		(.029)		(.026)
3rd quartile		.052*		.027
		(.029)		(.030)
4th quartile		.083**		.019
		(.033)		(.038)
N	6663	6663	5737	5737
R <sup>2</sup>	.13	.13	.14	.14
	Panel II: CES-D-10 score Wave I			
	Low	High	Low	High
% own-gender peers depressed	.085	.326**	.084	.158
	(.141)	(.154)	(.170)	(.173)
N	2830	3833	2365	3372
R <sup>2</sup>	.17	.18	.22	.20

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV.

The dependent variable is depression, defined as a dummy variable for whether the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 11.

Panel I: The key independent variable in Columns 1 and 3 is an indicator that is equal to 1 if the % own-gender peers depressed is above median and 0 otherwise; the key independent variables in Columns 2 and 4 are dummy variables representing the quartiles of the % own-gender peers depressed (first quartile is the reference group).

Panel II: The CES-D-10 score Wave I is the score obtained using answers from the CES-D-10 questionnaire. See Table A2 for details.

All regressions contain the same control variables as Table 3, Columns 3 and 6, including grade fixed effects, school fixed effects, and school time trends.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

In panel II of Table 4, we investigate whether exposure to peer depression has a different impact on individuals depending on their own mental health status. Indeed, the effect may depend on one's own mental health. People with poor mental health may be more susceptible to being affected by peer depression because they may have less ability to cope with the stress of being around someone else with poor mental health. In order to test this cross effect of own and peer depression, we divide our sample into a low/high mental health group on the basis of their CES-D-10 score in Wave I (above/below the median). The results indicate that,

indeed, individuals who had worse mental health are more susceptible to the depression of their peers. For females, the estimated coefficient of the peer effect for the high-score group is large and statistically significant at 5%, whereas for the low-score group this coefficient is smaller in size and statistically insignificant. For males, the estimated effect is also larger for the high-score group than the low-score group, but none of the coefficients are statistically significant.

In summary, our results indicate a positive effect of peer depression for females. The effect is more pronounced for females who have low mental health status and who are located in schools with a comparatively large share of depressed classmates.

## 4.2 Robustness checks and placebo tests

Table 5 presents robustness checks on our baseline findings, focusing on alternative methods of measuring depression and alternative definitions of the peer reference group.

We first explore whether there is an across-gender peer effect by including the share of other-gender peers who are depressed in the baseline specification. The results in column 1 for females indicate that the other gender’s effect is small and statistically insignificant, while the own-gender effect remains positive and statistically significant, albeit at 10%. For males (column 6), both peer effects are not statistically significant. These results indicate that when the peer effect does matter—for females—it operates through own-gendered peers.

We also estimate our baseline specification relying on a different measure of depression in Wave I that uses the 20-item Center of Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (which is not available in Wave IV). The results presented in columns 2 and 7 are consistent with the baseline results in Table 3—that is, for females, the effect is positive and statistically significant at 10%, while for males the effect is very small and statistically insignificant. A further robustness check that we perform is to check whether our results are sensitive to the choice of the CES-D-10 score cutoff, above which we designate an individual as being depressed. In columns 3-5 for females and 8-10 for males, we present results where we use higher cutoffs than those in the baseline—that is, designating depression as a rarer condition. For females, what is evident across the columns is that the peer effect is robustly positive and statistically significant, while for males, the effect is never statistically significant.<sup>12</sup> We have also estimated the baseline specification using the continuous CES-D-10 score, which we report in Table A8. As can be seen, the linear specification reported in columns 3 and 7 using the continuous scale shows the effect of peers’ depression to be negative but not statistically

---

<sup>12</sup>In our analysis, we have excluded students in grades in which there are less than 10 students. We perform a sensitivity analysis to assess whether our estimates of peer depression are sensitive to excluding small peer groups. Table A9 reports this analysis and shows that our results are robust to peer groups that are defined to be  $\geq 3$ ,  $\geq 5$ , and  $\geq 10$ .

significant for both genders. However, when we estimate a quadratic specification in columns 4 and 8, we find for females the peer effect to be negative and concave.

A further concern that we address is the possible measurement error in peer depression due to the fact that this is based on the in-home sample. Following the logic in ? and ?, we estimate a specification in which we “weight” peer depression by the share of peers observed in the in-home survey relative to those observed in the in-school survey.<sup>13</sup> This is reported in Table A8, columns 2 and 6, and indicates that the estimate of peer depression for females is robust.<sup>14 15</sup>

Table 5: Effect of peers’ depression on depression in adulthood: Robustness

	Females					Males				
	Both genders	CES-D-19	CES-D-10 threshold:			Both genders	CES-D-19	CES-D-10 threshold:		
			≥ 12	≥ 13	≥ 14			≥ 12	≥ 13	≥ 14
% own-gender peers depressed	.193*	.163*	.201***	.160*	.204**	.136	.022	.030	.102	.109
	(.108)	(.091)	(.074)	(.085)	(.085)	(.119)	(.122)	(.099)	(.118)	(.129)
% other gender peers depressed	-.018					.023				
	(.121)					(.121)				
N	6462	6661	6663	6663	6663	5566	5735	5737	5737	5737
R <sup>2</sup>	.13	.14	.11	.10	.10	.15	.15	.13	.12	.13

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009)

The dependent variable is depression, defined as a dummy variable for whether the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 11.

Both genders: both the % peers depressed for males and females are included in the regression.

CES-D-19: The dependent variable is depression, defined as a dummy variable for whether the 19-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 16. The % own-gender peers depressed is calculated using the same definition of depression.

CES-D-10 threshold: Depression is defined using alternative thresholds of the CES-D-10 score in Wave I. See Table A2 for details.

All regressions contain the same control variables as Table 3, Columns 3 and 6, including grade fixed effects, school fixed effects, and school time trends.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ .; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ .; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

We also perform placebo regressions in which we attach to each student a placebo peer depression by reassigning them to a randomly selected grade within the same school. These

<sup>13</sup>The average ratio of peers observed in the in-home survey relative to the school survey is 0.36 for females and 0.38 for males.

<sup>14</sup>We have also investigated whether peer effects vary across different sizes of the peer group and do not find such heterogeneity (see Table A8, columns 1 and 5).

<sup>15</sup>In further analysis reported in Appendix C, we explore the use of the in-school data for our research question. One of the advantages of the in-school data is that they provide a larger sample and peer groups can be constructed using the universe of students. A major drawback, though, is that depression is poorly measured in the in-school data, since the questionnaire does not include a full CES-D score, but only a self-reported measure of depression drawing from the question “In the last month, how often did you feel depressed or blue?”. Table A12, shows that when we use this measure and the in-school data we find that own-gender peer depression has a small, negative, and statistically insignificant effect on long-term depression for both males and females. In Appendix C, we provide suggestive evidence that this result is likely driven by the use of a different measure of depression rather than by whether peer depression is measured in the in-school or the in-home sample.

results are presented in Table A6 in the Online Appendix, which reports specifications similar to the ones in the baseline results in Table 3. Reassuringly, the coefficient on the placebo peer depression is not statistically significant in any of these specifications. This provides further support for the validity of our identification strategy.

Finally, following Cohen-Cole and Fletcher (2008), we also examine if, using our identification approach, we can detect peer effects in height, a health outcome that is unlikely to be transmitted through a social network. If we find such implausible peer effects then we would be circumspect about whether the peer effects on depression are genuine. Reassuringly, results reported in Table A7 show no statistically significant effect of peer height in any of the specifications, for both genders.

## 5 Mechanisms

We have established that females’ peer depression in adolescence has an enduring effect on own-depression in adulthood. In order to understand the mechanisms underlying this result, we will first investigate whether, as we would expect, peer depression in adolescence already has an impact on other adolescents’ depression in the short-term—that is, while in high school. Second, we will seek to understand the roots of the gender difference in the impact of peer depression that we find. Third, we will explore why this short-term effect lasts and continues to impact individual depression into adulthood (long-term effects).

### 5.1 The short-term effect of peer depression

We first examine whether adolescent peer depression has a short-term effect on depression when (the majority of) individuals are still in school. This would provide direct evidence that depression of peers is, indeed, contagious and confirm, in a causal manner, the psychology studies cited above and add to the evidence provided in ? and ?. Using the same empirical strategy adopted in our baseline model, we estimate equation (1), but now  $y_{isgt+1}$  is measured in Wave II and not in Wave IV—that is,  $t = \text{Wave I}$  and  $t + 1 = \text{Wave II}$ .<sup>16</sup> Recall that Wave II was conducted one year after Wave I.

The results, presented in Table 6 in columns 1 and 4, indicate that for adolescent females, there is a positive and significant short-term effect of peer depression, while for males the coefficient is smaller and statistically insignificant.<sup>17</sup> Quantitatively, the coefficient in column 1 of Table 6 suggests that a one standard deviation increase in female peer depression in Wave

---

<sup>16</sup>Observe that we do not regress peer depression (i.e.,  $\bar{y}_{-isgt}$ ) in Wave I on own-depression  $y_{isgt+1}$  in Wave I—that is,  $t = t + 1 = \text{Wave I}$ —because of the occurrence of the reflection problem.

<sup>17</sup>A test of equality of the coefficient on peer depression across the female and male samples indicates that they are not statistically distinguishable ( $p=0.296$ ).

I is associated with an increase in own-depression by 2.9 percentage points in Wave II (11.8% of baseline). This result indicates that peer depression has a strong and immediate causal impact on own-depression for females only.<sup>18</sup>

Table 6: Effect of peers' depression on depression in adolescence: Short run

	Females			Males		
% own-gender peers depressed	.251**		.325**	.124		.198*
	(.098)		(.126)	(.096)		(.118)
Bond with mother above median (BMA)		-.027*	.005		-.017	.007
		(.014)	(.029)		(.013)	(.019)
% own-gender peers depressed × BMA			-.125			-.172
			(.116)			(.118)
N	5948	5948	5948	5541	5541	5541
R <sup>2</sup>	.23	.23	.23	.21	.21	.21

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and II. The dependent variable is depression, defined as a dummy variable for whether the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 11, measured in Wave II.

The dependent variable is measured at the time of Wave II; all control variables are measured at the time of Wave I.

All regressions contain the same control variables as Table 3, Columns 3 and 6, including grade fixed effects, school fixed effects, and school time trends.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ .; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ .; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Adolescence is a special phase in which young people spend more time with their peers than with their families (?). Consequently, we now investigate the interplay between peers' and parents' influence in the development of depression in the short-term. That is, we aim to understand whether the strength of the connection that an adolescent has with his/her parents could act as a buffer for the negative peer influence on mental health in the short run. To do so, we construct an index of the strength of the mother/child relationship by taking the average across eight items contained in the Wave I questionnaire, in which respondents are asked to report on their connections with each parent during the past month through communication (i.e., whether parent and youth had discussed a personal problem, a romantic partner, or school work) and activities that facilitate connection (whether parent and youth worked on a project, played a sport, or went to a religious service, recreational/cultural event, or shopping together). We focus on the adolescent/mother relationship because information for fathers is missing for a large part of the sample (approximately 30%).

In order to measure the direct effect of the bond between the adolescent and his/her

<sup>18</sup>In Table 6, we consider students who are in both Waves I and II but the sample in Wave II may be different to the one in Wave IV that we used in Table 3. As a robustness check, in Table A10 in the Online Appendix, we use the same sample as in Table 3 but for Waves I and II. We see that the effects are similar, particularly for the short-run effect of peer depression on own-depression.

mother on own-depression, we estimate a version of the regression presented in Table 6 in columns 2 and 5, replacing peer depression with the strength of the child’s bond with their mother (indicator for the index being above the median). The results in columns 2 and 5 indicate that, indeed, having a strong connection to own mother is associated with a lower probability of being depressed for girls, while for boys the effect is not statistically significant. We then estimate a model that includes both peer depression and the quality of bond with the mother and their interaction. The results are displayed in columns 3 and 6 in Table 6. We find that the interaction term, while being negative (which indicates that a strong connection can attenuate the negative effect of peers on mental health), is not statistically significant. The lack of a significant interaction effect could be attributed to the fact that, in adolescence, children become increasingly more independent from their parents, whereas relationships with friends become more significant, as reported by the psychology literature cited above.

## 5.2 Gender differences in adolescent friendship socialization

It is well-documented that, during adolescence, which is a developmental period, peer relationships are of central importance in psychosocial development, and difficulties in this domain can be detrimental to mental health (?). Indeed, as adolescence involves unique upheaval, young people spend more time with their peers than with their families (?) and exert a great deal of energy forming peer networks (?).

It is also well-documented that adolescent girls have tighter and closer contacts with their female peers than boys have with their male peers, and these gender differences in socialization could play a role in depression. Indeed, adolescent girls’ relationships and friendships are characterized by greater levels of intimacy, emotional support, and self-disclosure (??), whereas such relationships among boys tend to be grounded in companionship and shared activities (?). For girls compared with boys, close interpersonal relationships are more important for self-definition and identity (?) and are considered more as a source of emotional support (?). Such gender differences in the form and function of interpersonal relationships are amplified as youth progress through adolescence, and the importance of the peer group grows in significance for youths’ social and emotional experiences (??).

Therefore, the manner in which girls interact with their female peers is very different from the manner in which boys interact with their male peers. In particular, during adolescence, girls appear to be more likely than boys to respond to stress and distress with *ruminatio*n, focusing inward on feelings of distress and personal concerns rather than taking action to relieve their distress. Indeed, it has been hypothesized that a leading mechanism through which peer influence could operate is *co-ruminatio*n, which refers to the tendency particularly observed among adolescent girls to extensively discuss and revisit problems without coming

up with solutions, thereby leading to symptoms of anxiety and depression (???).

In order to investigate this, in the Add Health data, we examine the peer-nomination questionnaire in Wave I, in which participants were asked to nominate up to five female friends and five male friends. They were also asked to report whether they had engaged in a number of activities with each friend during the past week. These activities include interactions with the friend (visiting their house, hanging out, or spending time on the weekend) and time spent talking with their nominated friends regarding a problem or talking on the phone, in the last seven days. Answers to these last two questions could be perceived as measures of whether respondents engage in behavior that would be considered as suggestive of co-rumination.

We present the summary statistics for these questions in Table 7 by gender—that is, girls with their nominated female friends and boys with their nominated male friends. Each entry of this table refers to the average incidence of the activity in question performed with friends of the same gender. We find a marked gender difference in the two measures of co-rumination reported in the two first rows of Table 7. Indeed, on average, girls report to have discussed a problem to 69% of their nominated female friends, while for boys this happens on average only with 39% of their nominated male friends. The difference is statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ). Girls also report to have talked on the phone with a larger proportion of their female friends than boys have with male friends (81% versus 69%); this difference is also statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ). Interestingly, for the other three measures—which are not capturing co-rumination but rather the time spent with friends—we see much smaller gender differences. This is clearly not causal evidence but merely indicates that co-rumination may explain why peer depression is more contagious for girls than for boys.<sup>19</sup>

In summary, this evidence indicates that there are differences in friendship relationships between girls and boys because girls are more likely to engage in communication with their female friends and discuss problems. The tendency to discuss extensively and co-ruminate about problems has been linked in the psychology literature to the development of depression symptoms and could explain the gender difference in peer influence that we find in this paper.

### 5.3 Understanding the long-term effect of peer depression

We have seen that the short-term effect of peer depression on own-depression is rather strong for female students. The key question is how this effect persists over time, particularly after 14 years. Indeed, in Wave I (1994-1995), students are between 13 (year 7) and 18 years of age (year 12) while, in Wave IV (2008-2009), they are between 27 and 32 years of age. Recall that

---

<sup>19</sup>In Table A11 in the Online Appendix, we provide a more general picture of friendship relationships than that of Table 7 by examining both directly nominated friends (as in Table 7) but also the peers in the same school/grade. We also display the relationships between male and female friends, and female and male friends. The general picture is similar to that in Table 7, in the sense that girls tend to co-ruminate more than boys.

Table 7: Gender Differences in Own-Gender Friend Socialization among Adolescents

	Females	Males	Difference
Talk about problems	0.694 (0.425)	0.390 (0.471)	0.304***
Talk on the phone	0.808 (0.355)	0.691 (0.446)	0.117***
Visit house	0.491 (0.461)	0.567 (0.445)	-0.076***
Hang out	0.573 (0.461)	0.607 (0.465)	-0.034***
Spend weekend	0.535 (0.464)	0.575 (0.463)	-0.040***
N	6482	5561	

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Wave I.

Talk about problems refers to the share of respondents who answered yes to the question Did you talk to [friend 1....5] about a problem during the past seven days ?

Talk on the phone refers to the share of respondents who answered yes to the question Did you talk to [friend 1....5] on the telephone during the past seven days?

Visit house refers to the share of respondents who answered yes to the question Did you go to [friend 1....5]'s house during the past seven days?

Hang out refers to the share of respondents who answered yes to the question Did you meet [friend 1....5] after school to hang out or go somewhere during the past seven days?

Spend weekend refers to the share of respondents who answered yes to the question Did you spend time with [friend 1....5] during the past weekend?

\*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

we define peers as students who are in the same grade, which implies that the respondents might know only a few of them personally. Thus, there is a high likelihood that these students do not interact with each other after high school, which implies that they have not seen each other for 9 years (for those who were in grade 7) and up to 14 years (for those who were in grade 12). We conjecture that the short-term effect of peer depression on own-depression persists over time because it may reduce the chance for depressed females to go to college, to work, and, thus, to earn a high income which, in turn, leads to more depression. In other words, being randomly “exposed” to depressed peers when young may impact the probability of college attendance, of being employed and of earning high income in adulthood, which, in turn, may have an effect on future depression.

In order to provide suggestive evidence for this mechanism, we perform two separate analyses. First, we investigate whether adolescent’s peer depression has, indeed, an impact on own college enrollment, work, and income in adulthood. Second, we examine the role of parents’ socioeconomic background on long-term depression. Indeed, while peers may disappear after high school, parents do not. Consequently, it is important to understand how the family structure and background have an impact on long-term depression and if they

mitigate the effect of peer depression.

### 5.3.1 The effect of peer depression on long-term outcomes

We explore the mechanism highlighted above—that is, whether peer depression in adolescence has an impact on adult outcomes. Specifically, we focus on whether peer depression affects post-secondary education (college attendance), employment, and income. In terms of descriptive statistics, 81% of females go to college, 74% are employed, and average income is \$30,000. The corresponding figures for males are 72% go to college, 85% are employed and average income is \$42,000.

Table 8: Effect of peers’ depression on depression in adulthood: Other outcomes

	Females			Males		
	College	Work	Income	College	Work	Income
% own-gender peers depressed	-.302*** (.096)	-.236** (.114)	-16.025* (9.471)	-.104 (.109)	.181 (.132)	1.386 (12.417)
Depressed in Wave I	-.085*** (.020)	-.036* (.020)	-4.402** (1.720)	-.049* (.025)	-.039** (.019)	-2.177 (1.531)
$\bar{Y}$	0.812	0.737	30.077	0.722	0.847	42.286
N	6663	5567	6333	5736	4637	5459
$R^2$	.24	.10	.15	.29	.16	.14

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009)

College: The dependent variable is a dummy variable that is equal to 1 if in Wave IV the individual reports enrolling to college or obtaining a degree higher than the high school degree as highest level of qualification, and 0 otherwise.

Work: The dependent variable is a dummy variable that is equal to 1 if in Wave IV the individual reports to work, and 0 otherwise.

Income: The dependent variable is the income in thousands dollars reported in Wave IV.

All regressions contain the same control variables as Table 3, Columns 3 and 6, including grade fixed effects, school fixed effects, and school time trends.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ .; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ .; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

The results of regressing the percentage of own gender peers who are depressed in adolescence on own outcomes in adulthood are displayed in Table 8.<sup>20</sup> We find that, for females, peer depression in adolescence influences long-term outcomes beyond depression. In particular, an increase in peer depression by one standard deviation is associated with a probability of college attendance that is 3.5 percentage points lower, a likelihood of working that is 2.8 percentage points lower, and a reduction in income of \$1,870, which translates to a 6.2% reduction in income at the baseline. For males, there is no evidence of a long-term effect on

<sup>20</sup>Note that the sample size varies across the columns of this table, thereby reflecting the fact that the employment and income questions are missing for a few of the observations in our sample.

other outcomes.

We have shown that peer depression in adolescence affects both long-term outcomes (college attendance, employment, and earnings) and long-term depression. One potential explanation for these findings is that peer depression in grades 7-12 leads to increased depression in the short term, which, then, negatively affects these other adult outcomes, as suggested by previous evidence (?????). These negative effects on one's socio-economic outcomes can, in turn, lead to higher incidence of depression in adulthood. We cannot show that this is the unique chain of causality with our current analysis, but this is one plausible path. An alternative pathway is that peer depression affects short-term depression, which, in turn, simultaneously affects both long-term depression and outcomes. Then, given the two-way interaction between mental health and educational or labor-market outcomes, the two would tend to negatively reinforce each other. Note, however, that in both stories the policy implications are the same: exposure to depressed peers in adolescence has an impact on long-term depression and outcomes for females.

### 5.3.2 The role of parents' socioeconomic background on long-term depression

In order to better understand the mechanism highlighted above, we now examine whether parental background might mitigate the effect of peer depression on own long-term depression. Indeed, prior research has reported that parental support and involvement exert important influences on adolescents' mental health because of the influential role of the family at this stage (?). In this regard, family socioeconomic status may be particularly important for buffering the negative influence of peer depression in adolescence, as it has been documented that disadvantaged children and adolescents are more likely to develop mental health problems (?). In Table 6, we depicted that the stronger the child/mother bond, the lower the short-term effect on own-depression. However, maternal bond did not reduce the impact of peer depression on short-term own-depression. We now explore whether the long-term peer effects can be moderated by own-family's socioeconomic status.

In order to carry out this analysis, we make use of two measures of socioeconomic status: family income and mother's occupation.<sup>21</sup> Specifically, we divide the sample into two groups on the basis of income: high- and low-family income (above and below median), while, for occupation, we divide it into four groups: (i) managerial/professional occupations; (ii) technical and office and sales workers; (iii) low skill occupations (e.g. restaurant worker, factory worker, farm worker etc., and (iv) homemaker.

We then estimate our main specification on these different samples. The results are presented in Table 9. For females, the results related to the household income reveal that the

---

<sup>21</sup>We use mother's occupation and not father's as information for the latter is missing for a large number of the respondents.

peer effect is large and statistically significant only for individuals in the low-household income group, whereas, for those in the high-income group, the effect is not significant. For occupation, the results show that the effect is stronger and statistically significant for individuals whose mother worked in a low-skill occupation; this effect weakens and becomes statistically insignificant as we move to technical occupations and professionals.<sup>22</sup> For males, none of the peer effects are statistically significant.

Table 9: Parental background

	Females						Males					
	Income		Mother's occupation				Income		Mother's occupation			
	Low	High	Home-maker	Blue collar	Tech./off. sales	Manag./profess.	Low	High	Home-maker	Blue collar	Tech./off. sales	Manag./profess.
% own-gender peers depressed	.375*** (.142)	.137 (.125)	.199 (.399)	.437** (.173)	.227 (.248)	.154 (.208)	.203 (.144)	-.062 (.171)	-.437 (.559)	.140 (.252)	-.162 (.230)	.355 (.296)
$\bar{Y}$	0.262	0.194	0.276	0.250	0.212	0.182	0.189	0.144	0.205	0.172	0.158	0.141
N	3305	3358	989	2280	1707	1663	2750	2987	814	1871	1486	1543
$R^2$	.18	.19	.38	.21	.31	.28	.22	.18	.43	.26	.36	.29

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV.

The dependent variable is depression, defined as a dummy variable for whether the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 11.

All regressions contain the same control variables as Table 3, Columns 3 and 6, including grade fixed effects, school fixed effects, and school time trends.

Low (high) income: household income is below (above) sample median.

Mother's occupation groups are defined as in Table 1.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Observe that we are unable to directly examine the role of poor parental mental health, as this is not reported in the Add Health data. However, we cannot rule out that for some of the parents with low-socioeconomic indicators, mental health problems could be an underlying cause for their status. Therefore, parental mental health problems could be an additional reason for the pattern we see in Table 9.

### 5.3.3 Discussion

In summary, we have shown that peer depression in adolescence can still have an impact on one's long-term depression, and have provided evidence consistent with a mechanism that this is because it reduces the likelihood of women to go to college and, thus, to work and to earn a good income which, in turn, leads to depression in adulthood.

There may be other mechanisms that can explain why peer depression affects own long-term depression. For example, girls who have been exposed to depressed peers in adolescence

<sup>22</sup>We fail to reject equality of the coefficients across the subgroups in any of the comparisons.

may have a higher likelihood of choosing depressed friends in adulthood and, thus, be depressed. We cannot test this mechanism as we do not have any information on peers and friendship relationships in Wave IV or even in Wave III. However, this does not contradict our story. Indeed, women who have been exposed to depressed peers in adolescence are less likely to go to college and to work in adulthood and may be more likely to associate with similar peers (homophily) and end up being depressed. What we believe and showed to be a crucial determinant of female’s peer depression is the exposure of depressed peers in adolescence, because adolescence is a rather important phase in becoming an adult and it is a period where, for the first time, peers become more important than parents. This implies that adolescents are much more fragile, vulnerable, and much more likely to be influenced by peer depression; particularly girls as they tend to have a more emotion-focused and ruminative relationship with their peers. We also showed that the economic status of the parents can mitigate the effects of peer depression, thereby implying that the most likely adolescents to be influenced by peer depression are the girls who come from disadvantaged families.

## 6 Concluding remarks

Adolescence is a critical period for the development of one’s mental health, as symptoms of depression, particularly for girls, tend to emerge during this period and continue and recur into adulthood. Depression is one of the most common, chronic, and costly illnesses affecting adolescents and adults worldwide. This paper contributes to our understanding of the long-term determinants of mental health by highlighting the causal role of peer depression in adolescence on females’ long-term depression, after accounting for own adolescence depression.

We use data from a large representative longitudinal survey of adolescents in the United States, following individuals from adolescence to adulthood, and use an identification strategy that relies on within-school and across-cohorts idiosyncratic variation in the proportion of same-gender peers who are depressed. We find a significant and positive causal effect of exposure to depressed peers in school on depression experienced in adulthood for females but not for males. An increase by one standard deviation in the share of own-gender peers (schoolmates) who are depressed increases the probability of depression in adulthood by 2.6 percentage points for females (or 11.5% of mean depression).

Then, we investigate the possible mechanisms that may explain our results. First, we show that female’s peer depression has also a strong positive impact on individual adolescent female depression (short-term effect) but no impact on boys’ depression. We provide some evidence suggesting that girls interact with other girls in a different manner than boys do with boys. In particular, we find that girls are more likely to engage in communication with their female friends by discussing problems and talking on the phone. This may indicate that

there is co-rumination among adolescent girls, that is, they tend to extensively discuss and revisit problems without coming up with solutions, thereby leading to symptoms of anxiety and depression. This evidence of the reasons behind the gender differences in the effects of peer depression that we find is suggestive but far from being conclusive and remains a fruitful area for future research.


Second, we investigate whether being randomly “exposed” to depressed peers when young has an impact on the probability of college attendance, of being employed, and of earning a high income in adulthood. We find a clear negative impact of peer depression on these outcomes, adding to the relative scant evidence on the causal impact of mental health on economic outcomes. We also find that the social background of the family matters, as girls from low-skilled and lower-occupation backgrounds are more susceptible to negative peer influences.

In terms of policy implications, our findings suggest that policies and interventions aimed at buffering the impact of peer effects on vulnerable adolescent girls can have long-lasting effects on the targeted individuals’ mental health and broader socioeconomic outcomes. In particular, interventions aimed at preventing the “contagion” of peer depression for girls coming from low socioeconomic status families may be effective in reducing long-term depression for females. Our results indicate that the combination of poverty and depression may magnify each other and lead to more depression. Therefore, given this paper’s findings, a natural policy to improve women’s mental health would be to promote mental well-being and provide mental and emotional health support and counseling within educational settings, in particular, to girls from disadvantaged background. This approach combined with efforts to raise awareness among parents about the far reaching implications of common mental health issues present in the school context can contribute to better outcomes for the children. Future research that evaluates the impact of such policies would be very valuable.

# Appendix

## A Figures


Figure A1: Distribution of % own-gender peers depressed



Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Wave I.

The figure plots the kernel density of the variable “% own gender peers depressed” for females and males.

Figure A2: Residual Distribution of % own-gender peers depressed



Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Wave I.

The figures plot the relative frequency of the residual “% own gender peers depressed” calculated as predicted residuals of a regression of average level in peer depression on grade and school fixed effects and school-specific time trend, separately for females and males.

## B Tables

Table A1: Probability of dropping out of the survey / repeating grade

	Dropping out of the survey				Repeating grade	
	Wave I / Wave IV		Wave I / Wave II		Females	Males
	Females	Males	Females	Males		
% own-gender peers depressed	-.129 (.084)	-.141 (.113)	-.014 (.080)	-.107 (.105)	.036 (.042)	.003 (.064)
Depressed in Wave I	.006 (.016)	.001 (.020)	-.030*** (.011)	-.033* (.019)	.002 (.009)	.009 (.013)
Race: White	-.004 (.021)	-.006 (.025)	-.039 (.024)	.015 (.022)	.006 (.013)	.001 (.017)
Race: African American	-.060** (.029)	.013 (.035)	-.038 (.031)	.013 (.026)	-.002 (.016)	-.003 (.023)
Race: Asian	.108** (.042)	.049 (.046)	-.069** (.033)	-.001 (.028)	-.032* (.017)	-.016 (.022)
Ethnicity: Hispanic	.025 (.022)	.015 (.031)	-.062*** (.022)	-.046* (.024)	.006 (.015)	-.014 (.018)
Number of siblings	.002 (.004)	-.000 (.005)	-.017*** (.003)	.011** (.004)	.001 (.002)	.004 (.004)
Picture Vocabulary Test score	-.002*** (.000)	-.002*** (.001)	-.001 (.000)	-.001 (.000)	-.000 (.000)	-.001** (.000)
Mother's educ: Missing	.041* (.024)	.012 (.033)	.027 (.024)	.068* (.035)	.003 (.014)	-.037** (.016)
Mother's educ: High school / some college	.019 (.019)	-.013 (.020)	-.017 (.016)	-.005 (.026)	-.005 (.010)	-.021* (.013)
Mother's educ: College degree or above	.035 (.022)	.004 (.024)	-.037** (.016)	-.011 (.030)	.002 (.010)	-.034*** (.012)
Mother's occup: Managerial / professional	-.002 (.021)	-.064** (.026)	-.024 (.017)	.021 (.022)	-.009 (.010)	-.019* (.011)
Mother's occup: Technical / office / sales	-.010 (.020)	-.017 (.024)	-.021 (.016)	.031 (.021)	-.002 (.010)	-.017 (.012)
Mother's occup: Blue collar	.011 (.018)	-.027 (.022)	-.013 (.014)	.052*** (.019)	.003 (.010)	-.013 (.012)
Father not present	.033** (.014)	.007 (.015)	.003 (.014)	-.002 (.014)	.003 (.008)	.027*** (.008)
Household income (thousand dollars)	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	-.000** (.000)	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)
N	8550	8102	7011	6072	6230	5870
R <sup>2</sup>	.10	.09	.47	.45	.09	.11

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I, II and IV.

The dependent variable is: a dummy variable for not being interviewed in Wave IV (Columns 1 and 2) or in Wave II (Columns 3 and 4), conditioning on being part of the selected sample in Wave I; a dummy variable for whether in Wave II individuals report of being in the same grade of Wave I (Columns 5 and 6).

All regressions contain the same control variables as Table 3, Columns 3 and 6, including grade fixed effects, school fixed effects, and school time trends.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table A2: CES-D-10 questionnaire

---

1)	You were bothered by things that don't usually bother you.
2)	You felt that you could not shake off the blues, even with help from your family and your friends.
3)	You felt you were just as good as other people.
4)	You had trouble keeping your mind on what you were doing.
5)	You felt depressed.
6)	You felt that you were too tired to do things.
7)	You were happy.
8)	You enjoyed life.
9)	You felt sad.
10)	You felt that people disliked you.

---

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV.  
 Scores to the answers vary from 0 to 3. Scores for answers to questions 3, 7 and 8 are reverse coded.

Table A3: Individual depression – Transition matrix

---

Depressed in Wave I	Depressed in Wave IV					
	Females			Males		
	No	Yes	Total	No	Yes	Total
No	4119	891	5010	4233	695	4928
Yes	1027	626	1653	555	254	809
Total	5146	1517	6663	4788	949	5737

---

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV.  
 Depression is defined as a dummy variable for whether the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 11.

Table A4: Raw and residual variation in peer depression

Females					
	Mean	SD	Min	Max	N
Raw variable	0.256	0.117	0.000	0.684	6663
Demeaning grade/school FE	0.000	0.078	-0.321	0.379	6663
Demeaning grade/school FE and school trends	0.000	0.060	-0.289	0.288	6663
Males					
	Mean	SD	Min	Max	N
Raw variable	0.150	0.088	0.000	0.556	5737
Demeaning grade/school FE	0.000	0.065	-0.217	0.328	5737
Demeaning grade/school FE and school trends	-0.000	0.050	-0.236	0.321	5737

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV.

Raw variable indicates the average level in peer depression.

Demeaning grade/school FE indicates the average level in peer depression calculated as predicted residuals of a regression of average level in peer depression on grade and school fixed effects.

Demeaning grade/school FE and school trends indicates the average level in peer depression calculated as predicted residuals of a regression of average level in peer depression on grade and school fixed effects and school-specific time trends.

Table A5: Effect of peers' depression on depression in adulthood – additional peer controls

	Females			Males		
% own-gender peers depressed	.237** (.107)	.224** (.108)	.235** (.099)	.091 (.114)	.098 (.109)	.106 (.108)
Depressed in Wave I	.203*** (.019)	.201*** (.019)	.202*** (.019)	.191*** (.025)	.191*** (.025)	.192*** (.025)
Race: White	-.041 (.036)	-.050 (.036)	-.049 (.036)	-.058** (.029)	-.063** (.027)	-.063** (.027)
Race: African American	-.026 (.039)	-.039 (.040)	-.039 (.040)	-.023 (.035)	-.021 (.034)	-.021 (.034)
Race: Asian	-.018 (.052)	-.039 (.049)	-.036 (.050)	-.030 (.051)	-.035 (.051)	-.034 (.051)
Ethnicity: Hispanic	-.009 (.037)	-.005 (.037)	-.004 (.037)	-.066** (.031)	-.063** (.030)	-.063** (.030)
Number of siblings	.006 (.005)	.006 (.005)	.005 (.005)	-.005 (.006)	-.005 (.006)	-.005 (.006)
Picture Vocabulary Test score	-.002*** (.001)	-.002*** (.001)	-.002*** (.001)	-.002*** (.001)	-.002*** (.001)	-.002*** (.001)
Mother's educ: Missing	.008 (.048)	.008 (.048)	.011 (.047)	.039 (.047)	.041 (.047)	.044 (.047)
Mother's educ: High school / some college	-.038* (.021)	-.038* (.021)	-.039* (.020)	-.009 (.023)	-.007 (.023)	-.005 (.023)
Mother's educ: College degree or above	-.048* (.026)	-.050* (.026)	-.050* (.026)	-.012 (.025)	-.010 (.025)	-.010 (.025)
Mother's occup: Managerial / professional	-.016 (.025)	-.015 (.024)	-.016 (.024)	-.026 (.023)	-.025 (.024)	-.024 (.024)
Mother's occup: Technical / office / sales	-.012 (.023)	-.012 (.023)	-.011 (.023)	-.021 (.021)	-.021 (.021)	-.022 (.021)
Mother's occup: Blue collar	.003 (.020)	.001 (.020)	.002 (.020)	-.026 (.019)	-.026 (.019)	-.024 (.019)
Father not present	.036** (.017)	.037** (.017)	.042** (.017)	.026 (.018)	.026 (.018)	.020 (.017)
Household income (thousand dollars)	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)
Share of peers whose mother's education is missing	.045 (.198)	.012 (.192)	.053 (.187)	.021 (.195)	.054 (.197)	.091 (.201)
Share of peers whose mother's education is high school / some college	.029 (.128)	.027 (.129)	.011 (.133)	-.101 (.154)	-.057 (.165)	-.035 (.171)
Share of peers whose mother's education is college degree or above	.190 (.196)	.160 (.191)	.139 (.194)	.202 (.175)	.241 (.185)	.232 (.184)
Share of peers whose mother's occupation is blue collar	-.017 (.164)	-.064 (.159)	-.050 (.162)	.132 (.144)	.153 (.145)	.188 (.141)
Share of peers whose mother's occupation is technical / office / sales	-.054 (.158)	-.063 (.160)	-.053 (.167)	.068 (.144)	.075 (.142)	.072 (.146)
Share of peers whose mother's occupation is managerial / professional	-.107 (.144)	-.112 (.138)	-.133 (.143)	.051 (.160)	.071 (.157)	.091 (.155)
Share of female peers	.157 (.138)	.186 (.133)	.136 (.135)	.217 (.142)	.190 (.164)	.169 (.156)
Share of White peers		-.206 (.163)	-.202 (.163)		-.136 (.164)	-.129 (.162)
Share of African American peers		-.292 (.211)	-.305 (.220)		.019 (.189)	.035 (.189)
Share of Asian peers		-.579* (.299)	-.502* (.278)		-.152 (.207)	-.143 (.211)
Share of Hispanic peers		.130 (.150)	.143 (.156)		.049 (.128)	.068 (.127)
Average picture vocabulary test of peers			.004 (.004)			-.001 (.003)
Average number of siblings of peers			-.016 (.025)			.005 (.030)
Share of peers whose father is not present			.150 (.103)			-.140 (.105)
Average household income of peers			-.000 (.001)			.001 (.001)
Grade fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
School fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
School time trends	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls for peers mother's education / occupation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls for peers race / ethnicity	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Additional peer controls	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
N	6663	6663	6663	5737	5737	5737
R <sup>2</sup>	.13	.13	.13	.14	.14	.14

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV. The dependent variable is depression, defined as a dummy variable for whether the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 11.

% own-gender peers depressed is the share of students who are depressed among all students of the same gender and in the same school and grade as that of the respondent. The respondent is excluded from the calculations of the % own-gender peers depressed.

The dependent variable is measured at the time of Wave IV; all control variables are measured at the time of Wave I. The excluded category for race is: Other races (American Indian and Other Race). The excluded category for mother's education is: Less than high school. Excluded category for mother's occupation is: Homemaker.

Controls for peers mother's education / occupation are: share of peers whose mother's education is missing, share of peers whose mother's education is high school / some college, share of peers whose mother's education is college degree or above, share of peers whose mother's occupation is managerial / professional, share of peers whose mother's occupation is technical / office / sales, share of peers whose mother's occupation is blue collar.

Controls for peers race / ethnicity are: share of White peers, share of African American peers, share of Asian peers, share of Hispanic peers.

Additional peer controls are: average number of siblings of peers, average picture vocabulary test of peers, share of peers whose father is not present, average household income of peers.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table A6: Placebo test of peers' depression on depression in adulthood

	Females			Males		
% own-gender placebo peers depressed	-.046 (.081)	-.047 (.079)	-.046 (.080)	.081 (.101)	.085 (.096)	.080 (.097)
Depressed in Wave I	.214*** (.019)	.202*** (.019)	.195*** (.019)	.203*** (.026)	.190*** (.026)	.188*** (.026)
Race: White		-.045 (.036)	-.040 (.036)		-.057** (.028)	-.058** (.028)
Race: African American		-.019 (.039)	-.027 (.039)		-.012 (.035)	-.022 (.035)
Race: Asian		-.015 (.053)	-.018 (.052)		-.031 (.050)	-.030 (.050)
Ethnicity: Hispanic		.003 (.036)	-.008 (.037)		-.058* (.030)	-.065** (.031)
Number of siblings		.006 (.005)	.006 (.005)		-.005 (.006)	-.005 (.006)
Picture Vocabulary Test score		-.003*** (.001)	-.002*** (.001)		-.002*** (.001)	-.002*** (.001)
Mother's educ: Missing			.008 (.048)			.042 (.047)
Mother's educ: High school / some college			-.038* (.021)			-.004 (.024)
Mother's educ: College degree or above			-.055** (.026)			-.016 (.026)
Mother's occup: Managerial / professional			-.012 (.024)			-.030 (.024)
Mother's occup: Technical / office / sales			-.011 (.024)			-.026 (.021)
Mother's occup: Blue collar			.004 (.019)			-.032* (.019)
Father not present			.036** (.017)			.026 (.018)
Household income (thousand dollars)			-.000 (.000)			-.000 (.000)
Grade fixed effects	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
School fixed effects	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
School time trends	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
N	6663	6663	6663	5737	5737	5737
R <sup>2</sup>	.12	.13	.13	.13	.14	.14

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV.

The dependent variable is depression, defined as a dummy variable for whether the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 11.

% own-gender placebo peers depressed is the share of students who are depressed among all students of the same gender and in the same school but in a different grade of the respondent. The respondent is excluded from the calculations of the % own-gender placebo peers depressed.

All regressions contain the same control variables as Table 3, Columns 3 and 6, including grade fixed effects, school fixed effects, and school time trends.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table A7: Placebo test: Peer effects on height

	Females			Males		
Own-gender peers height	.052 (.077)	.051 (.078)	.050 (.077)	-.022 (.066)	-.024 (.060)	-.027 (.060)
Height in Wave I	.715*** (.022)	.704*** (.022)	.702*** (.022)	.552*** (.025)	.540*** (.024)	.541*** (.024)
Grade fixed effects	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
School fixed effects	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
School time trends	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
N	6546	6546	6546	5651	5651	5651
R <sup>2</sup>	.60	.61	.61	.47	.49	.49

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV.

The dependent variable is height in centimeters measured in Wave IV.

% own-gender peers height is the average height of students of the same gender and in the same school and grade as that of the respondent. The respondent is excluded from the calculations of the % own-gender peers height.

All regressions contain the same control variables as Table 3, Columns 3 and 6, including grade fixed effects, school fixed effects, and school time trends.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ .; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ .; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table A8: Effect of peers' depression on depression in adulthood – further robustness

	Females				Males			
% own-gender peers depressed	.262** (.127)				-.028 (.240)			
% own-gender peers depressed × N of peers	-.002 (.002)				.006 (.010)			
% own-gender peers depressed × share in home	.426** (.187)				.317 (.320)			
% own-gender peers depressed (CES-D-10 score)	.091 (.080)				1.000* (.555)			
% own-gender peers depressed (CES-D-10 score) - squared	-.062* (.037)				.056 (.092)			
Depressed in Wave I	.203*** (.020)	.200*** (.019)	.282*** (.019)	.281*** (.019)	.191*** (.025)	.191*** (.026)	.326*** (.023)	.325*** (.023)
Grade fixed effects	Yes							
School fixed effects	Yes							
School time trends	Yes							
N	6663	6663	6663	6663	5737	5737	5737	5737
R <sup>2</sup>	.13	.13	.18	.18	.14	.14	.20	.20

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV.

The dependent variable is depression, defined as a dummy variable for whether the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 11 (Columns 1, 2, 5 and 6) and defined as the CES-D-10 score (Columns 3, 4, 7 and 8).

% own-gender peers depressed is defined as the share of students who are depressed among all students of the same gender and in the same school and grade as that of the respondent (Columns 1, 2, 5 and 6) and is defined as the average CES-D-10 score among all students of the same gender and in the same school and grade as that of the respondent (Columns 3, 4, 7 and 8). The respondent is excluded from the calculations of the % own-gender peers depressed.

The dependent variable is measured at the time of Wave IV; all control variables are measured at the time of Wave I. The excluded category for race is: Other races (American Indian and Other Race). The excluded category for mother's education is: Less than high school. Excluded category for mother's occupation is: Homemaker.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ .; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ .; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table A9: Effect of peers' depression on depression in adulthood – robustness to minimum group size

	Females			Males		
	$\geq 3$	$\geq 5$	$\geq 10$	$\geq 3$	$\geq 5$	$\geq 10$
% own-gender peers depressed	.220** (.090)	.239** (.095)	.224** (.101)	.155 (.114)	.121 (.117)	.098 (.131)
Depressed in Wave I	.196*** (.019)	.198*** (.019)	.203*** (.019)	.191*** (.025)	.191*** (.025)	.191*** (.025)
Grade fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
School fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
School time trends	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	6846	6822	6663	5941	5901	5737
$R^2$	.14	.14	.13	.15	.15	.14

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV. The dependent variable is depression, defined as a dummy variable for whether the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 11.

Column headers indicate the minimum group size (e.g.,  $\geq 3$  indicates that peer groups smaller than 3 students are excluded from the analyses.)

% own-gender peers depressed is the share of students who are depressed among all students of the same gender and in the same school and grade as that of the respondent. The respondent is excluded from the calculations of the % own-gender peers depressed.

The dependent variable is measured at the time of Wave IV; all control variables are measured at the time of Wave I.

All regressions contain the same control variables as Table 3, Columns 3 and 6, including grade fixed effects, school fixed effects, and school time trends.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table A10: Effect of peers' depression on depression in adolescence - Short run, Wave IV sample

	Females			Males		
% own-gender peers depressed	.261**	.371***		.165	.216	
	(.111)	(.138)		(.114)	(.133)	
Bond with mother above median (BMA)		-.022	.023		-.013	.008
		(.016)	(.030)		(.014)	(.019)
BMA × % own-gender peers depressed			-.178		-.152	
			(.118)		(.127)	
N	5074	5072	5072	4339	4338	4338
R <sup>2</sup>	.24	.24	.24	.25	.25	.25

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and II.

The dependent variable is depression, defined as a dummy variable for whether the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 11, measured in Wave II.

The dependent variable is measured at the time of Wave II; all control variables are measured at the time of Wave I.

The sample is the same of Table 6, but restricted to individuals observed in Wave IV.

All regressions contain the same control variables as Table 3, Columns 3 and 6, including grade fixed effects, school fixed effects, and school time trends.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table A11: Gender Differences in Own-Gender Friend Socialization among Adolescents

Activities / with:	All friends				Same school/grade			
	Females		Males		Females		Males	
	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males
Talk about problems	0.694	0.581	0.439	0.390	0.675	0.468	0.391	0.340
	(0.425)	(0.461)	(0.471)	(0.457)	(0.435)	(0.473)	(0.470)	(0.443)
Talk on the phone	0.808	0.669	0.651	0.691	0.803	0.525	0.564	0.662
	(0.355)	(0.437)	(0.446)	(0.421)	(0.362)	(0.471)	(0.472)	(0.435)
Visit house	0.491	0.305	0.356	0.567	0.462	0.207	0.245	0.517
	(0.461)	(0.430)	(0.445)	(0.450)	(0.458)	(0.384)	(0.405)	(0.460)
Hang out	0.573	0.422	0.433	0.607	0.588	0.372	0.388	0.614
	(0.461)	(0.464)	(0.465)	(0.453)	(0.460)	(0.460)	(0.462)	(0.455)
Spend weekend	0.535	0.442	0.425	0.575	0.495	0.300	0.320	0.516
	(0.464)	(0.465)	(0.463)	(0.457)	(0.469)	(0.437)	(0.442)	(0.465)
N	6482	5830	4719	5561	1480	723	753	1197

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Wave I.

Talk about problems refers to the share of respondents who answered yes to the question Did you talk to [friend 1...5] about a problem during the past seven days?

Talk on the phone refers to the share of respondents who answered yes to the question Did you talk to [friend 1...5] on the telephone during the past seven days?

Visit house refers to the share of respondents who answered yes to the question Did you go to [friend 1...5]'s house during the past seven days?

Hang out refers to the share of respondents who answered yes to the question Did you meet [friend 1...5] after school to hang out or go somewhere during the past seven days?

Spend weekend refers to the share of respondents who answered yes to the question Did you spend time with [friend 1...5] during the past weekend?

## C Using the in-school sample

In Table A12, we explore the potential use of a peer depression measure constructed using the in-school data. Since the in-school data do not include a full CES-D score, the alternative is to use a self-reported measure of depression drawing on the question: “In the last month, how often did you feel depressed or blue?”. We define a binary depression variable, which is equal to one when answers to this question are: “occasionally”; “often”; and “everyday”; and 0 otherwise. Then, using this variable we construct an alternative measure of own-gender peer depression, which uses the full in-school sample (about 90K observations) to define peer groups. We then match this variable with the sample that we use in our baseline analysis. We can match 4,998 females and 4,047 males. We then run our baseline regression of Table 3 by substituting the own-gender peer depression variable based on the CES-D score and the in-home data with the one constructed using the in-school data, as described above. The results are presented in columns 1 and 2 of Table A12. As can be seen, using this variable, own-gender peer depression has a small, negative, and statistically insignificant effect on long-term depression for both males and females.

We then seek to understand whether the fact that we do not find a significant effect of peer depression for females in particular (as in our main analysis) is due to the fact that peer depression is constructed using the larger sample of peers from the in-school data or whether it is due to the fact the depression is measured differently. To this end, we estimate a very similar regression to the one in columns 1 and 2 (using the identical sample), employing a measure of own-gender peer depression that still relies on a single self-reported question (this is just one of the components of the CES-D10 that we use as our main measure of depression) but this time is derived from the in-home questionnaire instead of the in-school questionnaire, so the peer groups are based on the in-home sample as in our main analysis. In particular, using the question of the in-home data “How often was the following true during the past seven days? You felt depressed”, we defined a depression variable that is equal to one when answers are: “sometimes”; “a lot of the time”; and “most of the time or all of the time”; and 0 otherwise; we then use this variable to construct the measure of peer depression in the in-home data. The results of this regression are reported in columns 3 and 4 of Table A12. What we see is that the estimated peer effects are very similar to those in columns 1 and 2, suggesting that results are not sensitive to the way peer groups are defined, that is, in-school or in-home.

As a final step, we also run our baseline specification using our baseline measure of peer depression that is based on the CES-D score (as in Table 3) on the same subsample as in columns 1-4 and report results in columns 5 and 6. These results demonstrate that our key result is still there and that the lack of significant peer effects for females in columns 1 and

3 are neither driven by using a subsample of our baseline sample in Table 3 nor do estimates depend on whether peer depression is measured in the school or the home sample. Instead, it is likely that the difference in results between columns 1, 3 and 5 is due to the use of a different measure of depression that relies on a single-question rather than the CES-D scale. This is perhaps not surprising given that the single-question definition is more prone to measurement issues and classification errors.

Table A12: Alternative definitions of own-gender peer depression

	In-School		In-Home			
	1 Quest. Depression		1 Quest. Depression		CES-D-10 score	
	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males
% own-gender peers depressed	-.042 (.203)	-.052 (.161)	-.044 (.100)	.043 (.095)	.301*** (.115)	.111 (.166)
Depressed in Wave I	.171*** (.022)	.188*** (.035)	.171*** (.022)	.189*** (.035)	.181*** (.023)	.191*** (.034)
N	4998	4047	4998	4047	4998	4047
R <sup>2</sup>	.15	.16	.15	.16	.15	.16

Source: Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Harris et al. (2009), Waves I and IV. % own-gender peers depressed is the share of students who are depressed among all students of the same gender and in the same school and grade as that of the respondent. The respondent is excluded from the calculations of the % own-gender peers depressed. Peer depression is calculated using a dummy variable for depression which is equal to 1 whether: whether students answer 'occasionally', 'often' or 'everyday' to the question 'In the last month, how often did you feel depressed or blue?' and 0 otherwise (Col 1 and 2); whether students answer 'sometimes', 'a lot of the time' or 'most of the time or all of the time' to the question 'How often was the following true during the past week? You felt depressed.' and 0 otherwise (Col 3 and 4); the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale is above 11 (Col 5 and 6) and 0 otherwise.

% own-gender peers depressed is the share of students who are depressed among all students of the same gender and in the same school and grade as that of the respondent. The respondent is excluded from the calculations of the % own-gender peers depressed.

All regressions contain the same control variables as Table 3, Columns 3 and 6, including grade fixed effects, school fixed effects, and school time trends.

Robust standard errors clustered at the school level are given in parentheses.

\*  $p < 0.10$ .; \*\*  $p < 0.05$ .; \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .