Workers' Health and Establishment Size

Tempesti, Tommaso

University of Massachusetts Lowell

29 June 2018

Workers' Health and Establishment Size

Tommaso Tempesti*

June 29, 2018

Abstract

I document the relationship between establishment size and various measures of workers' health. Workers at larger establishments are more likely to have chronic health conditions, have had a bed disability day in the last 12 months and be obese. They are also less likely to be smokers. Results for other health measures depend on the specification. My results may help in more effectively targeting workplace wellness programs. The results may also inform the design of better public interventions aimed at reducing occupational injuries. I discuss the relevance of my results for the establishment size-wage premium.

JEL Classification: I12, I18, J31

Keywords: Establishment size, Health, Wellness Programs, Employer size-wage premium.

1 Introduction

There is a vast literature on the relationship between health and labor market outcomes (Currie and Madrian (1999)). Employer size also features prominently in empirical and

*Department of Economics, University of Massachusetts Lowell. Email: Tommaso_Tempesti@uml.edu.
For comments on an earlier draft of this paper, I thank seminar participants at the 2016 Eastern Economics Association conference, at the 2017 Understanding Small Enterprises conference and at the Liberty Mutual Research Institute. All errors are mine.

theoretical work in labor and health economics, macroeconomics, and in the occupational health literature. However, the evidence on the relationship between health and employer size is still scant. The goal of this paper is to study if, and how, the health of workers is associated with the size of the establishment where they work.

The study of the relationship between health and establishment size is important for several reasons. First, both government and private programs have been developed to promote workers' health. At the government level, in 2011 the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health established the *Total Worker Health Program* which supports the adoption of best practices to "improve worker safety and health through a primary focus on the workplace" (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (2017)).

At the private level, workplace wellness programs generated 8 billions in revenue in 2016, a marked increase from 1.8 billions in 2011 (Pollitz et al. (2016)). Provisions in the Affordable Care Act likely contributed to this growth.[1] Wellness programs may offer services such as health screening, lifestyle management (e.g. smoking cessation, weight control and stress management) and management of chronic conditions (Mattke et al. (2013)). Mattke et al. (2013) find that these programs may have beneficial effects in terms of decreased smoking and increased exercise. However, small employers are much less likely than larger ones to offer such programs (Mattke et al. (2015)). In order to promote and target these programs more effectively, it would be helpful to know how different dimensions of health vary across workplaces. This study's contribution is to document the relationship between workers' health and employer size, a workplace characteristic which is easily observable by both policymakers and the private sector.

Various strands of prior empirical and theoretical work also motivate this paper. First, work in labor economics has documented the existence of an employer size-wage premium (e.g. Brown and Medoff (1989) and Troske (1999)). This work usually does not control for

[1]Provisions in the Affordable Care Act allow, within certain limits, to offer financial incentives to employees who meet a certain health goal (e.g. blood pressure) or participate in a wellness activities (e.g. smoking cessation or fitness programs) (Pollitz et al. (2016)).

health-related variables. Given that workforce' health may affect productivity (Currie and Madrian (1999)), studying how health varies with employer size complements the existing literature. Second, work in health economics has shown that workers with chronic health conditions are more likely to work at larger firms which offer health insurance (Kapur et al. (2008)). While I obtain a similar result for chronic health conditions, I also study how other measures of health vary with employer size. Finally, a large occupational health literature has studied the relationship between employer size and workplace injuries (e.g. Oleinick et al. (1995)). Given that health is a possible determinant of injury (Jansson et al. (2004)), my work adds to this literature by documenting how health varies with establishment size.

It is important to stress that the goal of this paper is not to show that establishment size *causally* affects health. First, the causality may go both ways. As noted above, less healthy workers may self-select into larger firms which are more likely to offer health insurance: this in turn may affect diagnosis and treatment of health conditions. In sections 2 and 6.2, I discuss how my results complement the literature that focuses on health status as a determinant of firm's choice (Kapur et al. (2008)). Second, empirically, establishment size is not randomly assigned and instrumental variables are not easily available. For this reason, the results reported here are only partial correlations. Nonetheless, as briefly discussed above and in section 2 with more details, the results here may provide insights both for policy-makers and for a vast array of different literatures.

I use data from the National Health Institute Survey (NHIS, hereafter), a large representative cross-sectional survey of the U.S. population. I use a regression framework to study the relationship between establishment size and a variety of measures of health and health-related behaviors. It is empirically important to use different dimensions of health as the results depend on the measure of health used.[2] I also allow the relationship between health and establishment size to be non-linear by using several categorical dummies for different establishment size. Again, this turns out to be empirically relevant for some of the health

[2]Currie and Madrian (1999, p. 3319) report that many empirical results in health economics depend on the specific measure of health used: for this reason, they suggest using different measures of health.

measures. Finally, I also study how different sets of regressors, such as demographics, education and health insurance availability, affect the relationship between establishment size and health. In the Supplementary Appendix I conduct a vast array of robustness checks.

To preview the results, I find only partial support for the hypothesis that healthier workers work at larger firms. In some regards, workers at larger firms have worse health than those at smaller ones: they are more likely to have chronic conditions, have had a bed disability day in the last 12 months and be obese. On the other hand, workers at larger establishments are less likely to be smokers. Interestingly, in models that do not control for job tenure and full-time status, workers at the largest establishments (1000+ employees) do better in terms of functional limitations, health status and mental health. I discuss how this fact suggests that larger firms, by offering more full-time and stable jobs, may be implicitly screening out workers who are less healthy in terms of e.g. mental health and functional limitations.

I find that obesity is higher at larger establishments, with the medium-sized firms (100 to 999 employees) being especially hit. Given that obesity is a factor in occupational injuries (Lin et al. (2013) and Janssen et al. (2011)), it is possible that the prevalence of obesity at these medium-sized firms may partly explain the higher rate of occupational injuries that has been observed at these firms (Leigh (1989)).

As to health-related behaviors, I find that workers at larger firms are less likely to be smokers but more likely of being obese. Given the lower availability of wellness program at smaller employers, my results suggests that promoting access to smoking cessation programs for workers in smaller companies may be beneficial but that there may not be as urgent a need to promote weight control programs for them.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the literature. Section 3 presents the empirical model while section 4 discusses the dataset and the variables used for estimation. Section 5 reports the results, section 6 discusses the results and section 7 concludes. Additional material can be found in the Supplementary Appendix.

2 Background and Literature Review

Insights from prior empirical and theoretical work provide testable hypotheses regarding the relationship between establishment size and health. First, a large literature in labor economics documents the existence of a sizable establishment size-wage premium. Brown and Medoff (1989) and Troske (1999) find that the establishment size-wage premium still persists even after controlling for a host of possible observable characteristics. Among the several explanations they advance for the size-wage premium, Brown and Medoff (1989) find support for only one: larger employers tend to hire higher-quality workers. Notably, Brown and Medoff (1989) do not control for workers' health in their regressions. Abowd et al. (1999)'s results echo those of Brown and Medoff (1989): using longitudinal matched employer-employee data for France, Abowd et al. (1999) find that individual fixed effects largely explain the firm size-wage premium. These results suggest that there are individual level variables that the econometrician usually does not observe but that contribute to the firm size-wage premium. A possible such variable is the health of workers. To the extent that healthier workers are more productive and so command a higher wage (Currie and Madrian (1999, p. 3332)), it is possible that the employer size-wage premium could be partially explained by differences in workers' health across employers of different size. This line of reasoning suggests that workers at larger employers will on average be healthier. Using several measures of health, I will test the null hypothesis that workers' health does not vary across establishment sizes.

While the focus of this paper is microeconomic in nature, it is also relevant for the macroeconomic literature. Empirical work documents that larger firms tend to be more productive (Bartelsman et al. (2013)). Motivated by this empirical regularity, recent work uses the distribution of firm size to explain output growth (Luttmer (2007)), the business cycle (Gabaix (2011)), and structural change (Buera and Kaboski (2012)). In the international trade literature, Melitz (2003)'s popular trade model predicts that trade liberalization reallocates

employment shares to larger, more productive firms, which are also more likely to become exporters. Melitz (2003)'s model has spawned a voluminous body of work, both empirical and theoretical (Melitz (2008)). My paper looks at one of the possible determinants of the higher productivity of larger firms, namely the health of their workforce.

Health economists have also studied the interplay between workers' health, employer provided health insurance and employer's size. Monheit and Vistnes (1994, Exhibit 3) do not find differences in health across firms with 25 or less employees and larger firms. Kapur et al. (2008) model the demand for employer health insurance coverage (EHI) and find that workers with high expected health costs are less likely to work at small establishments that offer EHI, relative to working at large firms that offer EHI. They suggest that this result is compatible with a demand side effect - with smaller firms which offer EHI screening out sick workers - and with a supply side effect - with sick workers preferring to work at larger firms possibly because of the higher job stability and EHI quality there (Kapur et al. (2008, p. 647-649, 659)). Kapur et al. (2008) argue that these mechanisms result in employment distortions, with some workers working at firms where they are less productive but where they can access EHI.

My paper both advances and is complementary to this literature. First, Kapur et al. (2008) present results for two dichotomous measure of establishments size: one with 25 or less employees and one with 50 or less employees. This is understandable given their interest in access to EHI and employment distortions. Indeed, workers in companies with 50 or more employees have a much higher access to EHI than workers at smaller companies (Bureau of Labor Statistics (2015, Table 2)). However, as in the establishment size-wage premium literature, I am interested in how workers' health changes along the whole establishment size distribution. For this reason, in my regression model I use dummies for several different establishment sizes. This also allows me to capture a possible non-linear relationship between health and establishment size.

Second, Kapur et al. (2008) use chronic health conditions as a proxy for a worker's

health. Again, this approach is justified because Kapur et al. (2008) are trying to model the demand for EHI and this demand is likely more responsive to the presence of persistent health problems. On the other hand, I am also interested in other aspects of a worker's health, such as functional limitations and moderate mental distress: these other aspects may not affect demand for EHI as much as chronic health conditions but they may be still of interest to policy-makers and relevant for workers' productivity. Moreover, I am also interested in directly studying some health-related behaviors such as smoking and obesity because wellness programs often targets them.

Finally, the relationship between employer size and workplace injuries is the subject of a large occupational health literature (e.g. Oleinick et al. (1995), Fenn and Ashby (2004), Champoux and Brun (2003), Fabiano et al. (2004), Sørensen et al. (2007)). While this body of work often finds the injury rate to decrease with establishment size, this is not always the case. For example, the Bureau of Labor Statistics' tabulations display an inverted U-shape of the injury rate relative to the US establishment size for private industry, with medium-sized firms being the most affected by injuries (Bureau of Labor Statistics (2017, Column 1)). Leigh (1989) confirms this inverted U-shape pattern when using firm level data from manufacturing and including other potential covariates (but not the health of the workers).[3] This literature rarely controls for the health of the workforce at different establishments. This is relevant because another strand of the literature finds that workers in poorer health conditions have a higher chance of injury (Jansson et al. (2004) and Galizzi (2013)). Taken together, the results from the occupational health literature suggest that healthier workers - who are less likely to get injured on the job - tend to work at larger firms, while less healthy workers work either at smaller firms (if job injuries decrease monotonically with establishment size) or at medium-sized firms (if job injuries display an inverted U-shape pattern with respect to establishment size). For these reasons, it is important to allow, as I do in my estimation, for the possible non-linear relationship between health and establishment

[3]It should also be noted that this inverted U-shape may in part be driven by the under-reporting of injury at smaller firms (Leigh et al. (2004) and Oleinick et al. (1995)).

size.

3 Empirical Model

I estimate variants of the following linear probability model:

$$h_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 size_i + \beta_2 X_i + \epsilon_i \tag{1}$$

where h_i is one of the dummy measures of *good* health for individual i, $size_i$ is a vector of dummies for the size of the establishment in which i works, X_i is a vector of other controls, ϵ_i is an error term and the β's are parameters to estimate. The parameters of interest are the establishment size dummies β_1. I will also report a Wald test for the hypothesis that all the establishment size dummies are zero. I discuss sampling weights and standard errors' estimation at the end of this section.

The interpretation of β_1 deserves special care. As in studies of the establishment size-wage premium, establishment size is not randomly assigned to survey respondents and suitable instruments are not available. For this reason, β_1 admits only an interpretation as a vector of partial correlation coefficients and the estimates of β_1 will provide information about this vector. In section 6 I discuss how the results relate to the various hypotheses laid out in section 2.

My dataset is obtained by pooling cross-sectional datasets for the 1997-2014 period. I run several variants of regression (1), both by using different measures of health and also nesting different sets of regressors X. In all models I include year, Census region and two-digit industry dummies. Given that I do not have panel data on individuals, I will not be able to control for individual fixed effects.

I first run a baseline regression of health on only establishment size, year, Census region and two-digit industry dummies, following an approach similar to Troske (1999, Table 3). Year dummies account for time factors which affect health, such as macroeconomic condi-

tions (Ruhm (2000)). Region and industry dummies account for geographic and industry variations in workers' health. While these variations are interesting on their own, they are not my focus here. Rather, the simple regressions of health on the region, industry (and year) dummies provide information for, e.g., the policymaker about how workers' health varies across establishment sizes, once other easily observable characteristics are taken into account. The results may help to better target policies and programs aimed at improving worker's health.

I rely on the health economics literature when adding to my model other X_i variables, that is, other determinants of health (Cutler and Lleras-Muney (2006) and Currie and Madrian (1999)). In the spirit of the employer size-wage premia literature (e.g. Troske (1999, Table 4)), I compare the estimates of β_1 across models in order to detect if the health-establishment size premia can be explained by the correlation between these other regressors and establishment size. I now describe each set of additional regressors.

Workforce demographics may vary with both establishment size and health. For example, Troske (1999, Table 3) finds that controlling for workforce characteristics decreases (but not eliminates) the wage-size premium. Obviously, workforce demographics may also be related to health. For this reason in my second set of regressions I add the following workers' characteristics to the base regression: age, family size and dummies for race, Hispanic, foreign-born and marriage status.

In a third set of regressions I then add a set of education dummies for various education categories. This is to account for the fact that more educated workers tend to work in larger establishments (Troske (1999, p. 20)) and that they may also have better health outcomes (e.g. Cutler et al. (2006)).

The occupational mix may vary across employers of different size. Moreover, occupation may affect health (Fletcher et al. (2011) and Kelly et al. (2014)). To account for this, in my fourth model I add occupation dummies.

Health may affect labor supply (Currie and Madrian (1999)). Even though my sample

only includes working people (so that I can use the information on employer size), health may also affect labor supply *conditional on being employed*. Given that smaller employers may employ more part-time workers, this fact may potentially confound the correlation between establishment size and health. Relatedly, Brown and Medoff (1989, p. 1041) find that job tenure increases with employer size. For these reasons, in another set of regressions, I also include in my model tenure with the employer and a dummy for full-time, where full-time is defined as usually working at least 35 hours of work.

I then add last year's personal earnings to my model.[4] While I report the results with earnings for completeness, they are not my main focus here. First, as discussed in section 4, my measure of earnings has many limitations. Second, I already include education which also captures some of the income variation.[5] Finally and most importantly, as already mentioned above, the labor economics literature documents the establishment size gradient of earnings. My focus here is instead on documenting any establishment size gradient of health *over and above* the gradient of earnings. In other words, we already know that workers at larger establishments earn more on average: I am interested in knowing whether on average they are also healthier, or less healthy.

In my last set of models, I add a dummy for whether health insurance is offered at work or not. This is to account for the fact that sicker workers value health insurance more than healthy workers and so they may prefer to work for larger employers because those employers are more likely to offer health insurance (Kapur et al. (2008)).

Even if I use a simple Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) to estimate the linear probability model (1), some additional methodological remarks are in order. The dataset I use is from a multistage probability sample that incorporates stratification, clustering, and oversampling of some subpopulations (Black, Hispanic, and Asian) in some years. To account for the complex nature of the sample, I follow the recommendations from the Minnesota Population

[4]Similarly, Cutler and Lleras-Muney (2006, Table 1) control for family income and Kapur et al. (2008) control for wages.

[5]It is important to note here that Cutler and Lleras-Muney (2006) find that the effect of education on health persists even after accounting for income.

Center from which I obtain the data (Blewett et al. (2016b)). First, I use weights in my regressions. The weight of an observation is given by the inverse probability of selection of that observation into the sample, with adjustment for non-response and post-stratification adjustments for demographics (age, race/ethnicity, and sex) (see the *Variance* section of Blewett et al. (2016b)). Second, given that I use data from several years, I divide the sampling weight by the number of years I pool. Third, in order to obtain standard errors which are appropriate for the sample design, I use information about the primary sampling unit and the stratification.

4 Data

The data come from the NHIS as processed in the IPUMS NHIS by the Minnesota Population Center (Blewett et al. (2016a)). The NHIS is a cross-sectional household survey of the civilian, non-institutionalized U.S. population. Since 1997 the NHIS randomly samples an adult individual in a sampled household to provide more detailed information about her health and her work, including information on the main regressor of interest, i.e. *size* in regression (1). I use data since 1997 to 2014.

I keep in the sample only respondents who are: a) of ages 18 to 64 at the time of interview; b) working for pay during the week preceding the interview; c) working in the private sector (that is, not working for the government and not self-employed); d) who had no missing variables on the dependent and independent variables described below. Table 1 contains the descriptive statistics.[6]

The NHIS contains a host of questions about the health of the respondent. I use only health-related questions that are available each year of the 1997-2014 period. Based on these questions, I use various measures of *good* health as dependent variable h in regression (1). In particular, I construct several dummy variables, with the convention that 1 indicates better health and 0 lower health.

[6]Note that these statistics are not adjusted using the sampling weights.

First, I create a dummy which is equal to 1 if the respondent reports *never* being told by a doctor or other health professional to have at least one of the following *chronic* conditions: asthma, cancer, coronary heart disease, diabetes, heart attack, heart condition/disease, hypertension, stroke, ulcer. Conversely, the dummy is 0 if the respondent was ever diagnosed as having at least one of the above conditions. Note that there is no specific time-frame for these conditions: even if the respondent was diagnosed with e.g. hypertension twenty years before the interview, he will have a value of 0 for this dummy (obviously, as long as he recalls that diagnosis during the interview). About two thirds of respondents (65%) report never being diagnosed with any of these health conditions.

I also use a dummy for the respondent reporting *no* functional limitations - that is, no difficulty doing any of several specific activities - because of a health problem. Interviewers define "health problem" as "any physical, mental, or emotional problem or illness (not including pregnancy)."[7] 80% of the respondents report no functional limitation.

Individuals are also asked to rate their current health status on a five-point Likert scale, with possible answers being Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, and Excellent. I create a dummy for the respondent reporting excellent, very good or good health and 0 otherwise. A large percentage of respondents (94%) reports having good health or better.

I also use a dummy for a respondent reporting good mental health. As an indicator of good mental health, I use a value smaller than 5 on the Kessler 6-items scale.[8] The Kessler scale is a 0-24 measure of mental health which is obtained by summing the answers to six questions about psychological distress during the past 30 days, such as "During the past 30 days, how often did you feel that everything was an effort?". The possible answers are "none of the time", "a little of the time", "some of the time", "most of the time" and "all of the

[7]For a fuller documentation of this variable and the underlying activity questions on which it is based, see the documentation for the *flany* variable on the IPUMS NHIS website (Blewett et al. (2016a)). An example of activity question is: "By yourself, and without any special equipment, how difficult is it for you to push or pull large objects like a living room chair?"

[8]While a score greater than 12 on this scale is used as cutoff for severe mental distress, Prochaska et al. (2012) provide evidence that scores above or equal to 5 indicate moderate mental distress. So my dummy measures *absence* of moderate mental distress.

time" which are scored respectively with 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4. Many respondents (84%) report good mental health.

I also use a dummy for the respondent reporting having spent more than half a day in bed because of illness or injury in the past 12 months.[9] Following the NHIS terminology, I refer to these days as bed disability days. 63% of respondents did not report any bed disability days in the past 12 months.

Finally, as measures of health-related behaviors, I use a dummy for *not* being obese (75% of the sample) and a dummy for *not* currently being a smoker (76% of the sample).

The NHIS asks the respondent about the number of employees at her work location. The possible answers are: 1-9, 10- 24, 25-49, 50-99, 100-249, 250-499, 500-999, 1000+ employees. I use 1-9 employees as reference category and include dummy variables for all the other categories. A firm may have more than one establishment but I do not have data on the size of the firm, only on the size of the establishment.

As additional control variables, X in regression (1), I use a subset - or all - of the following regressors: dummies for race, hispanic ethnicity, gender, foreign-born, married and educational attainment; age, family size, years on the current job and a full-time status dummy; two-digit occupation dummies; earnings as described below; a dummy for being offered health insurance coverage at work. All regressions I run include two-digit industry dummies, year and Census regions dummies.[10]

While 34% of respondents work in an establishment with less than 25 employees, 20% of them work in an establishment with 1000 or more employees (Table 1). The other respondents are distributed relatively evenly across the other establishment sizes. The respondents report a high tenure on their current job (almost 6.5 years) and 72% of them are offered health insurance at work.

[9]The dummy is based on the answer to the following survey question: "During the PAST 12 MONTHS [...] ABOUT how many days did illness or injury keep you in bed more than half of the day (include days while an overnight patient in a hospital)?".

[10]I slightly aggregate some occupation and industry codes because in the data some codes are used only in some years, not throughout the whole 1997-2014 period, and because some occupation and industry codes have only very few observations in them (e.g. Forestry and Fisheries is merged with Agriculture).

The NHIS collects information about nominal earnings in the previous year but it reports this information in income brackets. In order to convert the information to real earnings and to use a comparable measure over time, I do the following. First, I impute the mid-point earnings for everybody in a given income bracket (e.g. $7,500 for those in the $5,000-$9,999 bracket). I then convert these values to real 2014 dollars using the Personal Consumption Expenditure index (PCE). The top bracket is for $75,000 and higher yearly earnings. I set the earning variable to zero for these observations and create a dummy which is equal to 1 only for those in the top-bracket. Using the same logic, I create other dummies for those whose earnings are missing, differentiating among the reasons the earnings variable is missing.[11] In the regressions I include the real imputed earnings variable together with these other dummies.[12]

Tables A1 and A2 in the Appendix tabulate the means of several regressors by establishment size.[13] While the average value for some demographics - e.g. age and gender - do not change much across establishment size, others do: e.g. larger establishments have fewer white, fewer hispanic and fewer foreign workers but more black ones. Importantly, larger establishments have fewer high-school dropouts, fewer workers with only high-school and more workers with a college education or higher. Tenure, full-time status, earnings and health insurance offer also tend to increase with establishment size. This variation of health determinants across establishments of different size motivates the regression approach to which I now turn.

[11] More specifically, I create a dummy equal to 1 if earnings are missing because the respondent was not in the universe of the question (this happens only in less than 2% of my sample). I also create a dummy if earnings are missing because they were reported as unknown (e.g. the respondent refused or did not know): this last category includes 15% of my sample.

[12] Cawley (2004) also uses dummies to handle observations with missing values on a particular variable.

[13] These means are not adjusted for stratification and sampling weights. I have also computed these means using a weighted OLS regression that accounts for stratification and recomputed the means by establishment size. While the actual mean of some variable changes, e.g. the race dummies, the patterns of the regressors across establishment size is very similar to the one in tables A1 and A2.

5 Results

Tables 2 to 8 contain the main results. I run seven nested models, adding more regressors moving from column 1 to column 7. All regressions include year, region and industry dummies. In the most parsimonious model, in addition to these dummies, I only include the main regressors, i.e. the establishment size dummies. The omitted size category is establishments with 1 to 9 employees.

5.1 Chronic Conditions and Functional Limitations

Table 2 contains the results for the no chronic health conditions dummy. The first column shows that, when only including year, region and industry dummies, chronic conditions move non-linearly with establishment size. Workers in establishments with 10 to 49 employees are healthier than the ones in very small establishments (1 to 9 employees). As size increases further, chronic conditions worsen, with employees in the 250-499 category being the most affected. However, when adding even just demographics (column 2), the effect on workers in establishments with 10 to 49 employees disappears. On the other hand, across all models, employees in the 250-499 category and 1000+ category remain the most affected by health chronic conditions. In all specifications the Wald test rejects the hypothesis that all the establishment size dummies are zero. In terms of magnitudes, according to, e.g., column 7, the probability of not having chronic health conditions is lower by 2.1 percentage points for employees in the 250-499 and 1000+ categories, relative to those in the 1 to 9 group. This coefficient is not small: it is comparable, in absolute value, to being black (minus 2.4 percentage points) and to being married (plus 1.9 percentage points).

Table 3 contains the results for the no functional limitation dummy as dependent variable. According to columns 1 to 4, workers in the 25 to 99 establishments and those in the largest ones (1000+) are less likely to report functional limitations. In models that control for tenure and full-time status (column 5, 6 and 7), the coefficient on the 25 to 49 category remains

positive and significant while the coefficients on the 250 to 499 and 500 to 999 categories become more negative and significant. One of the messages from this table is that workers in the large, but not largest, establishments (i.e. with 250 to 999 employees) tend to do poorly in terms of functional limitations, either because they are not better than those in the smallest establishments (as in columns 1 to 4) or because they are actually worse than all other establishments (as in columns 5 through 7). Finally, the coefficient on the largest establishments becomes statistically insignificant in models where I control for job tenure and full-time status (columns 5 to 7). I elaborate on this fact below, after I have reported the results for good self-reported health status and good mental health where I find a similar pattern.

5.2 Health Status and Mental Health

Table 4 reports the results for the good self-reported health status dummy. While in the more parsimonious models (columns 1 and 2), good health seems to somewhat increase with establishment size, the inclusion of education dummies in column 3 takes away the significance of several coefficients. This is likely due to the fact that education is correlated with income and income may be correlated with good self-reported health status (Currie and Madrian (1999, p. 3315)). When other controls are added (columns 5 to 7), the sign and/or statistical significance of the coefficients change and the Wald test does not reject the hypothesis that all the establishment dummies are equal. Overall, there is no clear pattern emerging for the relationship between self-reported health status and establishment size. This result contrasts with the ones above and also with many of the results below for other health measures. For this reason, self-reported health status is likely not the best proxy of health to study how workers' health varies across establishment size. This limits the usefulness of the Current Population Survey (CPS) to study this topic, given that the CPS, while very rich in worker level data, only collects data about self-reported health status.

Table 5 contains the results for the good mental health status dummy, where good mental

health is defined as absence of moderate mental distress. In model 1, the coefficients on the establishment size dummies display a non-linear pattern. Workers who work in establishments either with 10 to 99 employees or with at least 500 employees fare better in terms of mental health than workers in either the smallest establishments or establishments with 100 to 499 employees. This result is fairly robust to the inclusion of demographic controls, education and occupation dummies (columns 2 through 4), even though the premium on the largest establishments is reduced in both size and statistical significance. In terms of magnitudes, the coefficient on e.g. the 50 to 99 category from column 4 (i.e. 0.011) is about 24% of the marriage premium to mental health (i.e. 0.046).

The results change when full-time status and job tenure are included in the model (columns 5 to 7). The above pattern in the coefficients disappears, with almost all coefficients losing statistical significance. The explanation for the different results between these two sets of models is the following. As Table A1 in the Appendix shows, full-time status and job tenure tend to increase with establishment size. In my sample, I also find that better mental health is also correlated with full-time status and job tenure.[14] For these reasons, controlling for full-time status and job tenure reduces the magnitude and significance of the mental health premia found in models 1 to 4 for some of the establishments larger than the smallest ones.[15] According to this line of reasoning, though, we would have expected the mental health premia to appear for *all* larger establishments in models 1 to 4. Instead, in such models, the coefficients on the 100-249, 250-499 and 500-999 categories are almost never significant. Even though workers in these establishments have longer job tenure and are

[14] I regress the measure of mental health on both full-time status and job tenure and find a statistically significant relationship for both regressors. The relationship is also large, especially for full-time status, which increases the probability of better mental health by 6 percentage points. Results available upon request. These results are not surprising given the literature on mental health. Ettner et al. (1997) find that psychiatric disorders reduce employment and Kessler and Frank (1997) find that they increase lost work days.

[15] A similar logic applies to the results for no functional limitations (table 3) and those for good self-reported health status (table 4). There too the coefficient on the largest establishment loses significance in model 5, relative to model 4. In unreported results, I find that, after controlling for age, both no functional limitations and good self-reported health status are positively correlated with both job tenure and full-time status.

more likely to work full-time than workers in the smallest establishments (1 to 9 employees), nonetheless they do not enjoy better mental health.

5.3 Bed Disability Days

Table 6 contains the results for the dummy for having no bed disability days in the past 12 months. Across all models, as establishment size increases, the probability of no bed disability day tends to decrease. In other words, workers in larger establishments are more likely to have had a bed disability day in the past 12 months. The coefficients are all strongly significant and large in terms of magnitude, being comparable to the coefficients for the college dummy. Controlling for health insurance offered at work (column 7) reduces, in absolute value, the coefficients on establishment size, but the coefficients still remain large and significant. This result is in line with the one in Monheit and Vistnes (1994, Exhibit 3) who, using a simple comparison of means, find that the number of bed days are higher at larger employers.[16]

5.4 Health-Related Behaviors

Table 7 contains the results for the dummy for *not* currently being a smoker. Smoking decreases with establishment size in model 1. Once controls for education are included, the effect persists only for establishments with at least 250 workers or more. When controlling for earnings (model 6), the coefficients for these establishments decrease in magnitude and become less statistically significant, even though they all remain significant at least at the the 10% confidence level.

Finally, Table 8 contains the results for the dummy for *not* being obese. A negative coefficient therefore indicates a higher probability of being obese. The coefficients on the

[16] I also rerun all the models in Table 6 also adding a dummy for having paid sick days at work. The results are in Table A15 in the Supplementary Appendix. Given that the availability of sick days increases with establishment size, when I control for paid sick days the magnitudes on the coefficients on establishment size get somewhat smaller. However, these coefficients remain strongly statistically significant and they still display the monotonic pattern present in Table 6.

10-24 category and for the establishments with 100 or more are negative across all models. The largest magnitudes, in absolute value, are for the 100-249, 250-499 and 500-999 categories: e.g., according to model 7, the probability of workers in establishments with 250 to 499 employees being obese is 3.2 percentage points higher than for workers in the smallest establishments. This coefficient is about a third (i.e. 0.032/0086) of the one on the college dummy.

I run several robustness checks and I report the results in the Supplementary Appendix. More specifically, I rerun all the regressions in Table 2 through 8 using a logistic regression rather OLS regressions. Moreover, in Table 2 through 8 I have used only binary measures of good health as dependent variable. When possible, I also run regressions using as dependent variables some non-binary measures such as the total number of chronic conditions. The robustness checks confirm the results I find in Tables 2 through 8.

6 Discussion

6.1 Workforce Health at the Largest Employers

The literature on labor economics find that workers at larger employers pay more, even after controlling for several characteristics. The review of the literature in section 2 suggests that the employer size-wage premium could be partially explained by differences in workers' health across employers of different size, with healthier and more productive workers working at larger firms. My results offer mixed support for this hypothesis. On one hand, workers at larger establishments are more likely to have chronic conditions, have had a bed disability day in the last 12 months and be obese. On the other hand, workers at larger establishments are less likely to be smokers. In models that do not control for job tenure and full-time status, workers at the largest establishments (1000+ employees) do better also in terms of functional limitations, health status and mental health.

It is worth discussing more the role of job tenure and full-time status by comparing

the results across model 4 and model 5 for each health outcome (Table 2 through Table 8). Model 5 includes all the regressors in model 4 plus tenure on the job and full-time status. For each health outcomes, except not being obese, the coefficient on the largest establishments (1000+ employees) decreases in model 5. This is more evident for the results for no functional limitations, good health status and good mental health where a positive and significant coefficient loses statistical significance once tenure on the job and full-time status are controlled for.

A possible explanation for this pattern of results is as follows. Larger firms, by offering more full-time and stable jobs, tend to hire fewer workers with a limited labor supply (that is, those who cannot work long hours or hold a stable job). If some health condition is partially responsible for the limited labor supply of these workers, then larger firms, by offering more full-time and stable jobs, also implicitly screen out these less healthy workers.[17]

Note that the above demand mechanism does not necessarily imply that workers at the largest firms will be healthier along every health dimension. As Kapur et al. (2008) point out, there is also a supply mechanism at work, with workers with high expected health costs preferring to work at larger firms where they can be covered by health insurance. We should expect the supply mechanism to prevail for those aspects of health which most affect the demand for health insurance, such as chronic health conditions. This is what I find in Table 2 where the coefficients for the three largest establishment sizes are negative and often significant in all models: this indicates that workers are more likely to have chronic conditions there. On the other hand, the demand side mechanism may counterbalance the supply side one for health conditions to which, possibly, the demand for EHI is less responsive. This is what I find in tables 3 through 5 for no functional limitation, good self-reported health status and good mental health. There, as previously mentioned, the coefficient for the largest establishment category is positive and significant when job tenure and full-time status are not controlled for.

[17]See Helpman et al. (2010, p. 1255-1256) for a discussion of screening at larger firms and for evidence that larger firms tend to screen workers more.

As mentioned in section 2, Kapur et al. (2008) also advance the hypothesis that smaller firms which offer EHI tend to screen out workers with more chronic health conditions. My results complicate this picture by suggesting that larger firms may also be screening out less healthy workers.

6.2 Comparison with Previous Results

It is useful to compare the result for chronic conditions to the results in Monheit and Vistnes (1994) and Kapur et al. (2008). Monheit and Vistnes (1994) use NHIS data from 1987 and define large firms as establishments with 25 employees or more. In a simple comparison of means, they find that small firms actually have a slightly higher percentage of employees with chronic health conditions (row 1 of their Exhibit 3). Using a regression framework, I instead find in Table 2 that health chronic conditions tend to be more prevalent at some of the largest establishments. Kapur et al. (2008) find that workers at small firms (25 or less employees) which offer health insurance have fewer chronic conditions than those who work at larger firms which offer health insurance.[18] My result in column 7 in Table 2 is in line with their result: even after controlling for health insurance being offered at work, workers in larger firms tend to have more chronic conditions than those at smaller firms. This result also complements Kapur et al. (2008)'s result by showing *where* chronic conditions get worse, i.e. at establishments with 250 workers or more, and not e.g. for those in the 50-249 category which Kapur et al. (2008) also define as large.

6.3 Relevance for Occupational Health

My results can also be related to other findings in the occupational health literature. After controlling for gender, hours, earnings, percent production workers and industry, Leigh (1989) finds that medium sized firms, that he defines as 20 to 999 workers, have the highest

[18]Kapur et al. (2008) also present similar results when small firms are defined as those with 50 or less employees.

rate of injuries and illnesses. To the extent that having a functional limitation increases the chance of injuries, the results in model 5 to 7 of Table 3 are somewhat in line with the one in Leigh (1989), at least for the largest among the medium sized firms (i.e. 250 to 999 workers). Moreover, Table 8 shows that the likelihood of a worker being obese is higher at large establishments, especially the ones with 100 to 999 employees. Various studies find that obesity is an important determinant of occupational injuries (Lin et al. (2013) and Janssen et al. (2011). Therefore, it is possible that the non-linear (inverted U-shape) relationship that Leigh (1989) finds between injury rate and firm size can be partially explained by the fact that obese workers - who have a higher chance of injury - are more likely to work in medium-sized firms. This hypothesis, only speculative now, may deserve further research scrutiny.

As for the result for bed disability days, it is important to note that bed disability days likely proxy not only health but also access to accommodations. Bronchetti and McInerney (2015) find that establishment size is an important determinant of whether a worker who got injured or became ill on the job is accommodated by the employer, with larger employers being much more likely to offer accommodations. My results suggest that this pattern holds true also for health issues in general, not just for job-related injuries and illnesses.

6.4 Wellness Programs and Public Programs

Wellness programs are more likely to be offered at larger companies than at smaller companies (Mattke et al. (2015)). These programs usually include smoking cessation (Mattke et al. (2013, Figure S.1)). To the extent that such programs are effective in reducing smoking, as found in Mattke et al. (2013), the results in Table 7 suggest that promoting access to these programs for workers in smaller companies may be beneficial, given that it is these workers who are more likely to be smokers.

Wellness programs also usually include weight control and fitness components (Mattke et al. (2013, Figure S.1)). As just mentioned, larger companies are more likely to offer these

programs. Table 8 suggests that promoting access to weight control programs for workers in smaller companies may not be a priority given that these workers are less likely to be obese.

Wellness programs also usually include disease management components (Mattke et al. (2013, Figure S.2)). Given the prevalence of health chronic conditions at larger, rather than smaller, employers (Table 2), the expansion of the disease management components of wellness programs to smaller employers does not seem to be a priority either.

As to public policy, one of the main goals of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health is to reduce work-related injuries and illnesses. In this regard, it is interesting to note how, according to Table 8, obesity is especially severe at middle-sized firms (100 to 999 employees). Given that, as already mentioned, obesity is one of the determinants of injuries, designing intervention programs with special attention to these firms may be warranted.

7 Conclusion

I use data from a large representative cross-sectional survey of the U.S. population to study how the health of the workers varies with the size of the establishment where they work. I find that workers at larger employers are more likely to have chronic conditions and being obese. Moreover, bed disability days increase with establishment size. On the other hand, workers at larger employers are less likely to smoke. Workers at the largest employers (1000+ workers) are also more likely to have no functional limitation, to report a good health status and good mental health: this health premium for the largest employers is due to the fact that these employers are also more likely to employ full-time workers and with workers with longer job tenure. The health-establishment size relationship displays non-linearities in some cases: for example, the probability of a worker being obese is highest for workers at medium-sized firms.

These results are relevant both for policy and for various other literatures. The prevalence of smoking at smaller companies suggests that these companies may benefit from a higher

availability of smoking cessation programs. I also document that obesity rates are highest at medium-sized firms (100 to 999 employees). Given that obesity increases the chance of work-related injuries, the prevalence of obesity at these medium-sized firms may explain the higher rate of occupational injuries that has been observed at these firms. Moreover, the results for obesity may help the design of more effective programs aimed at preventing injuries.

The finding that chronic health conditions are higher at larger employers accords well with previous findings in health economics. While I confirm this pattern for other measures of health (e.g. obesity), I also find that, for some dimensions of health, workers' health is higher at the largest employers (e.g. smoking). Given that the largest employers pay higher wages and tend to be more productive, this mixed patterns of results calls for more research to find out which dimension of health is more conducive to higher workers' productivity. I also find that controlling for job tenure and full-time status reduces the health premium (or increases the health penalty) of the largest establishments. This result suggests that the largest firms may use job characteristics to screen out less healthy workers. This mechanism deserves further research attention.

Other avenues for future research also include using firm-level data so as to control for firm-level characteristics. For example, firm's capital and total factor productivity may affect the relationship between establishment size and health. In recent work, Song et al. (2016) find that the increase in earnings inequality between workers over the last three decades has primarily been a between-firm, rather than a within-firm, phenomenon. Song et al. (2016) show that the increase in between-firm earnings inequality is mainly due to worker segregation, whereby more (less) highly paid workers tend to move into firms where other more (less) highly paid workers work. Employer-employee matched data would allow to see if a similar segregation occurs along the health dimension, not just the earnings dimension.

References

Abowd, J. M., F. Kramarz, and D. N. Margolis (1999). High wage workers and high wage firms. *Econometrica 67*(2), 251–333.

Bartelsman, E., J. Haltiwanger, and S. Scarpetta (2013). Cross-country differences in productivity: The role of allocation and selection. *American Economic Review 103*(1), 305–34.

Blewett, L. A., J. A. R. Drew, R. Griffin, M. L. King, and K. Williams (2016a). IPUMS Health Surveys: National Health Interview Survey, Version 6.2. http://doi.org/10.18128/D070.V6.2.

Blewett, L. A., J. A. R. Drew, R. Griffin, M. L. King, and K. Williams (2016b). User Notes, IPUMS Health Surveys: National Health Interview Survey, Version 6.2. http://doi.org/10.18128/D070.V6.2.

Bronchetti, E. T. and M. P. McInerney (2015). What determines employer accommodation of injured workers? the influence of workers compensation costs, state policies, and case characteristics. *ILR Review 68*(3), 558–583.

Brown, C. and J. Medoff (1989). The employer size-wage effect. *Journal of political Economy 97*(5), 1027–1059.

Buera, F. J. and J. P. Kaboski (2012). Scale and the origins of structural change. *Journal of Economic Theory 147*(2), 684–712.

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2015, March). Employee Benefits in the United States. Technical Report USDL-15-1432.

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2017, November). Employer-reported workplace injuries and illnesses (annual). `https://www.bls.gov/iif/oshwc/osh/os/qrtl1_00_2016.xlsx`.

Cawley, J. (2004). The impact of obesity on wages. *Journal of Human Resources 39*(2), 451–474.

Champoux, D. and J.-P. Brun (2003). Occupational health and safety management in small size enterprises: an overview of the situation and avenues for intervention and research. *Safety science 41*(4), 301–318.

Currie, J. and B. C. Madrian (1999). Health, Health Insurance and the Labor Market. *Handbook of Labor Economics 3*, 3309–3416.

Cutler, D., A. Deaton, and A. Lleras-Muney (2006). The determinants of mortality. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives 20*(3), 97–120.

Cutler, D. M. and A. Lleras-Muney (2006). Education and health: evaluating theories and evidence. Technical report, National bureau of economic research.

Ettner, S. L., R. G. Frank, and R. C. Kessler (1997). The impact of psychiatric disorders on labor market outcomes. *ILR Review 51*(1), 64–81.

Fabiano, B., F. Currò, and R. Pastorino (2004). A study of the relationship between occupational injuries and firm size and type in the italian industry. *Safety science 42*(7), 587–600.

Fenn, P. and S. Ashby (2004). Workplace risk, establishment size and union density. *British Journal of Industrial Relations 42*(3), 461–480.

Fletcher, J. M., J. L. Sindelar, and S. Yamaguchi (2011). Cumulative effects of job characteristics on health. *Health economics 20*(5), 553–570.

Gabaix, X. (2011). The granular origins of aggregate fluctuations. *Econometrica 79*(3), 733–772.

Galizzi, M. (2013). On the recurrence of occupational injuries and workers' compensation claims. *Health economics 22*(5), 582–599.

Helpman, E., O. Itskhoki, and S. Redding (2010). Inequality and unemployment in a global economy. *Econometrica 78*(4), 1239–1283.

Janssen, I., E. Bacon, and W. Pickett (2011). Obesity and its relationship with occupational injury in the canadian workforce. *Journal of obesity 2011*.

Jansson, B., M. Stenbacka, A. Leifman, and A. Romelsjö (2004). A small fraction of patients with repetitive injuries account for a large portion of medical costs. *The European Journal of Public Health 14*(2), 161–167.

Kapur, K., J. J. Escarce, M. S. Marquis, and K. I. Simon (2008). Where do the sick go? health insurance and employment in small and large firms. *Southern Economic Journal*, 644–664.

Kelly, I. R., D. M. Dave, J. L. Sindelar, and W. T. Gallo (2014). The impact of early occupational choice on health behaviors. *Review of Economics of the Household 12*(4), 737–770.

Kessler, R. C. and R. G. Frank (1997). The impact of psychiatric disorders on work loss days. *Psychological medicine 27*(4), 861–873.

Leigh, J. P. (1989). Firm size and occupational injury and illness incidence rates in manufacturing industries. *Journal of Community Health 14*(1), 44–52.

Leigh, J. P., J. P. Marcin, and T. R. Miller (2004). An estimate of the us government's undercount of nonfatal occupational injuries. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine 46*(1), 10–18.

Lin, T.-c., S. K. Verma, and T. K. Courtney (2013). Does obesity contribute to non-fatal occupational injury? evidence from the national longitudinal survey of youth. *Scandinavian journal of work, environment & health*, 268–275.

Luttmer, E. G. (2007). Selection, growth, and the size distribution of firms. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics 122*(3), 1103–1144.

Mattke, S., K. Kapinos, J. P. Caloyeras, E. A. Taylor, B. Batorsky, H. Liu, K. R. Van Busum, and S. Newberry (2015). Workplace wellness programs: Services offered, participation, and incentives. *Rand health quarterly 5*(2).

Mattke, S., H. Liu, J. Caloyeras, C. Huang, K. Van Busum, D. Khodyakov, and V. Shier (2013). Workplace Wellness Programs Study: Final report. Technical report, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.

Melitz, M. J. (2003). The Impact of Trade on Intra-Industry Reallocations and Aggregate Industry Productivity. *Econometrica 71*(6), 1695–1725.

Melitz, M. J. (2008). International Trade and Heterogeneous Firms. *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics 2*.

Monheit, A. C. and J. P. Vistnes (1994). Implicit pooling of workers from large and small firms. *Health Affairs 13*(1), 301–314.

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (2017). Total worker health. `https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/twh/totalhealth.html`.

Oleinick, A., J. V. Gluck, and K. E. Guire (1995). Establishment size and risk of occupational injury. *American journal of industrial medicine 28*(1), 1–21.

Pollitz, K., , and M. Rae (2016, May). Workplace Wellness Programs Characteristics and Requirements. `https://www.kff.org/private-insurance/issue-brief/workplace-wellness-programs-characteristics-and-requirements/`.

Prochaska, J. J., H.-Y. Sung, W. Max, Y. Shi, and M. Ong (2012). Validity study of the k6 scale as a measure of moderate mental distress based on mental health treatment need and utilization. *International journal of methods in psychiatric research 21*(2), 88–97.

Ruhm, C. J. (2000). Are recessions good for your health? *The Quarterly journal of economics 115*(2), 617–650.

Song, J., D. J. Price, F. Guvenen, N. Bloom, and T. Von Wachter (2016). Firming Up Inequality. Technical Report Working Paper 23371, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Sørensen, O. H., P. Hasle, and E. Bach (2007). Working in small enterprises–is there a special risk? *Safety Science 45*(10), 1044–1059.

Troske, K. R. (1999). Evidence on the employer size-wage premium from worker-establishment matched data. *Review of Economics and Statistics 81*(1), 15–26.

Table 1: Summary Statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
Has No Chronic Condition	0.65	0.48
No Functional Limitations	0.8	0.4
Good Self-Reported Health	0.94	0.23
Good Mental Health	0.84	0.37
No Bed disability days, past 12 months	0.63	0.48
Not Obese	0.75	0.43
Not Currently Smoking	0.76	0.43
1 to 9 employees	0.19	0.39
10 to 24 employees	0.15	0.36
25 to 49 employees	0.11	0.32
50 to 99 employees	0.1	0.3
100 to 249 employees	0.12	0.32
250 to 499 employees	0.07	0.26
500 to 999 employees	0.05	0.22
1000+ employees	0.2	0.4
Age	38.79	11.87
White	0.79	0.41
Black	0.14	0.34
Non-white and non-black	0.07	0.26
Hispanic	0.19	0.39
Male	0.51	0.5
Born Outside U.S.	0.19	0.39
Married	0.47	0.5
Family Size	2.61	1.49
High-School Dropout	0.11	0.31
High-School	0.3	0.46
Some College	0.33	0.47
College	0.19	0.39
More than College	0.08	0.27
Years on Current Job	6.44	7.65
Works Full-Time	0.82	0.39
Yearly earnings (2014k)	31.89	29.49
Offered Health Ins. At Work	0.72	0.45
N	196754	

Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

Table 2: No Chronic Health Condition: OLS Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.011**	0.004	0.004	0.005	0.003	0.001	0.002
	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
25-49	0.011**	0.006	0.005	0.007	0.004	0.002	0.003
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
50-99	-0.008	-0.005	-0.006	-0.004	-0.008	-0.010*	-0.008
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
100-249	-0.009*	-0.002	-0.005	-0.002	-0.006	-0.010*	-0.008
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
250-499	-0.022***	-0.013**	-0.017***	-0.014**	-0.020***	-0.023***	-0.021***
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
500-999	-0.011	-0.005	-0.009	-0.008	-0.013*	-0.017**	-0.015**
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
1000+	-0.013**	-0.008*	-0.015***	-0.013***	-0.018***	-0.023***	-0.021***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Age		-0.010***	-0.010***	-0.010***	-0.010***	-0.010***	-0.010***
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		-0.031***	-0.025***	-0.024***	-0.025***	-0.024***	-0.024***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Other		0.000	-0.004	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003
		(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Hispanic		0.019***	0.030***	0.029***	0.028***	0.030***	0.030***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Male		0.006*	0.002	0.002	-0.002	-0.007**	-0.007**
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Born Outside U.S.		0.116***	0.112***	0.110***	0.110***	0.111***	0.111***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Married		0.026***	0.021***	0.021***	0.020***	0.019***	0.019***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Family Size		0.003**	0.004***	0.004***	0.004***	0.004***	0.004***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.017***	0.018***	0.017***	0.013***	0.013***
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Some College			0.004	0.005	0.006	0.000	0.001
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
College			0.055***	0.059***	0.058***	0.048***	0.049***
			(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
More than College			0.073***	0.081***	0.082***	0.067***	0.067***
			(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Years on Current Job					0.001***	0.000**	0.000**
					(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Works Full-Time					0.030***	0.022***	0.024***
					(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.001***	0.001***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.007**
							(0.003)
Constant	0.753***	1.039***	1.028***	0.999***	0.981***	0.956***	0.957***
	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared	0.008	0.076	0.078	0.079	0.079	0.081	0.081
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.035	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000

All models are ordinary least squares regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for having never being diagnosed any of the health conditions reported in the text (see text for details). All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table 3: No Functional Limitation: OLS Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.008**	0.002	0.002	0.002	-0.001	-0.002	-0.002
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
25-49	0.020***	0.013***	0.012***	0.013***	0.009**	0.007*	0.007*
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
50-99	0.013***	0.012***	0.009**	0.011**	0.006	0.004	0.004
	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)
100-249	0.002	0.002	-0.001	0.001	-0.004	-0.007*	-0.007
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
250-499	-0.000	0.001	-0.004	-0.001	-0.009*	-0.012**	-0.012**
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
500-999	-0.001	-0.002	-0.008	-0.006	-0.013**	-0.017***	-0.016***
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
1000+	0.020***	0.016***	0.007	0.009**	0.001	-0.004	-0.004
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Age		-0.007***	-0.007***	-0.007***	-0.007***	-0.008***	-0.008***
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		0.030***	0.037***	0.039***	0.039***	0.039***	0.039***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Other		0.016***	0.010**	0.011***	0.012***	0.012***	0.012***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Hispanic		0.014***	0.030***	0.030***	0.029***	0.031***	0.031***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Male		0.070***	0.065***	0.067***	0.062***	0.055***	0.055***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Born Outside U.S.		0.077***	0.073***	0.074***	0.074***	0.075***	0.075***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Married		0.025***	0.019***	0.018***	0.016***	0.015***	0.015***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Family Size		-0.002	0.000	0.000	0.001	-0.000	-0.000
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.021***	0.020***	0.018***	0.014***	0.014***
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Some College			0.022***	0.019***	0.019***	0.014***	0.014***
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
College			0.082***	0.074***	0.073***	0.062***	0.062***
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
More than College			0.097***	0.088***	0.089***	0.070***	0.070***
			(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Years on Current Job					0.002***	0.001***	0.001***
					(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Works Full-Time					0.041***	0.032***	0.033***
					(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.001***	0.001***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.002
							(0.003)
Constant	0.790***	0.939***	0.917***	0.935***	0.911***	0.884***	0.884***
	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared	0.007	0.056	0.061	0.062	0.064	0.068	0.068
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.000

All models are ordinary least squares regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for reporting *no* functional limitations (see text for details). All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table 4: Good Health Status: OLS Regressions

	(1) b/se	(2) b/se	(3) b/se	(4) b/se	(5) b/se	(6) b/se	(7) b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.005**	0.004*	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.000	0.000
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
25-49	0.006***	0.004*	0.003	0.003	0.002	-0.000	-0.001
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
50-99	0.006**	0.006**	0.003	0.004*	0.002	-0.000	-0.001
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
100-249	0.002	0.003	0.000	0.001	-0.001	-0.004**	-0.005**
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
250-499	0.011***	0.012***	0.008***	0.009***	0.005**	0.002	0.001
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
500-999	0.007***	0.007***	0.002	0.003	-0.000	-0.004	-0.005*
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
1000+	0.012***	0.013***	0.006***	0.006***	0.003	-0.002	-0.002
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Age		-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.002***
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		-0.027***	-0.023***	-0.021***	-0.021***	-0.020***	-0.020***
		(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Other		-0.012***	-0.017***	-0.016***	-0.016***	-0.016***	-0.016***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Hispanic		-0.028***	-0.013***	-0.012***	-0.013***	-0.011***	-0.011***
		(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Male		0.009***	0.008***	0.009***	0.007***	0.003*	0.003**
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Born Outside U.S.		0.008***	0.011***	0.013***	0.013***	0.014***	0.014***
		(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Married		0.018***	0.014***	0.012***	0.012***	0.010***	0.010***
		(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Family Size		-0.001**	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.046***	0.043***	0.042***	0.040***	0.040***
			(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Some College			0.061***	0.056***	0.056***	0.052***	0.052***
			(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
College			0.082***	0.071***	0.071***	0.064***	0.063***
			(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
More than College			0.088***	0.076***	0.076***	0.066***	0.066***
			(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Years on Current Job					0.001***	0.000***	0.000***
					(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Works Full-Time					0.019***	0.013***	0.012***
					(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.000***	0.000***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							0.003*
							(0.002)
Constant	0.941***	1.012***	0.968***	1.000***	0.989***	0.975***	0.974***
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared	0.005	0.020	0.028	0.030	0.031	0.034	0.034
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.008	0.007	0.204	0.221	0.151

All models are ordinary least squares regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for an excellent, very good or good self-reported health status. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table 5: Good Mental Health: OLS Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.006*	0.007**	0.006*	0.007**	0.004	0.003	0.003
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
25-49	0.012***	0.012***	0.010**	0.012***	0.008**	0.006	0.006
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
50-99	0.012***	0.011***	0.009**	0.011***	0.006	0.004	0.004
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
100-249	0.006	0.004	0.001	0.003	-0.003	-0.006	-0.006
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
250-499	0.004	0.003	-0.001	0.001	-0.007	-0.011**	-0.010**
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
500-999	0.011**	0.010**	0.005	0.007	-0.001	-0.005	-0.005
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
1000+	0.018***	0.015***	0.007*	0.008**	-0.001	-0.006	-0.006
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Age		0.001***	0.001***	0.001***	-0.000	-0.000***	-0.000***
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		0.003	0.008**	0.012***	0.012***	0.012***	0.012***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Other		-0.001	-0.006	-0.005	-0.004	-0.004	-0.004
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Hispanic		-0.002	0.013***	0.014***	0.013***	0.015***	0.015***
		(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Male		0.049***	0.046***	0.047***	0.042***	0.036***	0.036***
		(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Born Outside U.S.		0.024***	0.024***	0.026***	0.027***	0.028***	0.028***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Married		0.052***	0.048***	0.046***	0.043***	0.042***	0.042***
		(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Family Size		-0.002*	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.038***	0.036***	0.033***	0.029***	0.030***
			(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Some College			0.043***	0.036***	0.036***	0.031***	0.031***
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
College			0.083***	0.071***	0.072***	0.062***	0.062***
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
More than College			0.088***	0.076***	0.078***	0.063***	0.063***
			(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Years on Current Job					0.002***	0.002***	0.002***
					(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Works Full-Time					0.037***	0.029***	0.029***
					(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.001***	0.001***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.001
							(0.003)
Constant	0.839***	0.743***	0.708***	0.733***	0.714***	0.689***	0.689***
	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared	0.008	0.019	0.023	0.024	0.028	0.031	0.031
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.003	0.056	0.041	0.033	0.005	0.005

All models are ordinary least squares regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for good mental health, corresponding to a value of the 6-items Kessler Scale smaller than 5. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table 6: No Bed Disability Days: OLS Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	-0.026***	-0.024***	-0.024***	-0.023***	-0.024***	-0.023***	-0.018***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
25-49	-0.032***	-0.031***	-0.030***	-0.029***	-0.031***	-0.029***	-0.023***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
50-99	-0.030***	-0.032***	-0.030***	-0.030***	-0.031***	-0.029***	-0.021***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)
100-249	-0.032***	-0.035***	-0.033***	-0.032***	-0.034***	-0.031***	-0.023***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
250-499	-0.041***	-0.042***	-0.040***	-0.038***	-0.041***	-0.038***	-0.029***
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
500-999	-0.045***	-0.044***	-0.041***	-0.039***	-0.043***	-0.040***	-0.031***
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
1000+	-0.043***	-0.048***	-0.044***	-0.041***	-0.045***	-0.043***	-0.034***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Age		0.003***	0.003***	0.003***	0.002***	0.002***	0.002***
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		0.064***	0.062***	0.060***	0.060***	0.059***	0.060***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Other		0.024***	0.026***	0.027***	0.028***	0.027***	0.028***
		(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Hispanic		0.049***	0.039***	0.038***	0.037***	0.037***	0.037***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Male		0.097***	0.097***	0.092***	0.090***	0.090***	0.089***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Born Outside U.S.		0.098***	0.094***	0.092***	0.093***	0.092***	0.090***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Married		0.006*	0.008**	0.010***	0.009***	0.011***	0.012***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Family Size		0.006***	0.005***	0.005***	0.005***	0.004***	0.003***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			-0.020***	-0.015***	-0.016***	-0.016***	-0.013***
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Some College			-0.057***	-0.046***	-0.046***	-0.044***	-0.042***
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
College			-0.049***	-0.031***	-0.030***	-0.029***	-0.026***
			(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
More than College			-0.047***	-0.023***	-0.021***	-0.023***	-0.020***
			(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Years on Current Job					0.002***	0.002***	0.002***
					(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Works Full-Time					0.009**	0.013***	0.020***
					(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						-0.000**	-0.000
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.031***
							(0.004)
Constant	0.734***	0.479***	0.510***	0.490***	0.489***	0.483***	0.483***
	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared	0.012	0.037	0.038	0.039	0.040	0.042	0.042
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

All models are ordinary least squares regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for not having any bed disability day in the past 12 months. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).
* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table 7: Not a Current Smoker: OLS Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.004	0.006	0.004	0.004	0.006	0.004	0.005
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
25-49	0.009*	0.011**	0.005	0.006	0.007*	0.005	0.007
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)
50-99	0.012**	0.013**	0.004	0.005	0.007	0.005	0.007
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
100-249	0.014***	0.014***	0.003	0.005	0.006	0.003	0.005
	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)
250-499	0.027***	0.029***	0.013**	0.014**	0.013**	0.009*	0.011**
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)
500-999	0.034***	0.036***	0.017***	0.018***	0.015***	0.011*	0.013**
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
1000+	0.054***	0.054***	0.026***	0.025***	0.020***	0.015***	0.016***
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Age		-0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.001***	-0.001***	-0.001***
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		0.058***	0.076***	0.079***	0.082***	0.083***	0.083***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Other		0.011**	-0.005	-0.006	-0.004	-0.003	-0.003
		(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Hispanic		0.063***	0.112***	0.114***	0.116***	0.117***	0.117***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Male		-0.019***	-0.028***	-0.017***	-0.017***	-0.022***	-0.022***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Born Outside U.S.		0.068***	0.066***	0.069***	0.075***	0.076***	0.076***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Married		0.094***	0.078***	0.076***	0.074***	0.073***	0.073***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Family Size		0.001	0.007***	0.007***	0.007***	0.006***	0.006***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.066***	0.060***	0.060***	0.057***	0.057***
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Some College			0.150***	0.136***	0.137***	0.132***	0.133***
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
College			0.254***	0.229***	0.234***	0.224***	0.225***
			(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
More than College			0.280***	0.251***	0.258***	0.243***	0.244***
			(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Years on Current Job					0.005***	0.004***	0.004***
					(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Works Full-Time					-0.036***	-0.043***	-0.041***
					(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.001***	0.001***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.006*
							(0.003)
Constant	0.692***	0.607***	0.511***	0.572***	0.610***	0.590***	0.590***
	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared	0.035	0.057	0.088	0.091	0.096	0.098	0.098
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.040	0.019

All models are ordinary least squares regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for not currently being a smoker. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).
* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table 8: Not Obese: OLS Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	-0.015***	-0.015***	-0.015***	-0.014***	-0.012***	-0.012***	-0.009**
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
25-49	-0.010**	-0.008*	-0.009**	-0.007	-0.005	-0.005	-0.001
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
50-99	-0.013***	-0.009**	-0.012***	-0.010**	-0.007	-0.007	-0.002
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
100-249	-0.035***	-0.028***	-0.033***	-0.030***	-0.027***	-0.027***	-0.022***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
250-499	-0.044***	-0.037***	-0.043***	-0.041***	-0.037***	-0.037***	-0.032***
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
500-999	-0.038***	-0.034***	-0.042***	-0.040***	-0.037***	-0.037***	-0.031***
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.007)
1000+	-0.020***	-0.015***	-0.028***	-0.026***	-0.023***	-0.024***	-0.019***
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Age		-0.004***	-0.004***	-0.004***	-0.004***	-0.004***	-0.004***
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		-0.106***	-0.097***	-0.094***	-0.093***	-0.093***	-0.093***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Other		0.028***	0.021***	0.022***	0.022***	0.022***	0.022***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Hispanic		-0.093***	-0.075***	-0.076***	-0.075***	-0.074***	-0.075***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Male		-0.015***	-0.021***	-0.020***	-0.017***	-0.020***	-0.020***
		(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Born Outside U.S.		0.118***	0.111***	0.109***	0.110***	0.111***	0.109***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Married		-0.004	-0.012***	-0.012***	-0.011***	-0.010***	-0.010***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Family Size		-0.012***	-0.009***	-0.009***	-0.010***	-0.010***	-0.011***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.011**	0.013***	0.014***	0.014***	0.015***
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Some College			0.018***	0.019***	0.019***	0.019***	0.020***
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
College			0.088***	0.086***	0.087***	0.084***	0.086***
			(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
More than College			0.125***	0.123***	0.124***	0.117***	0.118***
			(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Years on Current Job					-0.000	-0.000	-0.000
					(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Works Full-Time					-0.026***	-0.026***	-0.022***
					(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.000	0.000**
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.019***
							(0.003)
Constant	0.856***	1.031***	1.015***	0.961***	0.978***	0.970***	0.971***
	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared	0.013	0.038	0.044	0.046	0.047	0.048	0.048
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

All models are ordinary least squares regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for not currently being obese. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).
* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Supplementary Appendix

Tables A1 and A2 tabulate the means of several regressors by establishment size.

A Robustness Checks

I run several robustness checks and I report the results below.

A.1 Logit Models

I rerun all the regressions in Tables 2 through 8 using a logistic rather than an OLS regression. The results from the logistic regressions are contained in tables A3 through A9: in terms of sign and statistical significance, the results are virtually unchanged relative to the OLS ones.

A.2 Non-Binary Dependent Variables

In my main results I have used only binary measures of good health as dependent variable. When possible, I also use as dependent variables some non-binary measures.

I start by using the total number of chronic health conditions as dependent variable. This variable ranges from 0 to 9 in my sample. Table A10 and A11 contain, respectively, the results for the OLS regressions and negative binomial regressions. Note that in both of these tables the dependent variable is a measure of *poor* health. Therefore a positive coefficient on an establishment size category indicates that, other things being equal, workers in that category have worse health than those in the smallest establishment. I also use negative binomial models to account for the large mass of zero values as 65% of the sample report zero chronic health conditions (Table 1). The results in Table A10 and A11 are very similar to those for OLS regressions of a no health chronic condition dummy (Table 2). Differently from Table 2, the coefficient on establishments with 1000 employees or more in column 1

and 2 is not significant when using the total number of chronic conditions as regressand. However, this coefficient remains significant in all the other models.

The good health status dummy is obtained by dichotomizing a Likert scale for good health status. In Table A12 I use as dependent variable the Likert scale for good health status, with a value of 1 being equal to poor health, 2 to fair, 3 to good, 4 to very good and 5 to excellent health. The coefficient on 1000+ employees remains negative in columns 6 and 7, as it was in Table 4, but now it becomes statistically significant. Otherwise the results are very similar to when I use a simple dummy for health status being good or better (Table 4).

The good mental health dummy is obtained by dichotomizing the Kessler scale, which ranges from 0 to 24, with higher values indicating worse mental health. In Table A13 I use OLS regressions and I use as dependent variable 24 minus the Kessler scale: so higher values of the dependent variable indicate better mental health. The results are very similar to the ones in Table 5 where I use the good mental health dummy as dependent variable. The Kessler Scale has a large mass (50%) at the value of 0, the lowest value of the scale, indicating excellent mental health. Moreover, 84% of the sample have a value of the scale smaller than 5 (Table 1). To account for this large mass at small values of the scale, in Table A14 I also use negative binomial regression models with the Kessler scale as dependent variable. Given that higher values of the scale indicate *worse* mental health, the signs of the estimates in this table need to be interpreted accordingly. Again, the results are very similar to the ones in Table 5 where I use the good mental health dummy as regressand.

The no bed disability days dummy is obtained by dichotomizing the total number of bed disability days. As a robustness check, I also use as dependent variable the total number of bed disability days. The total number of bed disability days ranges from 0 to 365 but it has a large mass of zeros as 63% of the sample reports zero bed disability days (Table 1). Moreover, less than 3% of the sample reports more than 10 bed disability days. To limit the effects of outliers, I winsorize the data at 10. Again, note that this variable is a proxy or *poor* health and so the signs of the estimates need to be interpreted accordingly when

we compare them with the results in Table 6. In Table A16 I use OLS regressions and in Table A17 I use negative binomial regressions to account for the large mass of zeros in this variable. The results are very similar to the ones in Table 6 where the no bed disability days dummy is used.

As a robustness check for not currently smoking, I also use as dependent variable the number of cigarettes smoked per day. In my sample this variable ranges from 0 (for those who do not currently smoke) to 90 but the variable has a large mass at zero as 76% of the sample reports not currently smoking (Table 1). Moreover, less than 1% of the sample reports more than 30 cigarettes per day. Therefore I winsorize the variable at 30. In Table A18 I use OLS regressions and in Table A19 I use negative binomial regressions to account for the large mass of zeros in this variable. The results are very similar to the ones in Table 7 where the no currently smoking dummy is used.

As a robustness check for the not obese dummy, I also use as dependent variable the Body Mass Index in Table A20. Again, I find the same results as in Table 8.

Table A1: **Demographic Variables by Establishment Size**

Estab. Size	Age	White	Black	Other Race	Hispanic	Male	Foreign Born	Married	Family Size
1-9	38.86	0.82	0.10	0.08	0.23	0.51	0.23	0.47	2.66
10-24	37.42	0.81	0.12	0.07	0.23	0.52	0.21	0.45	2.65
25-49	37.75	0.81	0.13	0.07	0.21	0.53	0.19	0.46	2.63
50-99	39.03	0.80	0.13	0.07	0.20	0.53	0.20	0.47	2.62
100-249	39.68	0.78	0.15	0.07	0.18	0.53	0.18	0.48	2.60
250-499	40.03	0.76	0.17	0.07	0.15	0.51	0.16	0.48	2.56
500-999	39.80	0.76	0.16	0.08	0.14	0.50	0.16	0.50	2.56
1000+	39.04	0.76	0.16	0.08	0.14	0.50	0.15	0.49	2.55

Tabulations based on the analysis sample described in the text. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

Table A2: **Education and Other Controls by Establishment Size**

Estab. Size	High-School Dropout	High-School	Some College	College	More than College	Job Tenure	Full-Time	Real Earnings	Health Insurance Offered at Work
1-9	0.15	0.32	0.32	0.15	0.06	5.49	0.73	25.44	0.43
10-24	0.14	0.32	0.33	0.16	0.06	5.25	0.77	27.96	0.61
25-49	0.12	0.31	0.34	0.17	0.06	5.56	0.80	29.89	0.70
50-99	0.12	0.30	0.33	0.19	0.07	6.20	0.84	31.74	0.78
100-249	0.10	0.30	0.33	0.20	0.08	6.75	0.86	33.55	0.84
250-499	0.08	0.30	0.32	0.21	0.09	7.57	0.89	35.27	0.88
500-999	0.07	0.27	0.33	0.23	0.10	7.84	0.88	36.23	0.90
1000+	0.07	0.25	0.33	0.24	0.11	7.96	0.86	39.16	0.88

Tabulations based on the analysis sample described in the text. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

Table A3: No Chronic Health Condition: Logit Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
Has No Chronic Condition							
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.048**	0.017	0.017	0.022	0.013	0.006	0.013
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
25-49	0.048**	0.025	0.022	0.031	0.018	0.007	0.017
	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)
50-99	-0.034	-0.027	-0.033	-0.023	-0.040	-0.051**	-0.039
	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)
100-249	-0.041*	-0.014	-0.025	-0.014	-0.033	-0.048**	-0.035
	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.025)
250-499	-0.097***	-0.065**	-0.080***	-0.070**	-0.094***	-0.111***	-0.099***
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.029)
500-999	-0.048	-0.029	-0.047	-0.038	-0.063**	-0.081**	-0.068**
	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.032)
1000+	-0.056**	-0.043*	-0.072***	-0.063***	-0.090***	-0.114***	-0.101***
	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)
Age		-0.045***	-0.045***	-0.045***	-0.047***	-0.048***	-0.048***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		-0.149***	-0.125***	-0.119***	-0.122***	-0.119***	-0.118***
		(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.019)
Other		-0.004	-0.022	-0.020	-0.019	-0.019	-0.018
		(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.030)
Hispanic		0.110***	0.157***	0.155***	0.151***	0.159***	0.159***
		(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Male		0.027*	0.010	0.011	-0.007	-0.033**	-0.033**
		(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Born Outside U.S.		0.581***	0.563***	0.557***	0.556***	0.564***	0.561***
		(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Married		0.104***	0.085***	0.086***	0.082***	0.075***	0.076***
		(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Family Size		0.010*	0.016***	0.016***	0.018***	0.015***	0.015***
		(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.082***	0.088***	0.082***	0.063**	0.066***
			(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)
Some College			0.014	0.023	0.023	-0.002	0.001
			(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)
College			0.245***	0.263***	0.263***	0.215***	0.218***
			(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.029)
More than College			0.330***	0.368***	0.371***	0.301***	0.305***
			(0.033)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)
Years on Current Job					0.004***	0.002**	0.002**
					(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Works Full-Time					0.137***	0.099***	0.109***
					(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.003***	0.003***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.044***
							(0.017)
Constant	1.098***	2.478***	2.427***	2.288***	2.205***	2.098***	2.099***
	(0.061)	(0.069)	(0.072)	(0.114)	(0.115)	(0.116)	(0.116)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared							
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.023	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000

All models are logistic regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for having never being diagnosed any of the health conditions reported in the text (see text for details). All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A4: No Functional Limitation: Logit Regressions

	(1) b/se	(2) b/se	(3) b/se	(4) b/se	(5) b/se	(6) b/se	(7) b/se
No Functional Limitations							
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.052**	0.009	0.007	0.011	-0.007	-0.015	-0.012
	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)
25-49	0.123***	0.081***	0.073***	0.082***	0.057**	0.042	0.047
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.028)	(0.029)
50-99	0.081***	0.069**	0.054*	0.067**	0.033	0.021	0.026
	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)
100-249	0.013	0.007	-0.014	0.002	-0.034	-0.054*	-0.048*
	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.029)
250-499	-0.001	0.001	-0.027	-0.010	-0.057*	-0.081**	-0.074**
	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.033)
500-999	-0.004	-0.019	-0.056	-0.040	-0.088**	-0.112***	-0.106***
	(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.038)
1000+	0.124***	0.098***	0.042	0.058**	0.006	-0.028	-0.022
	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)
Age		-0.042***	-0.042***	-0.042***	-0.045***	-0.046***	-0.046***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		0.198***	0.244***	0.258***	0.253***	0.259***	0.259***
		(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)
Other		0.114***	0.085**	0.091***	0.091***	0.090***	0.090***
		(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)
Hispanic		0.116***	0.210***	0.216***	0.208***	0.222***	0.221***
		(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)
Male		0.454***	0.426***	0.446***	0.414***	0.374***	0.374***
		(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)
Born Outside U.S.		0.583***	0.566***	0.570***	0.567***	0.578***	0.577***
		(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)
Married		0.138***	0.103***	0.097***	0.090***	0.083***	0.083***
		(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)
Family Size		-0.019***	-0.008	-0.009	-0.005	-0.010	-0.011
		(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.151***	0.142***	0.131***	0.104***	0.105***
			(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.031)
Some College			0.150***	0.120***	0.122***	0.089***	0.090***
			(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.032)
College			0.528***	0.471***	0.472***	0.400***	0.402***
			(0.033)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.036)
More than College			0.622***	0.566***	0.573***	0.456***	0.457***
			(0.042)	(0.045)	(0.045)	(0.046)	(0.046)
Years on Current Job					0.008***	0.005***	0.005***
					(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Works Full-Time					0.243***	0.187***	0.192***
					(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.021)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.004***	0.004***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.022
							(0.020)
Constant	1.338***	2.369***	2.216***	2.302***	2.149***	1.989***	1.989***
	(0.072)	(0.086)	(0.090)	(0.134)	(0.135)	(0.136)	(0.136)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared							
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.000	0.001

All models are logistic regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for reporting *no* functional limitations (see text for details). All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).
* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A5: Good Health Status: Logit Regressions

	(1) b/se	(2) b/se	(3) b/se	(4) b/se	(5) b/se	(6) b/se	(7) b/se
Good Self-Reported Health							
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.100**	0.071*	0.059	0.061	0.033	0.007	-0.003
	(0.039)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.041)
25-49	0.122**	0.085*	0.060	0.068	0.032	-0.009	-0.023
	(0.047)	(0.047)	(0.047)	(0.047)	(0.048)	(0.048)	(0.047)
50-99	0.112**	0.115**	0.075	0.092*	0.042	-0.008	-0.025
	(0.049)	(0.050)	(0.050)	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.052)
100-249	0.048	0.063	0.006	0.029	-0.028	-0.091**	-0.110**
	(0.043)	(0.044)	(0.044)	(0.044)	(0.045)	(0.045)	(0.046)
250-499	0.235***	0.260***	0.187***	0.208***	0.134**	0.061	0.042
	(0.056)	(0.056)	(0.056)	(0.057)	(0.057)	(0.058)	(0.059)
500-999	0.148**	0.149**	0.054	0.071	-0.003	-0.083	-0.103*
	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.061)	(0.061)
1000+	0.279***	0.283***	0.146***	0.156***	0.079*	-0.018	-0.038
	(0.044)	(0.045)	(0.045)	(0.045)	(0.046)	(0.046)	(0.047)
Age		-0.044***	-0.042***	-0.042***	-0.046***	-0.047***	-0.047***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		-0.513***	-0.415***	-0.365***	-0.373***	-0.350***	-0.351***
		(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.037)
Other		-0.251***	-0.320***	-0.307***	-0.306***	-0.292***	-0.294***
		(0.052)	(0.053)	(0.053)	(0.053)	(0.053)	(0.053)
Hispanic		-0.559***	-0.288***	-0.270***	-0.283***	-0.258***	-0.256***
		(0.039)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)
Male		0.188***	0.143***	0.179***	0.130***	0.042	0.043
		(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)
Born Outside U.S.		0.183***	0.240***	0.274***	0.263***	0.286***	0.290***
		(0.039)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)
Married		0.339***	0.265***	0.238***	0.228***	0.196***	0.195***
		(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)
Family Size		-0.037***	-0.007	-0.005	-0.002	-0.003	-0.002
		(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.574***	0.532***	0.518***	0.465***	0.461***
			(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.036)
Some College			0.878***	0.765***	0.770***	0.685***	0.682***
			(0.042)	(0.044)	(0.043)	(0.044)	(0.044)
College			1.538***	1.308***	1.312***	1.153***	1.149***
			(0.055)	(0.057)	(0.058)	(0.058)	(0.058)
More than College			1.721***	1.461***	1.473***	1.234***	1.231***
			(0.078)	(0.085)	(0.085)	(0.084)	(0.084)
Years on Current Job					0.010***	0.004**	0.003*
					(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Works Full-Time					0.357***	0.222***	0.210***
					(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.034)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.011***	0.011***
						(0.001)	(0.001)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							0.063*
							(0.033)
Constant	2.843***	4.481***	3.901***	4.703***	4.474***	4.087***	4.089***
	(0.120)	(0.138)	(0.144)	(0.268)	(0.271)	(0.268)	(0.269)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared							
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.005	0.004	0.139	0.221	0.152

All models are logistic regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for an excellent, very good or good self-reported health status. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).
* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A6: Good Mental Health: Logit Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
Good Mental Health							
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.046*	0.054**	0.048*	0.053**	0.034	0.025	0.027
	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.026)
25-49	0.091***	0.093***	0.081**	0.094***	0.067**	0.052	0.054*
	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)
50-99	0.091***	0.087***	0.067**	0.085***	0.048	0.033	0.036
	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)
100-249	0.042	0.030	0.003	0.024	-0.020	-0.041	-0.038
	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)
250-499	0.028	0.024	-0.012	0.005	-0.056	-0.081**	-0.077**
	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.036)
500-999	0.086**	0.079*	0.038	0.054	-0.011	-0.037	-0.034
	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.042)
1000+	0.137***	0.119***	0.058**	0.068**	-0.004	-0.039	-0.036
	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.030)
Age		0.005***	0.006***	0.005***	-0.001*	-0.003***	-0.003***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		0.023	0.065***	0.092***	0.092***	0.096***	0.096***
		(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)
Other		-0.002	-0.041	-0.036	-0.029	-0.029	-0.029
		(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)
Hispanic		-0.020	0.090***	0.100***	0.090***	0.102***	0.101***
		(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)
Male		0.374***	0.358***	0.369***	0.332***	0.291***	0.291***
		(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Born Outside U.S.		0.195***	0.197***	0.208***	0.212***	0.222***	0.221***
		(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)
Married		0.400***	0.361***	0.346***	0.330***	0.322***	0.322***
		(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Family Size		-0.009	0.007	0.007	0.011*	0.006	0.006
		(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.266***	0.248***	0.230***	0.204***	0.205***
			(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)
Some College			0.302***	0.251***	0.253***	0.218***	0.219***
			(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.032)
College			0.652***	0.559***	0.564***	0.490***	0.491***
			(0.036)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.039)
More than College			0.741***	0.643***	0.661***	0.542***	0.543***
			(0.046)	(0.048)	(0.048)	(0.050)	(0.050)
Years on Current Job					0.022***	0.018***	0.018***
					(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Works Full-Time					0.241***	0.186***	0.188***
					(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.005***	0.005***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.012
							(0.022)
Constant	1.655***	0.936***	0.672***	0.990***	0.876***	0.684***	0.684***
	(0.083)	(0.087)	(0.091)	(0.149)	(0.151)	(0.151)	(0.151)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared							
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.002	0.047	0.033	0.031	0.007	0.008

All models are logistic regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for good mental health, corresponding to a value of the Kessler Scale smaller than 5. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A7: No Bed Disability Days: Logit Regressions

	(1) b/se	(2) b/se	(3) b/se	(4) b/se	(5) b/se	(6) b/se	(7) b/se
No Bed disability days, past 12 months							
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	-0.115***	-0.110***	-0.107***	-0.107***	-0.110***	-0.105***	-0.084***
	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
25-49	-0.144***	-0.141***	-0.135***	-0.133***	-0.138***	-0.132***	-0.102***
	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)
50-99	-0.135***	-0.146***	-0.138***	-0.134***	-0.142***	-0.132***	-0.095***
	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)
100-249	-0.141***	-0.158***	-0.149***	-0.143***	-0.152***	-0.142***	-0.102***
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)
250-499	-0.179***	-0.190***	-0.179***	-0.171***	-0.185***	-0.173***	-0.132***
	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.028)
500-999	-0.196***	-0.199***	-0.186***	-0.177***	-0.193***	-0.181***	-0.139***
	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)
1000+	-0.187***	-0.214***	-0.196***	-0.183***	-0.202***	-0.192***	-0.152***
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Age		0.013***	0.012***	0.012***	0.010***	0.010***	0.010***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		0.289***	0.280***	0.268***	0.270***	0.266***	0.270***
		(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.019)
Other		0.100***	0.110***	0.116***	0.118***	0.113***	0.119***
		(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)
Hispanic		0.235***	0.191***	0.184***	0.183***	0.183***	0.180***
		(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Male		0.424***	0.425***	0.403***	0.395***	0.395***	0.394***
		(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.015)
Born Outside U.S.		0.475***	0.456***	0.448***	0.453***	0.449***	0.439***
		(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)
Married		0.028*	0.038**	0.045***	0.040***	0.051***	0.055***
		(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)
Family Size		0.028***	0.022***	0.021***	0.021***	0.016***	0.014***
		(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			-0.119***	-0.096***	-0.101***	-0.097***	-0.087***
			(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)
Some College			-0.280***	-0.231***	-0.231***	-0.219***	-0.209***
			(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)
College			-0.248***	-0.163***	-0.160***	-0.152***	-0.139***
			(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)
More than College			-0.244***	-0.135***	-0.127***	-0.132***	-0.119***
			(0.033)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.036)
Years on Current Job					0.007***	0.007***	0.008***
					(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Works Full-Time					0.039**	0.059***	0.092***
					(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						-0.001***	-0.000
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.147***
							(0.017)
Constant	1.026***	-0.088	0.077	-0.034	-0.039	-0.061	-0.058
	(0.065)	(0.070)	(0.075)	(0.115)	(0.116)	(0.116)	(0.116)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared							
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

All models are logistic regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for not having any bed disability day in the past 12 months. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A8: Not a Current Smoker: Logit Regressions

	(1) b/se	(2) b/se	(3) b/se	(4) b/se	(5) b/se	(6) b/se	(7) b/se
Not Currently Smoking							
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.023	0.031	0.017	0.017	0.026	0.020	0.025
	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)
25-49	0.046*	0.060**	0.027	0.030	0.038	0.027	0.035
	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)
50-99	0.063**	0.074***	0.018	0.025	0.032	0.020	0.029
	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.030)
100-249	0.075***	0.083***	0.016	0.021	0.024	0.008	0.018
	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.028)
250-499	0.150***	0.166***	0.077**	0.078**	0.066**	0.047	0.057*
	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.035)
500-999	0.197***	0.208***	0.098***	0.099***	0.079**	0.058	0.068*
	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.036)
1000+	0.318***	0.324***	0.164***	0.156***	0.116***	0.088***	0.098***
	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)
Age		-0.001*	0.000	0.000	-0.007***	-0.008***	-0.008***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		0.336***	0.460***	0.478***	0.497***	0.504***	0.505***
		(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.022)
Other		0.076**	-0.003	-0.009	0.006	0.009	0.010
		(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)
Hispanic		0.357***	0.637***	0.647***	0.662***	0.673***	0.672***
		(0.025)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)
Male		-0.111***	-0.168***	-0.104***	-0.102***	-0.134***	-0.134***
		(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Born Outside U.S.		0.466***	0.458***	0.470***	0.510***	0.517***	0.515***
		(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)
Married		0.539***	0.459***	0.450***	0.438***	0.430***	0.431***
		(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Family Size		0.005	0.044***	0.045***	0.044***	0.040***	0.040***
		(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.358***	0.331***	0.333***	0.318***	0.320***
			(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)
Some College			0.788***	0.720***	0.728***	0.705***	0.708***
			(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)
College			1.543***	1.406***	1.447***	1.388***	1.391***
			(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)
More than College			1.971***	1.796***	1.850***	1.743***	1.746***
			(0.046)	(0.049)	(0.049)	(0.049)	(0.049)
Years on Current Job					0.029***	0.027***	0.027***
					(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Works Full-Time					-0.229***	-0.261***	-0.253***
					(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.003***	0.003***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.034*
							(0.019)
Constant	0.795***	0.360***	-0.194**	0.231*	0.449***	0.323**	0.323**
	(0.064)	(0.073)	(0.076)	(0.133)	(0.133)	(0.134)	(0.134)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared							
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.047	0.026

All models are logistic regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for not currently being a smoker. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A9: Not Obese: Logit Regressions

	(1) b/se	(2) b/se	(3) b/se	(4) b/se	(5) b/se	(6) b/se	(7) b/se
Not Obese							
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	-0.083***	-0.084***	-0.087***	-0.077***	-0.068***	-0.068***	-0.052**
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)
25-49	-0.057**	-0.045*	-0.053**	-0.041	-0.029	-0.030	-0.007
	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)
50-99	-0.075***	-0.055**	-0.070***	-0.056**	-0.040	-0.039	-0.012
	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)
100-249	-0.189***	-0.154***	-0.178***	-0.165***	-0.148***	-0.148***	-0.119***
	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.028)
250-499	-0.233***	-0.199***	-0.234***	-0.222***	-0.202***	-0.203***	-0.173***
	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.031)
500-999	-0.207***	-0.184***	-0.228***	-0.220***	-0.202***	-0.202***	-0.172***
	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.036)
1000+	-0.112***	-0.087***	-0.156***	-0.148***	-0.130***	-0.135***	-0.105***
	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)
Age		-0.021***	-0.021***	-0.020***	-0.020***	-0.020***	-0.020***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		-0.540***	-0.492***	-0.480***	-0.476***	-0.476***	-0.474***
		(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Other		0.257***	0.220***	0.228***	0.229***	0.226***	0.230***
		(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)
Hispanic		-0.534***	-0.441***	-0.445***	-0.440***	-0.437***	-0.439***
		(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)
Male		-0.084***	-0.122***	-0.119***	-0.104***	-0.115***	-0.115***
		(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Born Outside U.S.		0.708***	0.682***	0.672***	0.679***	0.681***	0.673***
		(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)
Married		-0.025	-0.069***	-0.067***	-0.064***	-0.061***	-0.059***
		(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Family Size		-0.069***	-0.058***	-0.058***	-0.059***	-0.063***	-0.064***
		(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.073***	0.084***	0.089***	0.086***	0.093***
			(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)
Some College			0.107***	0.114***	0.114***	0.112***	0.119***
			(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.028)
College			0.514***	0.509***	0.513***	0.496***	0.505***
			(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.032)
More than College			0.770***	0.765***	0.768***	0.730***	0.738***
			(0.039)	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.043)	(0.043)
Years on Current Job					-0.000	-0.001	-0.001
					(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Works Full-Time					-0.149***	-0.151***	-0.128***
					(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.000	0.001**
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.105***
							(0.019)
Constant	1.719***	2.732***	2.652***	2.366***	2.471***	2.428***	2.429***
	(0.062)	(0.070)	(0.074)	(0.115)	(0.116)	(0.117)	(0.117)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared							
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

All models are logistic regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for not currently being obese. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A10: Total Number of Chronic Health Condition: OLS Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	-0.014*	-0.001	0.000	-0.002	0.003	0.006	0.005
	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
25-49	-0.018**	-0.007	-0.005	-0.008	-0.002	0.003	0.002
	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
50-99	0.009	0.004	0.008	0.005	0.013	0.018**	0.017*
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
100-249	0.016*	0.004	0.009	0.005	0.014*	0.022***	0.021**
	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
250-499	0.032***	0.017*	0.025**	0.021**	0.033***	0.042***	0.040***
	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
500-999	0.016	0.008	0.018	0.014	0.026**	0.036***	0.034***
	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)
1000+	0.009	0.002	0.017**	0.014*	0.026***	0.038***	0.037***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Age		0.019***	0.019***	0.019***	0.020***	0.021***	0.021***
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		0.039***	0.027***	0.024***	0.025***	0.023***	0.023***
		(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Other		0.009	0.018**	0.016*	0.016*	0.015*	0.015*
		(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Hispanic		-0.014**	-0.038***	-0.038***	-0.036***	-0.039***	-0.039***
		(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Male		0.001	0.008	0.009*	0.018***	0.030***	0.030***
		(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Born Outside U.S.		-0.190***	-0.182***	-0.181***	-0.180***	-0.183***	-0.183***
		(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Married		-0.056***	-0.046***	-0.045***	-0.042***	-0.038***	-0.038***
		(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Family Size		-0.006***	-0.009***	-0.009***	-0.010***	-0.009***	-0.009***
		(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			-0.044***	-0.046***	-0.042***	-0.034***	-0.034***
			(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Some College			-0.024***	-0.025***	-0.026***	-0.014*	-0.014*
			(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
College			-0.128***	-0.130***	-0.129***	-0.107***	-0.107***
			(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)
More than College			-0.165***	-0.172***	-0.174***	-0.141***	-0.141***
			(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Years on Current Job					-0.002***	-0.001***	-0.001***
					(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Works Full-Time					-0.066***	-0.048***	-0.049***
					(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						-0.002***	-0.002***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							0.005
							(0.006)
Constant	0.326***	-0.253***	-0.220***	-0.207***	-0.167***	-0.117***	-0.117***
	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.040)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared	0.008	0.093	0.096	0.097	0.098	0.100	0.100
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.475	0.043	0.089	0.002	0.000	0.000

All models are OLS regressions. The dependent variable is the number of diagnosed chronic health conditions (see text for the list of conditions). **Note that this is a measure of poor health** and hence the comparison between the results in this table and those in Table 2 should account for this fact. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A11: Total Number of Chronic Health Condition: Negative Binomial Regressions

	(1) b/se	(2) b/se	(3) b/se	(4) b/se	(5) b/se	(6) b/se	(7) b/se
Total Number of Chronic Conditions out of 10							
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	-0.031*	0.001	0.001	-0.002	0.006	0.011	0.007
	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
25-49	-0.039**	-0.009	-0.006	-0.012	-0.001	0.008	0.002
	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)
50-99	0.017	0.017	0.022	0.015	0.029	0.038**	0.031*
	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)
100-249	0.030*	0.018	0.027	0.019	0.036**	0.049***	0.041**
	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
250-499	0.062***	0.044**	0.056***	0.048**	0.069***	0.084***	0.076***
	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)
500-999	0.030	0.027	0.042*	0.036	0.058**	0.073***	0.064***
	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.023)
1000+	0.018	0.017	0.041***	0.035**	0.059***	0.080***	0.072***
	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.016)
Age		0.038***	0.038***	0.038***	0.039***	0.040***	0.040***
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		0.086***	0.066***	0.059***	0.061***	0.058***	0.057***
		(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Other		0.022	0.036	0.033	0.032	0.032	0.031
		(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.023)
Hispanic		-0.060***	-0.102***	-0.102***	-0.098***	-0.105***	-0.104***
		(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Male		-0.005	0.011	0.012	0.026**	0.048***	0.048***
		(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Born Outside U.S.		-0.452***	-0.438***	-0.435***	-0.434***	-0.438***	-0.436***
		(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Married		-0.076***	-0.060***	-0.060***	-0.056***	-0.050***	-0.051***
		(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Family Size		-0.005	-0.009**	-0.009**	-0.011**	-0.009**	-0.009*
		(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			-0.084***	-0.087***	-0.082***	-0.067***	-0.069***
			(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Some College			-0.035**	-0.038**	-0.039**	-0.019	-0.021
			(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
College			-0.229***	-0.235***	-0.236***	-0.197***	-0.199***
			(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)
More than College			-0.297***	-0.315***	-0.318***	-0.263***	-0.265***
			(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)
Years on Current Job					-0.004***	-0.002***	-0.002***
					(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Works Full-Time					-0.106***	-0.073***	-0.079***
					(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						-0.003***	-0.003***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							0.028**
							(0.012)
Constant	-1.079***	-2.359***	-2.301***	-2.246***	-2.177***	-2.090***	-2.090***
	(0.049)	(0.051)	(0.052)	(0.079)	(0.079)	(0.079)	(0.079)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared							
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.228	0.016	0.044	0.001	0.000	0.000

All models are negative binomial regressions. The dependent variable is the number of diagnosed chronic health conditions (see text for the list of conditions). **Note that this is a measure of poor health** and hence the comparison between the results in this table and those in Table 2 should account for this fact. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).
* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A12: Good Health Status 1-5 Scale: OLS Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.021**	0.009	0.005	0.007	0.004	-0.003	-0.004
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
25-49	0.028***	0.015	0.004	0.009	0.004	-0.007	-0.008
	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
50-99	0.023**	0.023**	0.006	0.013	0.007	-0.006	-0.008
	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
100-249	-0.002	0.003	-0.019**	-0.010	-0.018*	-0.034***	-0.036***
	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
250-499	0.025**	0.032***	0.002	0.010	-0.000	-0.020*	-0.022*
	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.012)
500-999	0.027**	0.025**	-0.012	-0.003	-0.015	-0.037***	-0.039***
	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.013)
1000+	0.072***	0.072***	0.018*	0.024***	0.010	-0.017*	-0.019**
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Age		-0.015***	-0.015***	-0.015***	-0.017***	-0.017***	-0.017***
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		-0.162***	-0.126***	-0.112***	-0.112***	-0.106***	-0.106***
		(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Other		-0.099***	-0.132***	-0.126***	-0.125***	-0.122***	-0.122***
		(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Hispanic		-0.171***	-0.069***	-0.064***	-0.065***	-0.057***	-0.057***
		(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Male		0.078***	0.059***	0.072***	0.065***	0.040***	0.040***
		(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Born Outside U.S.		0.035***	0.034***	0.044***	0.046***	0.054***	0.054***
		(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Married		0.115***	0.082***	0.075***	0.071***	0.062***	0.062***
		(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Family Size		-0.007***	0.006***	0.006***	0.007***	0.005***	0.005***
		(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.202***	0.189***	0.186***	0.173***	0.172***
			(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Some College			0.315***	0.281***	0.282***	0.259***	0.259***
			(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)
College			0.528***	0.462***	0.464***	0.417***	0.417***
			(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)
More than College			0.623***	0.550***	0.555***	0.483***	0.482***
			(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)
Years on Current Job					0.004***	0.003***	0.003***
					(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Works Full-Time					0.040***	0.007	0.005
					(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.003***	0.003***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							0.006
							(0.007)
Constant	4.018***	4.521***	4.300***	4.462***	4.446***	4.359***	4.359***
	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared	0.013	0.055	0.082	0.086	0.088	0.093	0.093
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.008	0.016	0.064	0.004	0.004

All models are OLS regressions. The dependent variable is a Likert scale for good self-reported health status, with 1 being equal to Poor health, 2 to Fair, 3 to Good, 4 to Very Good and 5 to Excellent health. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A13: Good Mental Health 0-24 Scale: OLS Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.077***	0.082***	0.077***	0.082***	0.056*	0.045	0.041
	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)
25-49	0.130***	0.127***	0.115***	0.130***	0.093***	0.073**	0.067*
	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.036)
50-99	0.110***	0.098***	0.077**	0.101***	0.050	0.034	0.027
	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.036)
100-249	0.062*	0.039	0.012	0.038	-0.020	-0.045	-0.053
	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)
250-499	0.016	0.003	-0.035	-0.011	-0.092**	-0.118***	-0.127***
	(0.041)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.041)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.041)
500-999	0.079*	0.064	0.021	0.043	-0.042	-0.069	-0.078*
	(0.043)	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.042)	(0.043)
1000+	0.149***	0.112***	0.049	0.066**	-0.030	-0.067**	-0.076**
	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)
Age		0.007***	0.008***	0.007***	-0.001	-0.003***	-0.003***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		0.164***	0.206***	0.240***	0.238***	0.240***	0.240***
		(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)
Other		0.059	0.018	0.027	0.035	0.032	0.031
		(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)
Hispanic		0.052*	0.186***	0.197***	0.184***	0.199***	0.200***
		(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)
Male		0.562***	0.542***	0.548***	0.492***	0.444***	0.444***
		(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Born Outside U.S.		0.298***	0.314***	0.328***	0.335***	0.344***	0.346***
		(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)
Married		0.521***	0.480***	0.461***	0.439***	0.431***	0.430***
		(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Family Size		-0.004	0.011	0.012	0.017**	0.010	0.010
		(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.429***	0.410***	0.387***	0.349***	0.347***
			(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)
Some College			0.438***	0.381***	0.385***	0.338***	0.336***
			(0.045)	(0.046)	(0.045)	(0.046)	(0.046)
College			0.764***	0.659***	0.665***	0.576***	0.573***
			(0.047)	(0.049)	(0.049)	(0.050)	(0.050)
More than College			0.794***	0.673***	0.695***	0.570***	0.567***
			(0.050)	(0.054)	(0.054)	(0.054)	(0.054)
Years on Current Job					0.024***	0.020***	0.020***
					(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Works Full-Time					0.378***	0.306***	0.299***
					(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.028)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.007***	0.006***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							0.029
							(0.025)
Constant	21.940***	20.830***	20.464***	20.729***	20.538***	20.296***	20.296***
	(0.090)	(0.092)	(0.101)	(0.132)	(0.132)	(0.133)	(0.133)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared	0.011	0.028	0.032	0.034	0.038	0.043	0.043
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.001	0.004	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000

All models are OLS regressions. The dependent variable is equal to $-(Kesslerscale) + 24$: so the dependent variable ranges from 0 to 24, where higher values indicate better mental health. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A14: **Poor** Mental Health Scale (range 0 to 24): Negative Binomial Regressions

	(1) b/se	(2) b/se	(3) b/se	(4) b/se	(5) b/se	(6) b/se	(7) b/se
Poor Mental Health (range 0 to 24)							
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	-0.038***	-0.044***	-0.041***	-0.043***	-0.031**	-0.029**	-0.027*
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.014)
25-49	-0.064***	-0.064***	-0.059***	-0.067***	-0.050***	-0.041**	-0.038**
	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)
50-99	-0.055***	-0.050***	-0.039**	-0.052***	-0.028	-0.024	-0.019
	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)
100-249	-0.035**	-0.019	-0.004	-0.019	0.010	0.020	0.025
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)
250-499	-0.009	-0.002	0.017	0.004	0.045**	0.056***	0.061***
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)
500-999	-0.037*	-0.032	-0.010	-0.024	0.022	0.028	0.033
	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)
1000+	-0.076***	-0.056***	-0.025	-0.033**	0.015	0.030*	0.034**
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Age		-0.004***	-0.004***	-0.004***	-0.000	0.001	0.001
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		-0.084***	-0.107***	-0.123***	-0.125***	-0.123***	-0.123***
		(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)
Other		-0.038*	-0.021	-0.023	-0.030	-0.024	-0.024
		(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)
Hispanic		-0.022	-0.086***	-0.092***	-0.086***	-0.095***	-0.095***
		(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Male		-0.274***	-0.260***	-0.263***	-0.238***	-0.219***	-0.219***
		(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Born Outside U.S.		-0.158***	-0.156***	-0.162***	-0.166***	-0.166***	-0.167***
		(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Married		-0.249***	-0.230***	-0.222***	-0.210***	-0.211***	-0.211***
		(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Family Size		0.002	-0.005	-0.005	-0.007*	-0.001	-0.001
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			-0.186***	-0.176***	-0.163***	-0.153***	-0.152***
			(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Some College			-0.188***	-0.159***	-0.158***	-0.146***	-0.145***
			(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)
College			-0.354***	-0.301***	-0.302***	-0.272***	-0.270***
			(0.021)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)
More than College			-0.394***	-0.332***	-0.341***	-0.290***	-0.288***
			(0.025)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)
Years on Current Job					-0.013***	-0.011***	-0.011***
					(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Works Full-Time					-0.156***	-0.133***	-0.129***
					(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						-0.003***	-0.002***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.017
							(0.012)
Constant	0.718***	1.267***	1.418***	1.236***	1.307***	1.415***	1.415***
	(0.047)	(0.050)	(0.052)	(0.074)	(0.074)	(0.075)	(0.075)
lnalpha							
Constant	0.870***	0.840***	0.834***	0.830***	0.822***	0.814***	0.813***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared							
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000

All models are Negative Binomial regressions. The dependent variable is equal to the Kessler scale, which ranges from 0 to 24, where a higher value indicates *worse* mental health. See section A for details. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A15: No Bed Disability Days: OLS Regressions with Paid Sick Dummy

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	-0.023***	-0.020***	-0.020***	-0.020***	-0.021***	-0.020***	-0.017***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
25-49	-0.028***	-0.026***	-0.025***	-0.025***	-0.026***	-0.026***	-0.021***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
50-99	-0.024***	-0.025***	-0.024***	-0.024***	-0.025***	-0.024***	-0.019***
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
100-249	-0.025***	-0.026***	-0.026***	-0.025***	-0.027***	-0.026***	-0.020***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
250-499	-0.032***	-0.032***	-0.031***	-0.030***	-0.033***	-0.031***	-0.026***
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
500-999	-0.037***	-0.035***	-0.033***	-0.032***	-0.036***	-0.034***	-0.028***
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
1000+	-0.034***	-0.037***	-0.034***	-0.033***	-0.037***	-0.036***	-0.031***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Age		0.003***	0.003***	0.003***	0.002***	0.002***	0.002***
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		0.064***	0.063***	0.060***	0.061***	0.060***	0.060***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Other		0.025***	0.027***	0.028***	0.028***	0.027***	0.028***
		(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Hispanic		0.048***	0.040***	0.039***	0.039***	0.039***	0.038***
		(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Male		0.098***	0.098***	0.093***	0.090***	0.089***	0.089***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Born Outside U.S.		0.096***	0.092***	0.091***	0.091***	0.091***	0.089***
		(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Married		0.009***	0.010***	0.011***	0.010***	0.012***	0.012***
		(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Family Size		0.006***	0.005***	0.004***	0.005***	0.004***	0.003***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			-0.016***	-0.013***	-0.013***	-0.013***	-0.012**
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Some College			-0.052***	-0.044***	-0.043***	-0.042***	-0.040***
			(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
College			-0.041***	-0.026***	-0.024***	-0.024***	-0.023***
			(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
More than College			-0.040***	-0.019**	-0.017**	-0.020**	-0.019**
			(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Years on Current Job					0.002***	0.002***	0.002***
					(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Works Full-Time					0.017***	0.020***	0.024***
					(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						-0.000	0.000
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							-0.024***
							(0.004)
Paid sick leave at current job	-0.027***	-0.034***	-0.031***	-0.027***	-0.033***	-0.031***	-0.026***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Constant	0.738***	0.480***	0.507***	0.494***	0.489***	0.481***	0.481***
	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	194821	194821	194821	194821	194821	194821	194821
R-squared	0.012	0.037	0.039	0.040	0.041	0.042	0.042
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

These are the same models as in Table 6 with the addition of a dummy for having paid sick days at work. All models are ordinary least squares regressions. The dependent variable is a dummy for not having any bed disability day in the past 12 months. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).
* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A16: Total Number of Bed Disability Days: OLS Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.051**	0.050**	0.050**	0.049**	0.061***	0.063***	0.051**
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)
25-49	0.049**	0.052**	0.053**	0.051**	0.068***	0.072***	0.056***
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.021)
50-99	0.054**	0.063***	0.065***	0.061**	0.083***	0.085***	0.066***
	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)
100-249	0.045*	0.057**	0.062***	0.055**	0.081***	0.086***	0.065***
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)
250-499	0.115***	0.118***	0.124***	0.117***	0.150***	0.156***	0.134***
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.028)
500-999	0.145***	0.146***	0.154***	0.146***	0.180***	0.186***	0.165***
	(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)
1000+	0.113***	0.135***	0.147***	0.140***	0.176***	0.186***	0.165***
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Age		-0.005***	-0.004***	-0.004***	-0.002***	-0.001*	-0.001**
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		-0.144***	-0.156***	-0.153***	-0.151***	-0.151***	-0.153***
		(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Other		-0.076***	-0.068***	-0.073***	-0.075***	-0.073***	-0.076***
		(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)
Hispanic		-0.132***	-0.148***	-0.146***	-0.139***	-0.144***	-0.142***
		(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Male		-0.489***	-0.482***	-0.471***	-0.447***	-0.431***	-0.431***
		(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)
Born Outside U.S.		-0.334***	-0.320***	-0.317***	-0.316***	-0.318***	-0.313***
		(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)
Married		-0.145***	-0.135***	-0.136***	-0.128***	-0.128***	-0.130***
		(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Family Size		-0.026***	-0.028***	-0.027***	-0.029***	-0.026***	-0.025***
		(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			-0.026	-0.034	-0.025	-0.016	-0.022
			(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)
Some College			0.061**	0.046*	0.045*	0.055**	0.049**
			(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)
College			-0.109***	-0.131***	-0.130***	-0.104***	-0.111***
			(0.025)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)
More than College			-0.094***	-0.133***	-0.138***	-0.092**	-0.099***
			(0.033)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.036)
Years on Current Job					-0.007***	-0.006***	-0.006***
					(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Works Full-Time					-0.182***	-0.169***	-0.186***
					(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						-0.002***	-0.002***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							0.074***
							(0.017)
Constant	0.912***	1.788***	1.787***	1.800***	1.906***	1.980***	1.980***
	(0.061)	(0.064)	(0.067)	(0.107)	(0.108)	(0.108)	(0.108)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared	0.006	0.025	0.025	0.026	0.028	0.029	0.029
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

All models are ordinary least squares regressions. The dependent variable is the total number of bed disability days in the past 12 months, winsorized at 10: therefore, higher values of this variable are a proxy for *lower* health. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).
* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A17: Total Number of Bed Disability Days: Negative Binomial Regressions

	(1) b/se	(2) b/se	(3) b/se	(4) b/se	(5) b/se	(6) b/se	(7) b/se
Bed disability days, past 12 months							
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.042**	0.041**	0.042**	0.041**	0.053***	0.054***	0.044**
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)
25-49	0.040**	0.046**	0.047**	0.043**	0.061***	0.064***	0.049**
	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
50-99	0.043*	0.053**	0.055**	0.049**	0.072***	0.075***	0.058**
	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)
100-249	0.031	0.050**	0.055**	0.047**	0.071***	0.076***	0.057**
	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)
250-499	0.096***	0.110***	0.115***	0.106***	0.138***	0.142***	0.123***
	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.026)
500-999	0.121***	0.117***	0.124***	0.115***	0.147***	0.152***	0.133***
	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)
1000+	0.094***	0.118***	0.127***	0.118***	0.151***	0.160***	0.141***
	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)
Age		-0.004***	-0.004***	-0.003***	-0.001*	-0.001	-0.001
		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		-0.120***	-0.128***	-0.126***	-0.124***	-0.124***	-0.125***
		(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.018)
Other		-0.057**	-0.051**	-0.056**	-0.058**	-0.054**	-0.056**
		(0.026)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.026)
Hispanic		-0.136***	-0.144***	-0.141***	-0.136***	-0.140***	-0.139***
		(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)
Male		-0.424***	-0.417***	-0.412***	-0.392***	-0.379***	-0.378***
		(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Born Outside U.S.		-0.374***	-0.359***	-0.358***	-0.355***	-0.357***	-0.353***
		(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)
Married		-0.128***	-0.120***	-0.119***	-0.112***	-0.114***	-0.115***
		(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)
Family Size		-0.023***	-0.025***	-0.024***	-0.026***	-0.023***	-0.022***
		(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			0.010	0.004	0.015	0.019	0.016
			(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.024)
Some College			0.079***	0.069***	0.069***	0.074***	0.070***
			(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)
College			-0.063**	-0.077***	-0.073***	-0.053**	-0.058**
			(0.025)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)
More than College			-0.053	-0.078**	-0.080**	-0.042	-0.047
			(0.033)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.036)
Years on Current Job					-0.007***	-0.006***	-0.006***
					(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Works Full-Time					-0.159***	-0.150***	-0.164***
					(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.016)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						-0.001***	-0.001***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							0.065***
							(0.016)
Constant	-0.117*	0.607***	0.584***	0.615***	0.696***	0.759***	0.760***
	(0.065)	(0.069)	(0.072)	(0.115)	(0.115)	(0.114)	(0.115)
lnalpha							
Constant	1.216***	1.168***	1.166***	1.164***	1.161***	1.158***	1.158***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared							
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

All models are negative binomial regressions. The dependent variable is the total number of bed disability days in the past 12 months, winsorized at 10: therefore, higher values of this variable are a proxy for *lower* health. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A18: Number of Cigarettes per Day: OLS Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	-0.166**	-0.149**	-0.109	-0.123*	-0.146**	-0.131*	-0.143**
	(0.072)	(0.070)	(0.068)	(0.068)	(0.068)	(0.068)	(0.069)
25-49	-0.233***	-0.239***	-0.138*	-0.154**	-0.178**	-0.150**	-0.166**
	(0.075)	(0.073)	(0.071)	(0.072)	(0.072)	(0.071)	(0.073)
50-99	-0.265***	-0.275***	-0.119	-0.146*	-0.172**	-0.143*	-0.163*
	(0.085)	(0.084)	(0.082)	(0.082)	(0.082)	(0.082)	(0.085)
100-249	-0.304***	-0.321***	-0.131*	-0.156**	-0.170**	-0.130*	-0.152*
	(0.078)	(0.077)	(0.076)	(0.076)	(0.076)	(0.077)	(0.078)
250-499	-0.527***	-0.556***	-0.293***	-0.303***	-0.284***	-0.237***	-0.259***
	(0.087)	(0.086)	(0.084)	(0.083)	(0.083)	(0.083)	(0.085)
500-999	-0.655***	-0.671***	-0.354***	-0.361***	-0.314***	-0.262***	-0.284***
	(0.097)	(0.095)	(0.092)	(0.092)	(0.091)	(0.091)	(0.093)
1000+	-0.978***	-0.967***	-0.502***	-0.488***	-0.394***	-0.324***	-0.346***
	(0.074)	(0.074)	(0.071)	(0.071)	(0.071)	(0.072)	(0.074)
Age		0.034***	0.029***	0.029***	0.048***	0.051***	0.050***
		(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		-1.703***	-2.010***	-2.063***	-2.108***	-2.120***	-2.122***
		(0.050)	(0.048)	(0.049)	(0.049)	(0.049)	(0.049)
Other		-0.583***	-0.323***	-0.307***	-0.340***	-0.342***	-0.345***
		(0.063)	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.061)
Hispanic		-1.867***	-2.726***	-2.753***	-2.779***	-2.805***	-2.803***
		(0.050)	(0.055)	(0.055)	(0.055)	(0.055)	(0.055)
Male		0.544***	0.687***	0.418***	0.412***	0.488***	0.489***
		(0.042)	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.042)	(0.043)	(0.043)
Born Outside U.S.		-1.180***	-1.193***	-1.238***	-1.331***	-1.350***	-1.344***
		(0.049)	(0.051)	(0.052)	(0.052)	(0.052)	(0.053)
Married		-1.361***	-1.090***	-1.067***	-1.035***	-1.017***	-1.019***
		(0.046)	(0.045)	(0.045)	(0.045)	(0.044)	(0.044)
Family Size		0.039**	-0.069***	-0.074***	-0.068***	-0.059***	-0.058***
		(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			-1.324***	-1.202***	-1.197***	-1.156***	-1.162***
			(0.094)	(0.095)	(0.094)	(0.094)	(0.094)
Some College			-2.885***	-2.605***	-2.609***	-2.551***	-2.556***
			(0.099)	(0.101)	(0.101)	(0.100)	(0.100)
College			-4.495***	-4.001***	-4.073***	-3.938***	-3.945***
			(0.099)	(0.104)	(0.103)	(0.103)	(0.103)
More than College			-4.792***	-4.252***	-4.363***	-4.136***	-4.143***
			(0.103)	(0.109)	(0.109)	(0.109)	(0.109)
Years on Current Job					-0.070***	-0.065***	-0.065***
					(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Works Full-Time					0.532***	0.624***	0.606***
					(0.049)	(0.050)	(0.052)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						-0.007***	-0.008***
						(0.001)	(0.001)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							0.078
							(0.051)
Constant	4.850***	4.922***	6.773***	5.882***	5.304***	5.587***	5.586***
	(0.217)	(0.233)	(0.231)	(0.321)	(0.323)	(0.323)	(0.323)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196567	196567	196567	196567	196567	196567	196567
R-squared	0.044	0.075	0.109	0.113	0.118	0.119	0.119
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.001

All models are ordinary least squares regressions. The dependent variable is the number of cigarettes smoked per day, winsorized at 30 and set to zero for those who do not currently smoke. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A19: Number of Cigarettes per Day: Negative Binomial Regressions

	(1) b/se	(2) b/se	(3) b/se	(4) b/se	(5) b/se	(6) b/se	(7) b/se
Total Cigarettes per Day							
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	-0.047*	-0.036	-0.029	-0.022	-0.028	-0.022	-0.025
	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.028)
25-49	-0.072***	-0.068***	-0.041	-0.041	-0.050*	-0.038	-0.043
	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)
50-99	-0.079***	-0.086***	-0.041	-0.039	-0.048	-0.037	-0.043
	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.033)
100-249	-0.078***	-0.088***	-0.038	-0.036	-0.042	-0.032	-0.038
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.031)
250-499	-0.166***	-0.175***	-0.113***	-0.113***	-0.111***	-0.098***	-0.104***
	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.036)
500-999	-0.214***	-0.207***	-0.102**	-0.093**	-0.083**	-0.061	-0.067
	(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.042)	(0.043)	(0.043)
1000+	-0.311***	-0.295***	-0.172***	-0.151***	-0.130***	-0.103***	-0.109***
	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.031)
Age		0.013***	0.015***	0.015***	0.020***	0.021***	0.021***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		-0.596***	-0.679***	-0.693***	-0.700***	-0.709***	-0.709***
		(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)
Other		-0.271***	-0.207***	-0.188***	-0.195***	-0.191***	-0.191***
		(0.040)	(0.041)	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.042)
Hispanic		-0.742***	-0.934***	-0.941***	-0.948***	-0.956***	-0.956***
		(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)
Male		0.245***	0.299***	0.231***	0.228***	0.254***	0.254***
		(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)
Born Outside U.S.		-0.657***	-0.477***	-0.475***	-0.499***	-0.504***	-0.503***
		(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)
Married		-0.448***	-0.403***	-0.401***	-0.391***	-0.389***	-0.390***
		(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Family Size		0.009	-0.037***	-0.040***	-0.040***	-0.037***	-0.037***
		(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			-0.181***	-0.155***	-0.158***	-0.152***	-0.153***
			(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.022)
Some College			-0.554***	-0.489***	-0.499***	-0.489***	-0.490***
			(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)
College			-1.383***	-1.239***	-1.269***	-1.230***	-1.231***
			(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.034)
More than College			-1.877***	-1.699***	-1.733***	-1.651***	-1.652***
			(0.053)	(0.054)	(0.055)	(0.054)	(0.054)
Years on Current Job					-0.021***	-0.018***	-0.018***
					(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Works Full-Time					0.184***	0.210***	0.205***
					(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.023)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						-0.002***	-0.002***
						(0.000)	(0.000)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							0.021
							(0.019)
Constant	1.562***	1.492***	1.729***	1.509***	1.347***	1.445***	1.444***
	(0.070)	(0.070)	(0.077)	(0.154)	(0.157)	(0.156)	(0.156)
lnalpha							
Constant	2.522***	2.470***	2.412***	2.407***	2.402***	2.399***	2.399***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196567	196567	196567	196567	196567	196567	196567
R-squared							
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.048	0.032

All models are negative binomial regressions. The dependent variable is the number of cigarettes smoked per day, winsorized at 30 and set to zero for those who do not currently smoke. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A20: Body Mass Index: OLS Regressions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
1-9 employees	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
10-24	0.202***	0.198***	0.205***	0.185***	0.151***	0.145**	0.090
	(0.058)	(0.057)	(0.057)	(0.056)	(0.056)	(0.056)	(0.057)
25-49	0.190***	0.141**	0.165***	0.139**	0.095	0.090	0.013
	(0.062)	(0.059)	(0.060)	(0.059)	(0.059)	(0.059)	(0.061)
50-99	0.316***	0.230***	0.271***	0.241***	0.184***	0.171***	0.079
	(0.063)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.063)
100-249	0.545***	0.409***	0.469***	0.442***	0.381***	0.369***	0.268***
	(0.062)	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.062)
250-499	0.666***	0.540***	0.627***	0.599***	0.528***	0.516***	0.413***
	(0.070)	(0.068)	(0.068)	(0.068)	(0.067)	(0.068)	(0.069)
500-999	0.603***	0.519***	0.627***	0.612***	0.547***	0.535***	0.430***
	(0.084)	(0.082)	(0.081)	(0.081)	(0.081)	(0.081)	(0.083)
1000+	0.413***	0.308***	0.480***	0.458***	0.400***	0.394***	0.293***
	(0.057)	(0.056)	(0.055)	(0.056)	(0.056)	(0.057)	(0.058)
Age		0.072***	0.073***	0.072***	0.071***	0.071***	0.071***
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
White		Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Black		1.814***	1.684***	1.652***	1.634***	1.637***	1.629***
		(0.053)	(0.053)	(0.053)	(0.053)	(0.052)	(0.052)
Other		-0.661***	-0.560***	-0.580***	-0.584***	-0.575***	-0.587***
		(0.063)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.063)	(0.062)
Hispanic		1.683***	1.442***	1.459***	1.437***	1.430***	1.438***
		(0.048)	(0.050)	(0.050)	(0.049)	(0.050)	(0.049)
Male		1.022***	1.111***	1.107***	1.051***	1.068***	1.069***
		(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.039)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.040)
Born Outside U.S.		-1.686***	-1.565***	-1.537***	-1.563***	-1.560***	-1.535***
		(0.047)	(0.049)	(0.048)	(0.048)	(0.049)	(0.049)
Married		0.150***	0.259***	0.248***	0.238***	0.223***	0.214***
		(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.040)
Family Size		0.178***	0.146***	0.146***	0.153***	0.164***	0.168***
		(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.012)
High-School Dropout			Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
High-School			-0.068	-0.110*	-0.130*	-0.129*	-0.154**
			(0.066)	(0.066)	(0.067)	(0.066)	(0.066)
Some College			-0.117*	-0.166**	-0.164**	-0.172**	-0.198***
			(0.065)	(0.067)	(0.067)	(0.067)	(0.067)
College			-1.129***	-1.164***	-1.184***	-1.168***	-1.201***
			(0.071)	(0.075)	(0.075)	(0.075)	(0.075)
More than College			-1.710***	-1.742***	-1.760***	-1.695***	-1.728***
			(0.079)	(0.086)	(0.086)	(0.087)	(0.087)
Years on Current Job					-0.001	-0.000	-0.001
					(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Works Full-Time					0.551***	0.540***	0.459***
					(0.045)	(0.046)	(0.047)
Yearly earnings (2014k)						0.001	-0.001
						(0.001)	(0.001)
Offered Health Ins. At Work							0.363***
							(0.044)
Constant	25.574***	21.559***	21.699***	22.338***	21.950***	22.023***	22.019***
	(0.144)	(0.155)	(0.166)	(0.250)	(0.252)	(0.254)	(0.253)
Occupation Dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754	196754
R-squared	0.023	0.072	0.080	0.083	0.084	0.085	0.086
P-Value Joint Significance	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

All models are ordinary least squares regressions. The dependent variable is the body mass index. All regressions also include dummies for year, Census region and two-digit industry. Regressions incorporate the survey sample design (stratification and clustering). Regressions use Adult Sampling Weights divided by 18, the number of pooled cross-sections. Source: 1997-2014 data from IPUMS NHIS (Blewett et al. (2016a)).
* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01