Everyday experience suggests that people who have low self-esteem are more likely to feel sad, lonely, and dejected. Correspondingly, many theories of depression posit that self-esteem plays a central role in the etiology of depressive disorders (e.g., Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978; Beck, 1967), and operational definitions of depression include low self-esteem as a possible symptom (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). For decades, we have known that self-esteem and depression are empirically related: People with low self-esteem are more prone to depression, both clinical levels and milder forms of depressed affect, and depressed people are more likely to feel worthless, incompetent, and inadequate. However, the precise nature of this relation has been a topic of ongoing debate (Orth, Robins, & Roberts, 2008; Roberts & Monroe, 1999; Zeigler-Hill, 2011). Over the past several years, an emerging body of longitudinal studies, often based on large samples, have provided new insights into why and how low self-esteem is related to depression. As we review in this article, these studies suggest that low self-esteem is not only a correlate but also a vulnerability factor for depression. Identifying such factors is critically important, because depression can lead to severe personal consequences as a result of impaired functioning in the relationship, work, and health domains (Gottlib & Hammen, 2009), and it is projected to be the leading cause of the global burden of disease by the year 2030 (World Health Organization, 2008).

Before we describe the current state of knowledge on the relation between self-esteem and depression, we briefly define each construct. Self-esteem refers to an individual’s subjective evaluation of his or her worth as a person. Despite occasional short-term fluctuations, self-esteem is a relatively stable characteristic of individuals across the life span (Trzesniewski, Donnellan, & Robins, 2003). Depression involves a set of interrelated affective,
cognitive, and physiological symptoms, including sadness, inability to experience pleasure, hopelessness, poor concentration, and disordered sleep. In this article, we use the term depression to denote a continuous variable (i.e., individual differences in depressive symptoms) rather than a clinical category (i.e., major depressive disorder) because previous research suggests that depression is best conceptualized as a continuous construct (e.g., Hankin, Fraley, Lahey, & Waldman, 2005).

Competing Theoretical Models and Empirical Evidence

Several theoretical models have been proposed to explain why low self-esteem is associated with depression. The vulnerability model (Fig. 1A) states that low self-esteem is a causal risk factor for depression. For example, according to Beck’s (1967) cognitive theory of depression, negative beliefs about the self are not just a symptom of depression but play a critical causal role in its etiology (see also Metalsky, Joiner, Hardin, & Abramson, 1993). In the vulnerability model, low self-esteem is conceptualized as a stable personality factor that predisposes the person to experience depression; the link between predisposition and outcome can be mediated or moderated by other variables (Klein, Kotov, & Bufferd, 2011).

The scar model (Fig. 1B) proposes that low self-esteem is a consequence, rather than a cause, of depression. Specifically, depression is assumed to persistently deteriorate self-esteem, even after remittance of a depressive episode; that is, experiences of depression may leave “scars” in the individual’s self-concept that progressively erode self-esteem over time (see Coyne, Gallo, Klinkman, & Calarco, 1998; Shahar & Davidson, 2005). It is noteworthy that the vulnerability model and scar model are not mutually exclusive because both processes (i.e., low self-esteem contributing to depression and depression eroding self-esteem) might operate simultaneously, corresponding to the reciprocal relation model (Fig. 1C).

The vulnerability, scar, and reciprocal relation models have been tested in a number of recent longitudinal studies, many of which used large samples and advanced statistical approaches (such as latent variable modeling), thereby increasing the validity of the conclusions (e.g., Orth et al., 2008; Orth, Robins, Trzesniewski, Maes, & Schmitt, 2009; Shahar & Henrich, 2010). Most of the studies are based on cross-lagged regression models—the most common way to establish the prospective effect of one variable on another. The results consistently supported the vulnerability model and provided weak support for the scar model. Moreover, a meta-analysis of 77 longitudinal studies (including approximately 35,000 participants) indicated that the vulnerability and scar effects are both statistically significant, but the vulnerability effect is twice as large as the scar effect (Sowislo & Orth, 2013).

Evidence suggests that the vulnerability effect is robust and holds across a wide range of samples and study designs. For example, the vulnerability model holds for both men and women (Orth et al., 2008; Orth, Robins, Trzesniewski, et al., 2009; Sowislo & Orth, 2013). Thus, although men and women differ in their average levels of self-esteem and depression, the relation between self-esteem and depression does not vary by gender. Likewise, the vulnerability effect holds across all age groups from childhood to old age (Orth, Robins, Trzesniewski, et al., 2009; Sowislo & Orth, 2013), for affective-cognitive and somatic symptoms of depression (Kuster, Orth, & Meier, 2012; Orth, Robins, Trzesniewski, et al., 2009), for different measures of self-esteem and depression (Sowislo & Orth, 2013), after controlling for content overlap between self-esteem and depression scales (Orth et al., 2008; Orth, Robins, Trzesniewski, et al., 2009), and across time intervals ranging from a few weeks to more than a decade (Sowislo & Orth, 2013; Steiger, Allemand, Robins, & Fend, 2012). In addition, the vulnerability effect holds in a sample of Mexican-origin participants, including those born in Mexico as well as in the United States (Orth, Robins, Widaman, & Conger, in press). It is noteworthy that low self-esteem predicts clinically diagnosed depression (Ormel, Oldehinkel, & Vollebergh, 2004; Trzesniewski et al., 2006), and the vulnerability model holds in clinical and nonclinical samples (Sowislo & Orth, 2013).

A crucial question is whether low self-esteem actually exerts a causal influence on depression, or whether both variables are caused by the same underlying factors. Thus, low self-esteem might merely be an early manifestation of depression, as assumed by the precursor model (Fig. 1D). For example, it is possible that stressful events, such as a breakup of a close relationship, academic failure, being victimized, and losing one’s job, have an immediately damaging effect on self-esteem and a more slowly operating effect on depression. Then, researchers might observe a predictive effect of low self-esteem on depression, and—if the true causal factor is not included in the model—mistakenly interpret the pattern of results as evidence for the vulnerability model. Using data from three independent studies (one of which included a large national probability sample), Orth, Robins, and Meier (2009) found that the vulnerability effect of low self-esteem held when controlling for the effects of stressful life events and daily hassles. Likewise, in a study with a large community sample of Mexican-origin adolescents, the vulnerability effect held when controlling for third variables such as relational victimization, maternal depression, and low social support, as well as stressful life events (Orth et al., in press). Finally, neuroticism—the tendency to frequently experience negative feelings, to
worry, and to be emotionally unstable—might influence both self-esteem and depression, creating a spurious link between the two (Hankin, Lakdawalla, Carter, Abela, & Adams, 2007; Watson, Suls, & Haig, 2002). However, in a recent study that tested this hypothesis, the vulnerability effect held when controlling for the Big Five personality
traits, including neuroticism (Sowislo, Orth, & Meier, 2012). Thus, the available evidence does not support the claim that low self-esteem is merely a precursor of depression; nevertheless, research should continue to test this possibility in other samples and contexts.

Another plausible model of the relation between low self-esteem and depression is the diathesis-stress model (Fig. 1E). Here, low self-esteem is thought of as a diathesis—that is, a predisposing factor that exerts causal influence only if the person simultaneously experiences life stress (Hammen, 2005; Metalsky et al., 1993). In the face of challenging life circumstances, people with low self-esteem may have fewer coping resources and consequently be more prone to spiraling downward into depression. This model predicts an interaction between low self-esteem and stress, with risk for depression emerging only when both conditions are present. Orth, Robins, and Meier (2009) reviewed the available evidence and found that most studies did not show supporting evidence. Moreover, in three new longitudinal studies, one of which had sufficient power to detect even a very small interaction effect, low self-esteem did not interact with stressful life events (e.g., criminal victimization) or everyday stressors in the prediction of depression (Orth, Robins, & Meier, 2009). However, because interaction effects are often subtle and difficult to detect, it might be premature to dismiss the diathesis-stress model of low self-esteem and depression.

Tests of Refined Specifications of the Vulnerability Model

Given the robust evidence supporting the vulnerability model, the next step is to examine more refined specifications of the model. For example, which mediating mechanisms might account for the effect (Fig. 1F)? Only one study has tested for mediation, and it found that the tendency to ruminate about difficult life experiences mediated the prospective effect of low self-esteem on depression across several waves of data (Kuster et al., 2012). However, given that rumination only partially mediated the effect, it is likely that further processes are involved. For example, a possible interpersonal pathway is that low self-esteem leads to social avoidance and withdrawal, which has been linked to depression (Ottenbreit & Dobson, 2004). In addition, in contrast to people with high self-esteem, those with low self-esteem tend to dampen positive affect and feel undeserving of positive outcomes, which may contribute to the development of depression (Wood, Heimpel, Manwell, & Whittington, 2009; Wood, Heimpel, & Michela, 2003). Knowledge about mediating processes that account for the vulnerability effect is critical because it informs possible starting points for interventions aimed at preventing or reducing depression.

In addition, it is possible that other characteristics of self-esteem besides its level (i.e., low vs. high) are vulnerability factors for depression or moderate the effect of low self-esteem on depression (Fig. 1G). In particular, the degree to which self-esteem is unstable over short periods of time and contingent on external feedback might be influential (Kernis et al., 1998; Roberts & Gotlib, 1997). Most previous studies examining these hypotheses used small samples and consequently suffered from low power. A recent project used data from two large longitudinal studies to test the independent and interactive effects of level, stability, and contingency in one overarching model (Sowislo et al., 2012). In both studies, only self-esteem level, but not stability and contingency, predicted subsequent depression. Neither stability nor contingency moderated the effect of self-esteem level. Thus, the available evidence suggests that low self-esteem, but not unstable or contingent self-esteem, is a vulnerability factor for depression.

Previous research on the vulnerability model has focused almost exclusively on global self-esteem. However, perceiving oneself negatively in specific domains, such as academic competence, social skills, and physical attractiveness, might also contribute to depression. Knowledge about which domains of self-esteem contribute to the vulnerability effect is important for theoretical reasons, to help us understand why and for whom low self-esteem is a risk factor for depression. In addition, such knowledge could facilitate the design of interventions that target the particular domain of self-evaluation that has the most toxic effect on depression. In a recent study, we took a first step toward determining the degree to which global versus domain-specific measures of self-esteem prospectively predict depression, and we found that the vulnerability effect was driven, for the most part, by global self-esteem; the only domain-specific self-evaluation that prospectively predicted depression was honesty–trustworthiness (Orth et al., in press).

Future Directions and Implications

Although research on the link between low self-esteem and depression has made great progress recently, several aspects of the relation remain insufficiently understood. First, future research should continue to examine the intrapersonal and interpersonal mechanisms that account for the vulnerability effect. Second, most previous longitudinal studies examined effects across long periods of time, such as years. However, to fully understand the process, it is important to determine whether the vulnerability effect unfolds slowly over years or the processes linking self-esteem and depression play out over shorter periods (e.g., in reaction to specific situational experiences, such as being criticized by one’s peers or
relationship partner). Therefore, future research should analyze the dynamic relations between self-esteem and depression on a day-to-day level. Third, previous research had been based predominantly on participants of European origin (Sowislo & Orth, 2013). Future research should therefore examine samples from more diverse cultural contexts, particularly collectivistic cultures. There are theoretical reasons to believe that in individualistic cultures, self-esteem might be more central to psychological adjustment because of the emphasis placed on feeling good about one’s own accomplishments; in collectivistic cultures, feelings about how one’s accomplishments reflect on one’s family and community might be more critical (Kwan, Bond, & Singelis, 1997). Consequently, it is possible that the vulnerability effect does not hold in collectivistic cultural contexts. Finally, the presumed causal effect of self-esteem on depression should be tested more directly using alternative research designs. For example, intervention studies could test whether increasing self-esteem via an intervention leads to a decrease in risk for depression.

The research reviewed in this article has important theoretical implications because it counters the notion that self-esteem is an empty construct that has no long-term impact and is largely redundant with other measures of adjustment, such as depression (for review of the debate about the benefits of self-esteem, see, e.g., Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger, & Vohs, 2003; Orth, Robins, & Widaman, 2012; Swann, Chang-Schneider, & McClarty, 2007). Moreover, the research has important practical implications, suggesting that depression can be prevented, or reduced, by improving self-esteem. It is noteworthy that meta-analytic reviews suggest that it is possible to increase self-esteem by psychological interventions (e.g., O’Mar, Marsh, Craven, & Debus, 2006). It is our hope that, ultimately, the findings of the growing body of research on the link between low self-esteem and depression might contribute to designing effective interventions aimed at reducing the burden of depression.
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