



Association between district-level safety and self-rated health: a multilevel study in an urban setting

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-004695
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Dec-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Kim, Seung-Sup; Korea University, Department of Public Health Sciences Choi, Jaesung; Sungkyunkwan University, Department of Economics Park, Kisoo; Korea University, Department of Healthcare Management Chung, Yeonseung; Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Department of Mathematical Sciences Park, Sangjo; Seoul National University, Department of Communication Heo, Jongho; San Diego State University & University of California, San Diego, Public Health Joint Doctoral Program
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Public health, Sociology
Keywords:	perceived neighborhood safety, self-rated health, neighborhood crime rate, Seoul Welfare Panel Study, multilevel analysis

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **Association between district-level safety and self-rated health:**
5
6
7 **a multilevel study in an urban setting**
8
9

10
11
12 Seung-Sup Kim MD, ScD, Jaesung Choi PhD, Kisoo Park PhD, Yeonseung Chung PhD, Sangjo
13 Park BA, Jongho Heo*

14
15
16 Seung-Sup Kim

17 Department of Public Health Sciences, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea, Department
18 of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, US, Department of
19 Environmental and Occupational Health, The George Washington University School of Public
20 Health and Health Services, Washington, DC, US
21

22
23 Jaesung Choi

24 Department of Economics, Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, Republic of Korea
25

26
27 Kisoo Park

28 Department of Healthcare Management, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea
29

30
31 Yeonseung Chung

32 Department of Mathematical Sciences, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology,
33 Daejeon, Republic of Korea
34

35
36 Sangjo Park

37 Master's program, Department of Communication, Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of
38 Korea
39

40
41 Jongho Heo

42 Public Health Joint Doctoral Program, San Diego State University & University of California,
43 San Diego, US
44

45 Corresponding Author: Jongho Heo

46 Contact: +1-619-793-9738

47 Fax: +1-619-594-5888

48 E-mail: joheo@ucsd.edu

49
50 Public Health Joint Doctoral Program, San Diego State University & University of California,
51 San Diego, 9245 Sky Park Court, Ste. 100s, San Diego, CA, 92123, USA
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Association between district-level safety and self-rated health: a multilevel study in an urban setting

Abstract

Objectives: Several studies have reported the relationship between resident's perceived neighborhood safety and their health outcomes. However, those studies suffered from unreliability of neighborhood safety measure and potential residual confounding related to crime rates. In this study, using multilevel analysis to account for the hierarchical structure of the data, we examined associations between district-level safety and self-rated health after adjusting for potential confounders including individual-level perceived neighborhood safety and district-level crime rate.

Design: Cross-sectional study

Setting: We used the 1st wave of Seoul Welfare Panel Study, which has 7,761 individuals from 3,665 households in 25 administrative districts in Seoul, South Korea. District-level safety was obtained by aggregating responses from the residents that are representative samples for each administrative district in Seoul. We controlled objective district-level crime rate, individual-level perceived neighborhood safety and socio-demographic factors as well. To examine an association between district-level safety and residents' self-rated health, we used mixed effects logistic regression.

Results: Our results showed that higher district-level perceived safety, an aggregated measure of district residents' responses on neighborhood safety, was significantly associated with poor self-rated health after controlling for demographic influences and SES (OR: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.78-0.97). Notably, this association was still robust even when we additionally adjusted for district-level crime rate and individual-level perceived neighborhood safety (OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.77-0.96).

Conclusions: Our study highlights the importance of improving neighborhood safety to enhance resident health.

Keywords: perceived neighborhood safety, self-rated health, neighborhood crime rate, Seoul Welfare Panel Study, multilevel analysis

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Multilevel analytic frame was used to examine an association between district-level safety and residents' self-rated health using representative samples of metropolis, Seoul, South Korea.
- We succeed in adjusting for potential confounders such as individual-level perceived neighborhood safety and district-level crime rate in our analytic model, which past studies have failed.
- Causal relationships cannot be inferred from the cross-sectional data.

INTRODUCTION

Crime is one of the major problems in many metropolitan areas across countries. Although city crime rates have dropped globally since the mid-1990s,[1] there are still large variations and dramatic fluctuations across cities.[2] Past criminological studies revealed that variations in crime rates were explained by characteristics of metropolitan areas, such as population sizes, ethnic heterogeneity, geographic mobility, economic segregation, unemployment rate, poverty level and degree of social integration and control.[2-4] Thus, many governments have made great efforts to reduce the crime rates especially in metropolitan areas by intervening in those characteristics to ensure the safety of their residents.

Safety from crime is not only an essential human need in daily life, but also a prerequisite to human health.[5] A body of past studies has reported the relationship between residents' perceptions of neighborhood safety and their health outcomes.[6,7] For example, one UK survey with 407 adults reported that fear of crime was significantly associated with self-rated health and mental well-being.[8] Ziersch and Baum[10] showed that perceived neighborhood safety was related to physical and mental health among 2,400 residents in western suburbs of Adelaide, Australia.

However, these earlier studies suffer from the following limitations. First is the potential measurement error of the perceived neighborhood safety. The individual perception can be influenced by several factors such as prior individual experience of victimization, or individual health conditions other than neighborhood-level safety.[11,12] This could be particularly a critical issue in previous cross-sectional studies because of the potential reverse causation, meaning that the sick are more likely to perceive their neighborhood as unsafe.[7,13] The second

1
2
3
4 limitation is lack of representativeness of samples within the operationalized definition of
5
6 neighborhood. The sample size or the sample size within neighborhood of previous studies was
7
8 too small to be representative for each neighborhood.[6, 8,14] Unless the responses are obtained
9
10 from a representative sample of participants within each neighborhood, aggregated perceived
11
12 neighborhood measures can potentially be prone to measurement errors. Also, unavailability in
13
14 appropriate neighborhood measure may explain why there is scant hierarchical or multilevel
15
16 analysis which allows for estimating the influence of neighborhood measures on residents' health
17
18 outcomes. The final limitation is that previous studies did not adjust for district-level crime rate
19
20 as a potential confounder although crime-rate has been reported to influence perception of
21
22 neighborhood safety as well as residents' health outcomes.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 In this study, we assessed the district-level safety, which was obtained by aggregating responses
30
31 from the residents that are representative samples for each administrative district in Seoul, the
32
33 capital of South Korea. Then, using multilevel analysis to account for the hierarchical structure
34
35 of the data, we examined associations between district-level safety and self-rated health after
36
37 adjusting for potential confounders including individual-level perceived neighborhood safety and
38
39 district-level crime rate.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **METHODS**

47 **Study population**

48
49
50 Data were obtained from the Seoul Welfare Panel Study (SWPS), which tracked a representative
51
52 sample of households residing in 25 administrative districts in Seoul, South Korea. The SWPS
53
54 was launched in 2008 by the Seoul Welfare Foundation. The 1st wave of the survey was
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 conducted in 2008 and its supplementary survey targeting the low-income households was
5
6 implemented in 2009. The SWPS was suspended after the 2nd wave of the survey was conducted
7
8 in 2010 September. The survey employed a two-stage stratified cluster sampling approach where
9
10 a representative sample of census tracts for each district was first drawn, and then households
11
12 were randomly selected within those sampled census tracts at baseline. A household
13
14 representative answered household survey and all members of a household whose age is 15 or
15
16 older were interviewed. A total of 7,761 individuals completed the interviews in Wave 1. The
17
18 SWPS have been publicly released [<http://panel.welfare.seoul.kr>]. Because there was no
19
20 observation with missing variables, the final sample used in the data analysis of this research
21
22 consists of 7,761 individuals from 3,665 households from 25 administrative districts in Seoul.
23
24
25
26
27
28 This research received IRB exemption from Division of Research Affairs at the San Diego State
29
30 University.
31
32

33 34 **Exposure: district-level perceived neighborhood safety**

35
36
37 Perceived neighborhood safety was assessed through the household survey using a question
38
39 about how much a household representative agrees with the following statement: ‘My current
40
41 residential environment is unsafe’. Respondents answered in a five ordinal scale from “very
42
43 agree” (coded as 1) to “very disagree” (coded as 5). The answer was then dichotomized into
44
45 “unsafe” (coded as 0) for the response, 1-3 and “safe” (coded as 1) for the response, 4-5. The
46
47 binary responses from household representatives were aggregated to calculate an administrative
48
49 district-level perceived neighborhood safety by taking a weighted average within each district
50
51 with the household size used as weight. Such aggregation implies that the district-level perceived
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 neighborhood safety is essentially a sample proportion of individuals who answered “safe”
5
6 within each district.
7
8

9 10 **Outcome: self-rated health**

11
12
13 Poor self-rated health was assessed through the individual interview using the question “How
14 would you rate your overall health?” Respondents answered within a five ordinal scale ranging
15 from “Very good” (coded as 1) to “very poor” (coded as 5). The response was then dichotomized
16 into “good health” (coded as 0) for response, 1-3 and “poor health” (coded as 1) for response, 4-
17 5. Although self-rated health cannot assess multi-dimensional aspects of health conditions, it is
18 known to be a reliable predictor of life-expectancy after adjusting for other health indicators.[15]
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Covariates**

29
30
31 We included several confounders in the data analysis. For individual-level confounders, we have
32 sex, age group (15-19 yrs, 20-29 yrs, 30-39 yrs, 40-49 yrs, 50-59 yrs, 60-69 yrs, and 70 years or
33 more), education level (elementary or less, junior high school, high school, college graduate,
34 university graduate, and graduate school or more), marital status(married or cohabiting vs.
35 others), and job status (employed vs. unemployed), household with six categories (1,000,000
36 KRW or less, 1,010,000-2,000,000 KRW, 2,010,000-3,000,000 KRW, 3,010,000-4,000,000
37 KRW, 4,010,000-5,000,000 KRW, and Above 5,000,000 KRW), and individual-level
38 neighborhood safety (unsafe vs. safe). Because neighborhood safety was assessed solely from the
39 household survey, we assigned the value of perceived neighborhood safety measured from each
40 household representative to all members of the household.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 We considered district-level crime rate as a potential covariate at district-level because it can
5 influence residents' health as well as perceived safety. District-level crime rates for each of 25
6 administrative district ('Gu') in Seoul were collected from the 'Analytical report on crimes
7 (2008)' that is annually published by supreme prosecutors' office in South Korea.[16] Crime rate
8 was calculated by dividing the total number of crimes by the total number of residents in each
9 district (Expressed in number/year/1000persons). Using an administrative district identifier in the
10 SWPS, we linked the official crime rate of each administrative district to our final dataset of the
11 SWPS.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 24 **Data analysis**

25
26 Mixed effects logistic regression was used to investigate the association between district-level
27 safety and self-rated health. Because of the hierarchical structure in our data (i.e., individuals are
28 nested in households, which in turn are nested in districts), within-household and within-district
29 correlations were incorporated using household-specific and district-specific random intercepts.
30 We made stepwise adjustments of potential confounders in the data analysis. First, we adjusted
31 for potential confounders including sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and
32 household-level income. Second, we added individual-level perceived neighborhood safety to the
33 previously listed confounders for adjustment. Finally, we examined the association after
34 adjusting for district-level crime rate in addition to all of the previously mentioned confounders.
35 All of the confounders were included as categorical variables and the district-level safety was
36 included after standardization for simple interpretation in the model. All computations were done
37 using R statistical software.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the distribution of the study population and the prevalence of poor self-rated health by each of the individual-level, household-level, and district-level characteristics. Overall, self-rated health was reported at 20.9% (1,620 out of 7,761 participants). The proportion was higher for women and showed an increasing pattern with age. Lower proportions were observed for participants in lower education levels. The unemployed and the group of people in an unsafe neighborhood exhibited higher prevalence of poor self-rated health compared to the employed and the group in a safe neighborhood. Household income were fairly equally distributed in the SWPS. As to the district-level safety and crime rate, given the overall mean of each variable, relative size of each standard deviation shows that there are considerable variations among the 25 districts.

District-level safety was significantly associated with poor self-rated health while different sets of confounders being step-wisely adjusted (Table 2). Living in a district where its safety level is 1 standard deviation (0.08) higher resulted in 13% lower odds of reporting self-rated poor health status (OR: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.78, 0.97) after adjusting for sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and household-level income. When adjusted for individual-level safety, this association was slightly attenuated but still significant (OR: 0.88, 95% CI: 0.79, 0.98). When we controlled for district-level crime, the magnitude of this association was slightly increased and remained significant (OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.77, 0.96).

DISCUSSION

1
2
3
4 Evidence from our study indicated that district-level safety, as assessed by aggregating responses
5 from district residents, was significantly associated with poor self-rated health even after
6
7 controlling for demographic influences and SES. Notably, this association was still robust when
8
9 we also adjusted for district-level crime rate and individual-level perceived neighborhood safety.
10
11
12

13
14 Our findings are in line with previous research that showed associations between perceived
15 regional safety and health outcomes. Past studies have also reported that residents who perceived
16 that their neighborhood had more severe problems were more likely to experience greater
17 anxiety, stress, and depression.[6,17] The studies sampled women, children, and the elderly also
18 provided consistent evidence of a relationship between perceived crime risk and physical
19 health.[7,14]
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 In this study, district-level crime rate was not associated with self-rated health in the fully
31 adjusted model. Furthermore, our post-hoc analysis showed that there was no statistically
32 significant relationship between district crime rate and residents' self-rated health regardless of
33 covariate adjustment, although district-level crime rate could be a major influence on district-
34 level safety. This finding is different from past studies that reported a significant relationship
35 between district crime rate and residents' health such as coronary heart disease[18] and low birth
36 weight.[19]
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The differential association between perceived district-level perceived safety and crime rate in
48 relation to self-rated health could be explained by three ways. First, mass media may increase
49 individual-level perceived neighborhood insecurity regardless of their neighborhood crime rates,
50 especially when they reported the crime in ways of exaggeration.[20,21] The mass media tend to
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 emphasize criminal stories which can draw attention from audience.[22] Previous studies called
5
6 this phenomenon as "cultivation effect" meaning that exposure to the world of television
7
8 cultivates exaggerated perceptions of viewers and magnifies viewers' fear about crime.[23] The
9
10 residents who watched news on neighborhood crimes may perceive their neighborhood more
11
12 vulnerable regions to crime. Moreover, mass media may also increase the perceived
13
14 neighborhood safety of individuals regardless of their objective neighborhood crime rates.[21]
15
16 Second, different types of crime have different effects on the perceived risk or fear of crime. For
17
18 example, murder, rape, and personal theft may have higher effects on the fear of crime than
19
20 larceny and auto-theft. Hence, total crime rate that was used in this research to indicate district-
21
22 level crime rate would not be a proper measure when searching its association with the residents'
23
24 health condition.[24] Finally, if social and physical resources of neighborhood are deteriorated or
25
26 deprived, residents tend to perceive neighborhood safety more irrespective with the objective
27
28 neighborhood crime rate.[25] The poor quality of social and physical environment, such as
29
30 dilapidated houses or having no formal or informal neighborhood networks, may trigger to
31
32 perceive neighborhood dangerous.[26,27]

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40 There could be several pathways linking these perceived neighborhood safety to self-rated health
41
42 irrespective to objective neighborhood crime rate. First, higher district-level perceived safety can
43
44 cause less outdoor physical activities[7,28] leading to poor health. Second, elevated district-level
45
46 perceived safety iteratively aggravate social supports or deteriorate physical environments, in
47
48 turn, may harm mental and physical outcomes.[29] Last, elevated district-level perceived safety
49
50 may be a latent stressor causing chronic stress status undermine residents' mental health.[30]
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Our study has a limitation of potential reverse causation due to its cross-sectional study design,
5
6 implying that people with poor-self rated health are more likely to perceive their neighborhood
7
8 as unsafe. However, because the association was still significant after adjusting for individual-
9
10 perceived safety, which is a critical pathway of this reverse causation, so we believe that the
11
12 potential reverse causation cannot fully explain the observed association.
13
14

15
16
17 Despite this limitation, our study has the strength in that we used representative samples for each
18
19 operationalized administrative district, which enabled multi-level analysis using an aggregate
20
21 measure of perceived safety as an exposure variable. Furthermore, we found a significant
22
23 association after adjusting for other relevant potential confounder such as district-crime rate that
24
25 could influence both exposure and outcome variable in this study. To our knowledge, this is one
26
27 of the first studies controlled for crime-rate to examine the association between perceived
28
29 neighborhood safety and health outcome.
30
31
32

33
34 In sum, our study showed that district-level perceived safety was associated with residents' poor
35
36 self-rated health even after controlling for demographic influences, SES, district-level crime rate,
37
38 and individual-level perceived safety. Our study results evoke the importance of local authorities
39
40 (or governments) to make efforts toward improving neighborhood safety to enhance resident
41
42 health.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the independent variables and their associations with self-rated poor health (N=7761)

Variables	Total	Prevalence of poor self-rated health	
	N	N (%)	p-values
<i>Individual level variables (N=7761)</i>			
Sex			<0.0001
Male	3547	599 (16.9)	
Female	4214	1021 (24.2)	
Age (years)			<0.0001
15-19	536	17 (3.2)	
20-29	973	26 (2.7)	
30-39	1577	92 (5.8)	
40-49	1425	185 (13.0)	
50-59	1139	242 (21.2)	
60-69	1130	482 (42.7)	
70 or more	981	576 (58.7)	
Job Status			<0.0001
Employed	3199	293 (9.2)	
Unemployed	4562	1327 (29.1)	
Education Level			<0.0001
Elementary school or less	1143	664 (58.1)	
Middle school	703	271 (38.5)	
High school	2483	433 (17.4)	
College graduate	572	46 (8.0)	
University graduate	2516	185 (7.4)	
Graduate school or more	344	21 (6.1)	
Marital status			0.151
Married/cohabiting	5059	1031 (20.4)	
Others	2702	589 (21.8)	
Individual-level safety			<0.0001
Safe	6777	1361 (20.1)	
Unsafe	984	259 (26.3)	
<i>Household level variables (N=3665)</i>			
Household Income			
1,000,000 KRW or less	770		
1,010,000-2,000,000 KRW	772		
2,010,000-3,000,000 KRW	656		
3,010,000-4,000,000 KRW	510		
4,010,000-5,000,000 KRW	345		
Above 5,000,000 KRW	612		
<i>District level variables (N=25)</i>			
District-level perceived safety (mean (SD) ^a	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Range</u>
	0.87	0.08	0.68-0.98

1
2
3
4 **District-level crime rate (mean (SD))^b** 4.63 2.94 2.25-16.31
5

6 ^a District-specific average of individual-level safety
7

8 ^b Expressed in number/year/1000persons
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 2. Associations between district-level perceived safety and poor self-rated health

	Unadjusted		Adjusted ^a					
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
District-level perceived safety ^b	0.83***	(0.76, 0.91)	0.87*	(0.78, 0.97)	0.88*	(0.79, 0.98)	0.86**	(0.77, 0.96)
Individual-level perceived safety					0.83	(0.66, 1.04)	0.82	(0.65, 1.04)
District-level crime rate							0.97	(0.93, 1.01)

^a Adjusted for sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and household-level income

^b Aggregated responses about neighborhood safety among residents in the same district. The variables was included in the data analysis after standardization

* p-value<0.05, ** p-value<0.01, *** p-value<0.001

1
2
3 Acknowledgments: None
4

5 Contributorship: SSK coordinated the design, analysis and writing the manuscript. JC, KP, YC,
6 SP, JH participated in the design, analysis and in preparing the manuscript. All of the authors
7 contributed to read, edited and approved of the final draft of the manuscript.
8
9

10 Competing interests: None
11

12 Data Sharing Statement: No additional data are available.
13

14
15
16
17 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
18 not-for-profit sectors.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

1. Tseloni A, Mailley J, Farrell G, et al. Exploring the international decline in crime rates. *European Journal of Criminology* 2010;**7**(5):375-94.
2. McCall PL, Land KC, Parker KF. Heterogeneity in the rise and decline of city-level homicide rates, 1976–2005: A latent trajectory analysis. *Social Science Research* 2011;**40**(1):363-78.
3. Sampson RJ, Raudenbush SW, Earls F. Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science* 1997;**277**(5328):918-24.
4. Patterson EB. Poverty, income inequality, and community crime rates. *Criminology* 1991;**29**(4):755-76.
5. Krug EG, Mercy JA, Dahlberg LL, et al. The world report on violence and health. *The lancet* 2002;**360**(9339):1083-88.
6. Gary TL, Stark SA, LaVeist TA. Neighborhood characteristics and mental health among African Americans and whites living in a racially integrated urban community. *Health & Place* 2007;**13**(2):569-75.
7. Tucker-Seeley RD, Subramanian S, Li Y, et al. Neighborhood safety, socioeconomic status, and physical activity in older adults. *American journal of preventive medicine* 2009;**37**(3):207-13.
8. Green G, Gilbertson JM, Grimsley MF. Fear of crime and health in residential tower blocks A case study in Liverpool, UK. *The European Journal of Public Health* 2002;**12**(1):10-15.
9. Latkin CA, Curry AD. Stressful neighborhoods and depression: a prospective study of the impact of neighborhood disorder. *Journal of health and social behavior* 2003:34-44.
10. Ziersch AM, Baum FE, MacDougall C, et al. Neighbourhood life and social capital: the implications for health. *Social science & medicine* 2005;**60**(1):71-86.

- 1
2
3 11. Raudenbush SW. *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*:
4
5 Sage, 2002.
6
- 7
8 12. Kruger DJ, Reischl TM, Gee GC. Neighborhood social conditions mediate the association
9
10 between physical deterioration and mental health. *American journal of community*
11
12 *psychology* 2007;**40**(3-4):261-71.
13
- 14 13. Wen M, Hawkey LC, Cacioppo JT. Objective and perceived neighborhood environment,
15
16 individual SES and psychosocial factors, and self-rated health: An analysis of older
17
18 adults in Cook County, Illinois. *Social science & medicine* 2006;**63**(10):2575-90.
19
- 20 14. White M, Kasl SV, Zahner GE, et al. Perceived crime in the neighborhood and mental health
21
22 of women and children. *Environment and Behavior* 1987;**19**(5):588-613.
23
- 24 15. Idler EL, Benyamini Y. Self-rated health and mortality: a review of twenty-seven community
25
26 studies. *J Health Soc Behav* 1997;**38**(1):21-37.
27
- 28 16. Supreme Prosecutors' Office Republic Of Korea. Analytical Report on Crimes (2008), 2009.
29
- 30 17. Curry A, Latkin C, Davey-Rothwell M. Pathways to depression: The impact of neighborhood
31
32 violent crime on inner-city residents in Baltimore, Maryland, USA. *Social Science &*
33
34 *Medicine* 2008;**67**(1):23-30.
35
- 36 18. Sundquist K, Theobald H, Yang M, et al. Neighborhood violent crime and unemployment
37
38 increase the risk of coronary heart disease: a multilevel study in an urban setting. *Social*
39
40 *science & medicine* 2006;**62**(8):2061-71.
41
42
- 43 19. O'Campo P, Xue X, Wang M-C, et al. Neighborhood risk factors for low birthweight in
44
45 Baltimore: a multilevel analysis. *American Journal of Public Health* 1997;**87**(7):1113-18.
46
- 47 20. Warr M. Fear of victimization. *Public Perspective* 1993;**5**:25-28.
48
- 49 21. Romer D, Jamieson KH, Aday S. Television news and the cultivation of fear of crime.
50
51 *Journal of communication* 2003;**53**(1):88-104.
52
- 53 22. Lipschultz JH, Hilt ML. *Crime and local television news: Dramatic, breaking, and live from*
54
55 *the scene*: Routledge, 2002.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 23. Gerbner G. Cultivation analysis: An overview. *Mass Communication and Society* 1998;**1**(3-
4 4):175-94.
5
6
7 24. Meier RF, Short JF. CRIME AS HAZARD: PERCEPTIONS OF RISK AND SERIOUSNESS*.
8 *Criminology* 1985;**23**(3):389-400.
9
10 25. Carpiano RM. Toward a neighborhood resource-based theory of social capital for health:
11 Can Bourdieu and sociology help? *Social science & medicine* 2006;**62**(1):165-75.
12
13 26. Rodrigues CD. Civil democracy, perceived risk, and insecurity in Brazil: An extension of the
14 systemic social control model. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and*
15 *Social Science* 2006;**605**(1):242-63.
16
17 27. Gibson CL, Zhao J, Lovrich NP, et al. Social integration, individual perceptions of collective
18 efficacy, and fear of crime in three cities. *Justice Quarterly* 2002;**19**(3):537-64.
19
20 28. Roman CG, Chalfin A. Fear of walking outdoors: a multilevel ecologic analysis of crime and
21 disorder. *American journal of preventive medicine* 2008;**34**(4):306-12.
22
23 29. Kim S-S, Chung Y, Perry MJ, et al. Association between interpersonal trust, reciprocity, and
24 depression in South Korea: A prospective analysis. *PloS one* 2012;**7**(1):e30602.
25
26 30. Stockdale SE, Wells KB, Tang L, et al. The importance of social context: neighborhood
27 stressors, stress-buffering mechanisms, and alcohol, drug, and mental health disorders.
28 *Social Science & Medicine* 2007;**65**(9):1867-81.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STROBE 2007 (v4) checklist of items to be included in reports of observational studies in epidemiology*
Checklist for cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies (combined)

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses	6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6-7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6-7
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	6-7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7-9
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7-9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7-9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	9
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	9

		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	10
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	10
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	10
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	10
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	10
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	13
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	13
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	17

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Association between district-level safety and self-rated health: a multilevel study in an urban setting

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-004695.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-Apr-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Kim, Seung-Sup; Korea University, Department of Public Health Sciences Choi, Jaesung; Sungkyunkwan University, Department of Economics Park, Kisoo; Korea University, Department of Healthcare Management Chung, Yeonseung; Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Department of Mathematical Sciences Park, Sangjo; Seoul National University, Department of Communication Heo, Jongho; San Diego State University & University of California, San Diego, Public Health Joint Doctoral Program
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Public health, Sociology
Keywords:	perceived neighborhood safety, self-rated health, neighborhood crime rate, Seoul Welfare Panel Study, multilevel analysis

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **Association between district-level safety and self-rated health:**
8
9
10 **a multilevel study in an urban setting**
11
12
13

14 Seung-Sup Kim MD, ScD, Jaesung Choi PhD, Kisoo Park PhD, Yeonseung Chung PhD, Sangjo
15 Park BA, Jongho Heo*
16

17
18 Seung-Sup Kim

19 Department of Public Health Sciences, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea, Department
20 of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, US, Department of
21 Environmental and Occupational Health, The George Washington University School of Public
22 Health and Health Services, Washington, DC, US
23
24

25
26 Jaesung Choi

27 Department of Economics, Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, Republic of Korea
28

29
30 Kisoo Park

31 Department of Healthcare Management, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea
32

33
34 Yeonseung Chung

35 Department of Mathematical Sciences, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology,
36 Daejeon, Republic of Korea
37

38
39 Sangjo Park

40 Master's program, Department of Communication, Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of
41 Korea
42

43
44 Jongho Heo

45 Public Health Joint Doctoral Program, San Diego State University & University of California,
46 San Diego, US
47

48 Corresponding Author: Jongho Heo

49 Contact: +1-619-793-9738

50 Fax: +1-619-594-5888

51 E-mail: joheo@ucsd.edu

52 Public Health Joint Doctoral Program, San Diego State University & University of California,
53 San Diego, 9245 Sky Park Court, Ste. 100s, San Diego, CA, 92123, USA
54
55
56
57

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Association between district-level safety and self-rated health:
8
9 a multilevel study in an urban setting
10
11
12
13

14 **Abstract**
15

16
17 **Objectives:** Several studies have reported the relationship between resident's perceived
18 neighborhood safety and their health outcomes. However, those studies suffered from
19 unreliability of neighborhood safety measure and potential residual confounding related to crime
20 rates. In this study, using multilevel analysis to account for the hierarchical structure of the data,
21 we examined associations between district-level safety and self-rated health after adjusting for
22 potential confounders including individual-level perceived neighborhood safety and district-level
23 crime rate.
24
25

26
27 **Design:** Cross-sectional study
28

29
30 **Setting:** We used the 1st wave of Seoul Welfare Panel Study, which has 7,761 individuals from
31 3,665 households in 25 administrative districts in Seoul, South Korea. District-level safety was
32 obtained by aggregating responses from the residents that are representative samples for each
33 administrative district in Seoul. To examine an association between district-level safety and
34 residents' self-rated health, we used mixed effects logistic regression.
35
36

37
38 **Results:** Our results showed that higher district-level perceived safety, an aggregated measure of
39 district residents' responses on neighborhood safety, was significantly associated with poor self-
40 rated health after controlling for demographic influences and SES (OR: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.78-0.97).
41 Notably, this association was still robust even when we additionally adjusted for district-level
42 crime rate and individual-level perceived neighborhood safety (OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.77-0.96).
43
44

45
46 **Conclusions:** Our study highlights the importance of improving neighborhood safety to enhance
47 resident health.
48
49
50
51

52
53 **Keywords:** perceived neighborhood safety, self-rated health, neighborhood crime rate, Seoul
54 Welfare Panel Study, multilevel analysis
55
56
57

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Multilevel analytic frame was used to examine an association between district-level safety and residents' self-rated health using representative samples of metropolis, Seoul, South Korea.
- We succeed in adjusting for potential confounders such as individual-level perceived neighborhood safety and district-level crime rate in our analytic model, which past studies have failed.
- Causal relationships cannot be inferred from the cross-sectional data.

INTRODUCTION

Crime is one of the major problems in many metropolitan areas across countries. Although city crime rates have dropped globally since the mid-1990s,¹ there are still large variations and dramatic fluctuations across cities.² Past criminological studies revealed that variations in crime rates were explained by characteristics of metropolitan areas, such as population sizes, ethnic heterogeneity, geographic mobility, economic segregation, unemployment rate, poverty level and degree of social integration and control.²⁻⁴ Thus, many governments have made great efforts to reduce the crime rates especially in metropolitan areas by intervening in those characteristics to ensure the safety of their residents.

Safety from crime is not only an essential human need in daily life, but also a prerequisite to human health.⁵ A body of past studies has reported the relationship between residents' perceptions of neighborhood safety and their health outcomes.^{6,7} For example, one UK survey with 407 adults reported that fear of crime was significantly associated with self-rated health and mental well-being.⁸ Ziersch and Baum⁹ showed that perceived neighborhood safety was related to physical and mental health among 2,400 residents in western suburbs of Adelaide, Australia.

However, these earlier studies suffer from the following limitations. First, most of previous studies used individual-level neighborhood perceived safety as exposure variable, which could be influenced by several factors such as prior individual experience of victimization or individual health conditions other than neighborhood-level safety.^{10,11} This could be particularly a critical issue in previous cross-sectional studies because of the potential reverse causation, meaning that the sick are more likely to perceive their neighborhood as unsafe.^{7,12} The second limitation is lack of representativeness of samples within the operationalized definition of neighborhood. Few

1
2
3
4 studies had enough sample size or the sample size within neighborhood to be representative for
5
6 each neighborhood.^{6,8,13} Unless the responses are obtained from a representative sample of
7
8 participants within each neighborhood, aggregated perceived neighborhood measures can
9
10 potentially be prone to measurement errors. The final limitation is that previous studies did not
11
12 adjust for district-level crime rate as a potential confounder although crime-rate has been
13
14 reported to influence perception of neighborhood safety as well as residents' health outcomes.
15
16
17

18
19 In this study, we assessed the district-level safety, which was obtained by aggregating responses
20
21 from the residents that are representative samples for each administrative district in Seoul, the
22
23 capital of South Korea. Then, using multilevel analysis to account for the hierarchical structure
24
25 of the data, we examined associations between district-level safety and self-rated health after
26
27 adjusting for potential confounders including individual-level perceived neighborhood safety and
28
29 district-level crime rate.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **METHODS**

38 **Study population**

39
40 Data were obtained from the Seoul Welfare Panel Study (SWPS), which tracked a representative
41
42 sample of households residing in 25 administrative districts in Seoul, South Korea. The SWPS
43
44 was launched in 2008 by the Seoul Welfare Foundation. The 1st wave of the survey was
45
46 conducted in 2008 and its supplementary survey targeting the low-income households was
47
48 implemented in 2009. The SWPS was suspended after the 2nd wave of the survey was conducted
49
50 in 2010 September. The survey employed a two-stage stratified cluster sampling approach where
51
52 a representative sample of census tracts for each district was first drawn, and then households
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 were randomly selected within those sampled census tracts at baseline. A household
5
6 representative answered household survey and all members of a household whose age is 15 or
7
8 older were interviewed. A total of 7,761 individuals completed the interviews in Wave 1. The
9
10 SWPS have been publicly released [<http://panel.welfare.seoul.kr>]. Because all respondents
11
12 answered on questionnaire items we used in this study, we were able to conduct our analyses
13
14 based on the entire sample participated in the first wave of SWPS without listwise deletion or
15
16 missing value imputation for handling missing data. The final sample used in the data analysis of
17
18 this research consists of 7,761 individuals from 3,665 households from 25 administrative districts
19
20 in Seoul. The number of households in each district was 146.6 on average, ranging from 108 to
21
22 198. This research received IRB exemption from Division of Research Affairs at the San Diego
23
24 State University.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Exposure: district-level perceived neighborhood safety**

32
33 Perceived neighborhood safety was assessed through the household survey using a question
34
35 about how much a household representative agrees with the following statement: ‘My current
36
37 residential environment is unsafe’. Respondents answered in a five level ordinal scale from
38
39 “strongly agree” (coded as 1) to “strongly disagree” (coded as 5). The answer was then
40
41 dichotomized into “unsafe” (coded as 0) for the response, 1-2 and “safe” (coded as 1) for the
42
43 response, 3-5. The binary responses from household representatives were aggregated to calculate
44
45 an administrative district-level perceived neighborhood safety by taking a weighted average of
46
47 household-specific perceived safety within each district with the household size used as weight.
48
49 Such aggregation results in that the district-level perceived neighborhood safety is essentially
50
51 sample proportion of individuals who answered “safe” within each district.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Outcome: self-rated health

Poor self-rated health was assessed through the individual interview using the question “How would you rate your overall health?” This question is on the ordinal level, ranging from “very good” (coded as 1) to “very poor” (coded as 5). The response was then dichotomized into “good health” (coded as 0) for response, 1-3 and “poor health” (coded as 1) for response, 4-5. Although self-rated health cannot assess multi-dimensional aspects of health conditions, it is known to be a reliable predictor of life-expectancy after adjusting for other health indicators.¹⁴

Covariates

We included several confounders in the data analysis. For individual-level confounders, we have sex, age group (15-19 yrs, 20-29 yrs, 30-39 yrs, 40-49 yrs, 50-59 yrs, 60-69 yrs, and 70 years or more), education level (elementary or less, junior high school, high school, college graduate, university graduate, and graduate school or more), marital status (married or cohabiting vs. others), and job status (employed vs. unemployed), household income with six categories (1,000,000 KRW or less, 1,010,000-2,000,000 KRW, 2,010,000-3,000,000 KRW, 3,010,000-4,000,000 KRW, 4,010,000-5,000,000 KRW, and Above 5,000,000 KRW), and individual-level neighborhood safety (unsafe vs. safe). Because neighborhood safety was assessed solely from the household survey, we assigned the value of perceived neighborhood safety measured from each household representative to all members of the household.

We considered district-level crime rate as a potential covariate at district-level because it can influence residents’ health as well as perceived safety. District-level crime rates for each of 25 administrative district (‘Gu’) in Seoul were collected from the ‘Analytical report on crimes

1
2
3
4 (2008)' that is annually published by supreme prosecutors' office in South Korea.¹⁵ District-level
5
6 crime rate was calculated by dividing the total number of crimes by the total number of residents
7
8 in each district (Expressed in number/year/1000persons). Using an administrative district
9
10 identifier in the SWPS, we linked the official crime rate of each administrative district to our
11
12 final dataset of the SWPS.
13
14

15 16 17 **Data analysis**

18
19 Mixed effect logistic regression was used to investigate the association between district-level
20
21 safety and self-rated health. Because of the hierarchical structure in our data (i.e., individuals are
22
23 nested in households, which in turn are nested in districts), within-household and within-district
24
25 correlations were incorporated using household-specific and district-specific random intercepts.
26
27 We made stepwise adjustments of potential confounders in the data analysis. First, we adjusted
28
29 for potential confounders including sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and
30
31 household-level income. Second, we added individual-level perceived neighborhood safety to the
32
33 previously listed confounders for adjustment. Finally, we examined the association after
34
35 adjusting for district-level crime rate in addition to all of the previously mentioned confounders.
36
37 All of the confounders were included as categorical variables and the district-level safety was
38
39 included after standardization for simple interpretation in the model. All computations were done
40
41 using R statistical software.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **RESULTS**

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Table 1 presents the distribution of the study population and the prevalence of poor self-rated
5 health by each of the individual-level, household-level, and district-level characteristics. Overall,
6 poor self-rated health was reported at 20.9% (1,620 out of 7,761 participants). The proportion
7 was higher for women and showed an increasing pattern with age. Lower proportions were
8 observed for participants in lower education levels. The unemployed and people living in an
9 unsafe neighborhood exhibited higher prevalence of poor self-rated health compared to the
10 employed and those living in a safe neighborhood. Household income were fairly equally
11 distributed in the SWPS. As to the district-level safety and crime rate, given the overall mean of
12 each variable, relative size of each standard deviation shows that there were considerable
13 variations among the 25 districts.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 District-level safety was significantly associated with poor self-rated health while different sets
30 of confounders being step-wisely adjusted (Table 2). Living in a district where its safety level is
31 1 standard deviation (0.08) higher resulted in 13% lower odds of reporting self-rated poor health
32 status (OR: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.78, 0.97) after adjusting for sex, age, education level, job status,
33 marital status, and household-level income. When adjusted for individual-level safety, this
34 association was slightly attenuated but still significant (OR: 0.88, 95% CI: 0.79, 0.98). When we
35 controlled for district-level crime, the magnitude of this association was slightly increased and
36 remained significant (OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.77, 0.96).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 DISCUSSION

51
52 Evidence from our study indicated that district-level perceived safety, which was assessed by
53 aggregating responses from residents in each district, was significantly associated with poor self-
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 rated health even after controlling for demographic information and SES. Notably, this
5
6 association was still robust when we additionally adjusted for district-level crime rate and
7
8 individual reporting of perceived neighborhood safety.
9
10

11
12 Our findings are in line with previous research that showed associations between perceived
13
14 neighborhood safety and health outcomes. Past studies have also reported that residents who
15
16 perceived that their neighborhood had more severe problems were more likely to experience
17
18 greater anxiety, stress, and depression.^{6,16} The studies sampled women, children, and the elderly
19
20 also provided consistent evidence of a relationship between perceived crime risk and physical
21
22 health.^{7,13}
23
24
25
26

27
28 In this study, district-level crime rate was not associated with self-rated health in the fully
29
30 adjusted model. Furthermore, our post-hoc analysis showed that there was no statistically
31
32 significant relationship between district crime rate and residents' self-rated health regardless of
33
34 covariate adjustment, although district-level crime rate could be a major influence on district-
35
36 level safety. This finding is different from past studies that reported a significant relationship
37
38 between district crime rate and residents' health such as coronary heart disease¹⁷ and low birth
39
40 weight.¹⁸
41
42
43
44

45
46 The differential association between district-level perceived safety and crime rate in relation to
47
48 self-rated health could be explained by three ways. First, mass media may increase individual-
49
50 level perceived neighborhood insecurity regardless of their neighborhood crime rates, especially
51
52 when they reported the crime in ways of exaggeration.^{19,20} The mass media tend to emphasize
53
54 criminal stories which can draw attention from audience.²¹ Previous studies called this
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 phenomenon as "cultivation effect" meaning that exposure to the world of television cultivates
6 exaggerated perceptions of viewers and magnifies viewers' fear about crime.²² The residents who
7
8
9 watched news on neighborhood crimes may perceive their neighborhood more vulnerable
10
11 regions to crime. Moreover, mass media may also increase the individual-level perceived
12
13 neighborhood safety regardless of their objective neighborhood crime rates.²⁰ Second, different
14
15 types of crime would have different effects on the perceived risk or fear of crime. For example,
16
17 murder, rape, and personal theft may have higher effects on the fear of crime than larceny and
18
19 auto-theft. Hence, total crime rate that was used in this research might not be sophisticated
20
21 enough to clearly capture the association between the prevalence of crime in the district and the
22
23 residents' health condition.²³ However, when we conducted a post-hoc analysis using a different
24
25 measure, '5 index crime rate', which includes major five serious crimes (i.e. murder, robbery,
26
27 rape, assault and theft) that has been adopted by Korean police to indicate violent crime rate, still
28
29 we could not find any association with residents' self-rated health. Finally, if social and physical
30
31 resources of neighborhood are deteriorated or deprived, residents tend to perceive neighborhood
32
33 safety more irrespective of the objective neighborhood crime rate.²⁴ The poor quality of social
34
35 and physical environment, such as dilapidated houses or having no formal or informal
36
37 neighborhood networks, may work as a trigger to make residents perceive their neighborhood
38
39 dangerous.^{25,26}

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 There could be several pathways linking district-level perceived neighborhood safety to self-
49
50 rated health irrespective of neighborhood crime rate and individual-level perceived neighborhood
51
52 safety. First, higher district-level perceived safety can cause less outdoor physical activities^{7,27}
53
54 leading to poor health. Second, elevated district-level perceived safety iteratively aggravates
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 social supports or deteriorates physical environments, in turn, it may harm mental and physical
5 outcomes.²⁸ Last, elevated district-level perceived safety may be a latent stressor causing chronic
6 stress status that could undermine residents' mental health.²⁹
7
8
9

10
11
12 Our study has several limitations. First, potential reverse causation is of concern due to its cross-
13 sectional study design, implying that people with poor-self rated health are more likely to
14 perceive their neighborhood as unsafe. However, because the association was still significant
15 after adjusting for individual-perceived safety, which is a critical pathway of this reverse
16 causation, so we believe that the potential reverse causation cannot fully explain the observed
17 association. Second, this study assessed perceived neighborhood safety through a single-item
18 measure. This item may not reflect multi-dimensional aspects of the neighborhood safety.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Despite these limitations, our study has the strength in that we used representative samples for
32 each operationalized administrative district, which enabled multi-level analysis using an district-
33 level aggregate measure of perceived safety whereas most of previous studies used individual
34 reporting of perceived safety as an exposure variable. Furthermore, to our knowledge, this is one
35 of the first studies to examine the association between district-level perceived neighborhood
36 safety and health outcome after adjusting for district-level crime rate.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 In sum, our study showed that district-level perceived safety was associated with residents' poor
47 self-rated health even after controlling for demographic influences, SES, district-level crime rate,
48 and individual-level perceived safety. Our study results evoke the importance of local authorities
49 (or governments) to make efforts toward improving neighborhood safety to enhance residents'
50 health.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the independent variables and their associations with self-rated poor health (N=7761)

Variables	Total	Prevalence of poor self-rated health	
	N	N (%)	p-values
<i>Individual level variables (N=7761)</i>			
Sex			<0.0001
Male	3547	599 (16.9)	
Female	4214	1021 (24.2)	
Age (years)			<0.0001
15-19	536	17 (3.2)	
20-29	973	26 (2.7)	
30-39	1577	92 (5.8)	
40-49	1425	185 (13.0)	
50-59	1139	242 (21.2)	
60-69	1130	482 (42.7)	
70 or more	981	576 (58.7)	
Job Status			<0.0001
Employed	3199	293 (9.2)	
Unemployed	4562	1327 (29.1)	
Education Level			<0.0001
Elementary school or less	1143	664 (58.1)	
Middle school	703	271 (38.5)	
High school	2483	433 (17.4)	
College graduate	572	46 (8.0)	
University graduate	2516	185 (7.4)	
Graduate school or more	344	21 (6.1)	
Marital status			0.151
Married/cohabiting	5059	1031 (20.4)	
Others	2702	589 (21.8)	
Individual-level safety			<0.0001
Safe	6777	1361 (20.1)	
Unsafe	984	259 (26.3)	
<i>Household level variables (N=3665)</i>			
Household Income			
1,000,000 KRW or less	770		
1,010,000-2,000,000 KRW	772		
2,010,000-3,000,000 KRW	656		
3,010,000-4,000,000 KRW	510		
4,010,000-5,000,000 KRW	345		
Above 5,000,000 KRW	612		
<i>District level variables (N=25)</i>			
District-level perceived safety (mean (SD))^a	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Range</u>
	0.87	0.08	0.68-0.98

1
2
3
4
5 **District-level crime rate (mean (SD))^b** 4.63 2.94 2.25-16.31
6

7 ^a District-specific average of individual-level safety

8 ^b Expressed in number/year/1000persons
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 2. Associations between district-level perceived safety and poor self-rated health

	Unadjusted		Adjusted ^a					
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
District-level perceived safety ^b	0.83***	(0.76, 0.91)	0.87*	(0.78, 0.97)	0.88*	(0.79, 0.98)	0.86**	(0.77, 0.96)
Individual-level perceived safety					0.83	(0.66, 1.04)	0.82	(0.65, 1.04)
District-level crime rate							0.97	(0.93, 1.01)

^a Adjusted for sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and household-level income

^b Aggregated responses about neighborhood safety among residents in the same district. The variables was included in the data analysis after standardization

* p-value<0.05, ** p-value<0.01

1
2
3 Acknowledgments: None
4
5
6

7
8 Competing interests: None
9
10

11
12 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
13 not-for-profit sectors.
14
15

16
17
18 Contributorship: SSK coordinated the design, analysis and writing the manuscript. JC, KP, YC, SP, JH
19 participated in the design, analysis and in preparing the manuscript. All of the authors contributed to
20 read, edited and approved of the final draft of the manuscript.
21
22

23
24
25 Data sharing: No additional data are available.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

1. Tseloni A, Mailley J, Farrell G, et al. Exploring the international decline in crime rates. *European Journal of Criminology*. 2010;7(5):375-394.
2. McCall PL, Land KC, Parker KF. Heterogeneity in the rise and decline of city-level homicide rates, 1976–2005: A latent trajectory analysis. *Social Science Research*. 2011;40(1):363-378.
3. Sampson RJ, Raudenbush SW, Earls F. Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*. 1997;277(5328):918-924.
4. Patterson EB. Poverty, income inequality, and community crime rates. *Criminology*. 1991;29(4):755-776.
5. Krug EG, Mercy JA, Dahlberg LL, et al. The world report on violence and health. *The lancet*. 2002;360(9339):1083-1088.
6. Gary TL, Stark SA, LaVeist TA. Neighborhood characteristics and mental health among African Americans and whites living in a racially integrated urban community. *Health & Place*. 2007;13(2):569-575.
7. Tucker-Seeley RD, Subramanian S, Li Y, et al. Neighborhood safety, socioeconomic status, and physical activity in older adults. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2009;37(3):207-213.
8. Green G, Gilbertson JM, Grimsley MF. Fear of crime and health in residential tower blocks A case study in Liverpool, UK. *The European Journal of Public Health*. 2002;12(1):10-15.
9. Ziersch AM, Baum FE, MacDougall C, et al. Neighbourhood life and social capital: the implications for health. *Social science & medicine*. 2005;60(1):71-86.
10. Raudenbush SW. *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Vol 1: Sage; 2002.
11. Kruger DJ, Reischl TM, Gee GC. Neighborhood social conditions mediate the association between physical deterioration and mental health. *American journal of community psychology*. 2007;40(3-4):261-271.
12. Wen M, Hawkey LC, Cacioppo JT. Objective and perceived neighborhood environment, individual SES and psychosocial factors, and self-rated health: An analysis of older adults in Cook County, Illinois. *Social science & medicine*. 2006;63(10):2575-2590.
13. White M, Kasl SV, Zahner GE, et al. Perceived crime in the neighborhood and mental health of women and children. *Environment and Behavior*. 1987;19(5):588-613.
14. Idler EL, Benyamini Y. Self-rated health and mortality: a review of twenty-seven community studies. *J Health Soc Behav*. Mar 1997;38(1):21-37.
15. Supreme Prosecutors' Office Republic Of Korea. *Analytical Report on Crimes (2008)*. 2009.
16. Curry A, Latkin C, Davey-Rothwell M. Pathways to depression: The impact of neighborhood violent crime on inner-city residents in Baltimore, Maryland, USA. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2008;67(1):23-30.
17. Sundquist K, Theobald H, Yang M, et al. Neighborhood violent crime and unemployment increase the risk of coronary heart disease: a multilevel study in an urban setting. *Social science & medicine*. 2006;62(8):2061-2071.
18. O'Campo P, Xue X, Wang M-C, et al. Neighborhood risk factors for low birthweight in Baltimore: a multilevel analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*. 1997;87(7):1113-1118.
19. Warr M. Fear of victimization. *Public Perspective*. 1993;5:25-28.
20. Romer D, Jamieson KH, Aday S. Television news and the cultivation of fear of crime. *Journal of communication*. 2003;53(1):88-104.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
21. Lipschultz JH, Hilt ML. *Crime and local television news: Dramatic, breaking, and live from the scene*. Routledge; 2002.
22. Gerbner G. Cultivation analysis: An overview. *Mass Communication and Society*. 1998;1(3-4):175-194.
23. Meier RF, Short JF. CRIME AS HAZARD: PERCEPTIONS OF RISK AND SERIOUSNESS*. *Criminology*. 1985;23(3):389-400.
24. Carpiano RM. Toward a neighborhood resource-based theory of social capital for health: Can Bourdieu and sociology help? *Social science & medicine*. 2006;62(1):165-175.
25. Rodrigues CD. Civil democracy, perceived risk, and insecurity in Brazil: An extension of the systemic social control model. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2006;605(1):242-263.
26. Gibson CL, Zhao J, Lovrich NP, et al. Social integration, individual perceptions of collective efficacy, and fear of crime in three cities. *Justice Quarterly*. 2002;19(3):537-564.
27. Roman CG, Chalfin A. Fear of walking outdoors: a multilevel ecologic analysis of crime and disorder. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2008;34(4):306-312.
28. Kim S-S, Chung Y, Perry MJ, et al. Association between interpersonal trust, reciprocity, and depression in South Korea: A prospective analysis. *PloS one*. 2012;7(1):e30602.
29. Stockdale SE, Wells KB, Tang L, et al. The importance of social context: neighborhood stressors, stress-buffering mechanisms, and alcohol, drug, and mental health disorders. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2007;65(9):1867-1881.

1
2
3
4 Jongho Heo, MPH, Doctoral student
5 Public Health Joint Doctoral Program,
6 San Diego State University & University of California, San Diego 9245
7 Sky Park Court, Ste. 100, San Diego, CA 92123
8 Phone: (619) 793-9738
9 E-mail: joheo@ucsd.edu; jjongho77@gmail.com
10

11 Editor-in-Chief
12 BMJ open
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Dear Editor-in-Chief in the BMJ open**
20

21 This is the revision of our paper, "Association between district-level safety and self-rated health:
22 a multilevel study in an urban setting". We really appreciate that the reviewer provided precious
23 comments on how to improve the manuscript.
24
25
26
27
28

29 Sincerely yours,
30 Jongho Heo on behalf of co-authors
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Association between district-level safety and self-rated health: a multilevel study in an urban setting

Seung-Sup Kim MD, ScD, Jaesung Choi PhD, Kisoo Park PhD, Yeonseung Chung PhD, Sangjo Park BA, Jongho Heo*

Seung-Sup Kim

Department of Public Health Sciences, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea, Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, US, Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, The George Washington University School of Public Health and Health Services, Washington, DC, US

Jaesung Choi

Department of Economics, Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Kisoo Park

Department of Healthcare Management, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Yeonseung Chung

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Daejeon, Republic of Korea

Sangjo Park

Master's program, Department of Communication, Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Jongho Heo

Public Health Joint Doctoral Program, San Diego State University & University of California, San Diego, US

Corresponding Author: Jongho Heo

Contact: +1-619-793-9738

Fax: +1-619-594-5888

E-mail: joheo@ucsd.edu

Public Health Joint Doctoral Program, San Diego State University & University of California, San Diego, 9245 Sky Park Court, Ste. 100s, San Diego, CA, 92123, USA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Association between district-level safety and self-rated health: a multilevel study in an urban setting

Abstract

Objectives: Several studies have reported the relationship between resident's perceived neighborhood safety and their health outcomes. However, those studies suffered from unreliability of neighborhood safety measure and potential residual confounding related to crime rates. In this study, using multilevel analysis to account for the hierarchical structure of the data, we examined associations between district-level safety and self-rated health after adjusting for potential confounders including individual-level perceived neighborhood safety and district-level crime rate.

Design: Cross-sectional study

Setting: We used the 1st wave of Seoul Welfare Panel Study, which has 7,761 individuals from 3,665 households in 25 administrative districts in Seoul, South Korea. District-level safety was obtained by aggregating responses from the residents that are representative samples for each administrative district in Seoul. ~~We controlled objective district level crime rate, individual level perceived neighborhood safety and socio-demographic factors as well.~~ To examine an association between district-level safety and residents' self-rated health, we used mixed effects logistic regression.

Results: Our results showed that higher district-level perceived safety, an aggregated measure of district residents' responses on neighborhood safety, was significantly associated with poor self-rated health after controlling for demographic influences and SES (OR: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.78-0.97). Notably, this association was still robust even when we additionally adjusted for district-level crime rate and individual-level perceived neighborhood safety (OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.77-0.96).

Conclusions: Our study highlights the importance of improving neighborhood safety to enhance resident health.

Keywords: perceived neighborhood safety, self-rated health, neighborhood crime rate, Seoul Welfare Panel Study, multilevel analysis

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Multilevel analytic frame was used to examine an association between district-level safety and residents' self-rated health using representative samples of metropolis, Seoul, South Korea.
- We succeed in adjusting for potential confounders such as individual-level perceived neighborhood safety and district-level crime rate in our analytic model, which past studies have failed.
- Causal relationships cannot be inferred from the cross-sectional data.

INTRODUCTION

Crime is one of the major problems in many metropolitan areas across countries. Although city crime rates have dropped globally since the mid-1990s,¹ there are still large variations and dramatic fluctuations across cities.² Past criminological studies revealed that variations in crime rates were explained by characteristics of metropolitan areas, such as population sizes, ethnic heterogeneity, geographic mobility, economic segregation, unemployment rate, poverty level and degree of social integration and control.²⁻⁴ Thus, many governments have made great efforts to reduce the crime rates especially in metropolitan areas by intervening in those characteristics to ensure the safety of their residents.

Safety from crime is not only an essential human need in daily life, but also a prerequisite to human health.⁵ A body of past studies has reported the relationship between residents' perceptions of neighborhood safety and their health outcomes.^{6,7} For example, one UK survey with 407 adults reported that fear of crime was significantly associated with self-rated health and mental well-being.⁸ Ziersch and Baum⁹ showed that perceived neighborhood safety was related to physical and mental health among 2,400 residents in western suburbs of Adelaide, Australia.

However, these earlier studies suffer from the following limitations. First, most of previous studies used individual-level neighborhood perceived safety as exposure variable, which could be influenced by several factors such as prior individual experience of victimization or individual health conditions other than neighborhood-level safety. ~~First is the potential measurement error of the perceived neighborhood safety. The individual perception can be influenced by several factors such as prior individual experience of victimization, or individual health conditions other than neighborhood-level safety.~~^{10,11} This could be particularly a critical issue in previous cross-

1
2
3
4 sectional studies because of the potential reverse causation, meaning that the sick are more likely
5 to perceive their neighborhood as unsafe. This could be particularly a critical issue in previous
6 cross-sectional studies which did not control for individuals' safety perception because of the
7 potential reverse causation, meaning that the sick are more likely to perceive their neighborhood
8 as unsafe.^{7,12} The second limitation is lack of representativeness of samples within the
9 operationalized definition of neighborhood. Few studies The had enough sample size or the
10 sample size within neighborhood of previous studies was too small to be representative for each
11 neighborhood.^{6,8,13} Unless the responses are obtained from a representative sample of
12 participants within each neighborhood, aggregated perceived neighborhood measures can
13 potentially be prone to measurement errors. Also, this unavailability in appropriate neighborhood
14 measure may explain why there is scant hierarchical or multilevel study analysis which
15 examined allows for estimating the influence of perceived neighborhood safety measures on
16 residents' health outcomes. The final limitation is that previous studies did not adjust for district-
17 level crime rate as a potential confounder although crime-rate has been reported to influence
18 perception of neighborhood safety as well as residents' health outcomes.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 In this study, we assessed the district-level safety, which was obtained by aggregating responses
42 from the residents that are representative samples for each administrative district in Seoul, the
43 capital of South Korea. Then, using multilevel analysis to account for the hierarchical structure
44 of the data, we examined associations between district-level safety and self-rated health after
45 adjusting for potential confounders including individual-level perceived neighborhood safety and
46 district-level crime rate.

METHODS

Study population

Data were obtained from the Seoul Welfare Panel Study (SWPS), which tracked a representative sample of households residing in 25 administrative districts in Seoul, South Korea. The SWPS was launched in 2008 by the Seoul Welfare Foundation. The 1st wave of the survey was conducted in 2008 and its supplementary survey targeting the low-income households was implemented in 2009. The SWPS was suspended after the 2nd wave of the survey was conducted in 2010 September. The survey employed a two-stage stratified cluster sampling approach where a representative sample of census tracts for each district was first drawn, and then households were randomly selected within those sampled census tracts at baseline. A household representative answered household survey and all members of a household whose age is 15 or older were interviewed. A total of 7,761 individuals completed the interviews in Wave 1. The SWPS have been publicly released [<http://panel.welfare.seoul.kr>]. ~~Because a~~~~Because A~~~~all respondents answered on questionnaire items we used in this study, we were able to conduct our analyses based on the entire sample participated in the first wave of SWPS without listwise deletion or missing value imputation for handling missing data.~~~~there was no observation with missing variables,~~ the final sample used in the data analysis of this research consists of 7,761 individuals from 3,665 households from 25 administrative districts in Seoul. The number of households in each district was 146.6 on average, ranging from 108 to 198. This research received IRB exemption from Division of Research Affairs at the San Diego State University.

Exposure: district-level perceived neighborhood safety

1
2
3
4 Perceived neighborhood safety was assessed through the household survey using a question
5
6 about how much a household representative agrees with the following statement: ‘My current
7
8 residential environment is unsafe’. Respondents answered in a five level ordinal scale from
9
10 “strongly agree” (coded as 1) to “strongly disagree” (coded as 5). The answer was then
11
12 dichotomized into “unsafe” (coded as 0) for the response, 1-~~2~~3 and “safe” (coded as 1) for the
13
14 response, ~~3-5,4,5~~4-5. The binary responses from household representatives were aggregated to
15
16 calculate an administrative district-level perceived neighborhood safety by taking a weighted
17
18 average of household-specific perceived safety within each district with the household size used
19
20 as weight. Such aggregation implies results in that the district-level perceived neighborhood
21
22 safety is essentially a sample proportion of individuals who answered “safe” within each district.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Outcome: self-rated health**

30
31
32 Poor self-rated health was assessed through the individual interview using the question “How
33
34 would you rate your overall health?” This question is on the Respondents answered within a five
35
36 ordinal level, scale ranging from “vVery good” (coded as 1) to “very poor” (coded as 5). The
37
38 response was then dichotomized into “good health” (coded as 0) for response, 1-3 and “poor
39
40 health” (coded as 1) for response, 4-5. Although self-rated health cannot assess multi-
41
42 dimensional aspects of health conditions, it is known to be a reliable predictor of life-expectancy
43
44 after adjusting for other health indicators.¹⁴
45
46
47
48

49 **Covariates**

50
51
52 We included several confounders in the data analysis. For individual-level confounders, we have
53
54 sex, age group (15-19 yrs, 20-29 yrs, 30-39 yrs, 40-49 yrs, 50-59 yrs, 60-69 yrs, and 70 years or
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 more), education level (elementary or less, junior high school, high school, college graduate,
5
6 university graduate, and graduate school or more), marital status (married or cohabiting vs.
7
8 others), and job status (employed vs. unemployed), household income with six categories
9
10 (1,000,000 KRW or less, 1,010,000-2,000,000 KRW, 2,010,000-3,000,000 KRW, 3,010,000-
11
12 4,000,000 KRW, 4,010,000-5,000,000 KRW, and Above 5,000,000 KRW), and individual-level
13
14 neighborhood safety (unsafe vs. safe). Because neighborhood safety was assessed solely from the
15
16 household survey, we assigned the value of perceived neighborhood safety measured from each
17
18 household representative to all members of the household.
19
20
21
22
23

24 We considered district-level crime rate as a potential covariate at district-level because it can
25
26 influence residents' health as well as perceived safety. District-level crime rates for each of 25
27
28 administrative district ('Gu') in Seoul were collected from the 'Analytical report on crimes
29
30 (2008)' that is annually published by supreme prosecutors' office in South Korea.¹⁵ District-level
31
32 cCrime rate was calculated by dividing the total number of crimes by the total number of
33
34 residents in each district (Expressed in number/year/1000persons). Using an administrative
35
36 district identifier in the SWPS, we linked the official crime rate of each administrative district to
37
38 our final dataset of the SWPS.
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Data analysis**

45
46 Mixed effects logistic regression was used to investigate the association between district-level
47
48 safety and self-rated health. Because of the hierarchical structure in our data (i.e., individuals are
49
50 nested in households, which in turn are nested in districts), within-household and within-district
51
52 correlations were incorporated using household-specific and district-specific random intercepts.
53
54
55 We made stepwise adjustments of potential confounders in the data analysis. First, we adjusted
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 for potential confounders including sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and
5
6 household-level income. Second, we added individual-level perceived neighborhood safety to the
7
8 previously listed confounders for adjustment. Finally, we examined the association after
9
10 adjusting for district-level crime rate in addition to all of the previously mentioned confounders.
11
12 All of the confounders were included as categorical variables and the district-level safety was
13
14 included after standardization for simple interpretation in the model. All computations were done
15
16 using R statistical software.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 RESULTS

26
27
28 Table 1 presents the distribution of the study population and the prevalence of poor self-rated
29
30 health by each of the individual-level, household-level, and district-level characteristics. Overall,
31
32 poor self-rated health was reported at 20.9% (1,620 out of 7,761 participants). The proportion
33
34 was higher for women and showed an increasing pattern with age. Lower proportions were
35
36 observed for participants in lower education levels. The unemployed and ~~the group of people~~
37
38 living in an unsafe neighborhood exhibited higher prevalence of poor self-rated health compared
39
40 to the employed and ~~those the group living~~ in a safe neighborhood. Household income were
41
42 fairly equally distributed in the SWPS. As to the district-level safety and crime rate, given the
43
44 overall mean of each variable, relative size of each standard deviation shows that there ~~were~~
45
46
47
48
49
50 considerable variations among the 25 districts.

51
52
53 District-level safety was significantly associated with poor self-rated health while different sets
54
55 of confounders being step-wisely adjusted (Table 2). Living in a district where its safety level is
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 1 standard deviation (0.08) higher resulted in 13% lower odds of reporting self-rated poor health
5
6 status (OR: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.78, 0.97) after adjusting for sex, age, education level, job status,
7
8 marital status, and household-level income. When adjusted for individual-level safety, this
9
10 association was slightly attenuated but still significant (OR: 0.88, 95% CI: 0.79, 0.98). When we
11
12 controlled for district-level crime, the magnitude of this association was slightly increased and
13
14 remained significant (OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.77, 0.96).
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 DISCUSSION

22
23 Evidence from our study indicated that district-level perceived safety, as-which was assessed by
24
25 aggregating responses from district-residents in each district, was significantly associated with
26
27 poor self-rated health even after controlling for demographic information graphic influences
28
29 and SES-SES. Notably, this association was still robust when we additionally adjusted for
30
31 district-level crime rate and individual reporting of -level perceived neighborhood safety.
32
33
34
35

36 Our findings are in line with previous research that showed associations between perceived
37
38 regional neighborhood safety and health outcomes. Past studies have also reported that residents
39
40 who perceived that their neighborhood had more severe problems were more likely to experience
41
42 greater anxiety, stress, and depression.^{6,16} The studies sampled women, children, and the elderly
43
44 also provided consistent evidence of a relationship between perceived crime risk and physical
45
46 health.^{7,13}
47
48
49
50

51 In this study, district-level crime rate was not associated with self-rated health in the fully
52
53 adjusted model. Furthermore, our post-hoc analysis showed that there was no statistically
54
55 significant relationship between district crime rate and residents' self-rated health regardless of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 covariate adjustment, although district-level crime rate could be a major influence on district-
5
6 level safety. This finding is different from past studies that reported a significant relationship
7
8 between district crime rate and residents' health such as coronary heart disease¹⁷ and low birth
9
10 weight.¹⁸
11
12

13
14
15 The differential association between ~~perceived~~-district-level perceived safety and crime rate in
16
17 relation to self-rated health could be explained by three ways. First, mass media may increase
18
19 individual-level perceived neighborhood insecurity regardless of their neighborhood crime rates,
20
21 especially when they reported the crime in ways of exaggeration.^{19,20} The mass media tend to
22
23 emphasize criminal stories which can draw attention from audience.²¹ Previous studies called
24
25 this phenomenon as "cultivation effect" meaning that exposure to the world of television
26
27 cultivates exaggerated perceptions of viewers and magnifies viewers' fear about crime.²² The
28
29 residents who watched news on neighborhood crimes may perceive their neighborhood more
30
31 vulnerable regions to crime. Moreover, mass media may also increase the individual-level
32
33 perceived neighborhood safety ~~of individuals~~ regardless of their objective neighborhood crime
34
35 rates.²⁰ Second, different types of crime would have different effects on the perceived risk or fear
36
37 of crime. For example, murder, rape, and personal theft may have higher effects on the fear of
38
39 crime than larceny and auto-theft. Hence, total crime rate that was used in this research ~~to~~
40
41 ~~indicate district level crime rate might~~ would not be a sophisticated enough to clearly capture
42
43 proper measure when searching its the association between the prevalence of crime in the district
44
45 and with the residents' health condition.²³ However, when we conducted a post-hoc analysis
46
47 using a different measure, with '5 index crime rate', which includes major five serious
48
49 different crimes (i.e. murder, robbery, rape, assault and theft) that, which has been adopted by
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Korean police to indicate violent crime rate, still we could not find any association was
5
6 observed with in relation to residents' self-rated health. Finally, if social and physical resources
7
8 of neighborhood are deteriorated or deprived, residents tend to perceive neighborhood safety
9
10 more irrespective of with the objective neighborhood crime rate.²⁴ The poor quality of social and
11
12 physical environment, such as dilapidated houses or having no formal or informal neighborhood
13
14 networks, may work as a trigger to make residents perceive their neighborhood dangerous.^{25,26}
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

There could be several pathways linking these perceived neighborhood safety district-level
perceived neighborhood safety to self-rated health irrespective of the objective-neighborhood
crime rate and individual-level perceived neighborhood safety. First, higher district-level
perceived safety can cause less outdoor physical activities^{7,27} leading to poor health. Second,
elevated district-level perceived safety iteratively aggravates social supports- or deteriorates
physical environments, in turn, it may harm mental and physical outcomes.²⁸ Last, elevated
district-level perceived safety may be a latent stressor causing chronic stress status that could
undermine residents' mental health.²⁹

Our study has several a-limitations. First, of potential reverse causation is of concern due to its
cross-sectional study design, implying that people with poor-self rated health are more likely to
perceive their neighborhood as unsafe. However, because the association was still significant
after adjusting for individual-perceived safety, which is a critical pathway of this reverse
causation, so we believe that the potential reverse causation cannot fully explain the observed
association. Second, this study assessed perceived neighborhood safety through a single-item
measure. This item may not reflect multi-dimensional aspects of the neighborhood safety.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Despite the ~~eseis~~ limitations, our study has the strength in that we used representative samples for each operationalized administrative district, which enabled multi-level analysis using an district-level aggregate measure of perceived safety ~~as an exposure variable~~ whereas most of previous studies used individual reporting of perceived safety as an exposure variable. ~~Furthermore, t~~ Furthermore, we found a significant association after adjusting for other relevant potential confounder such as district crime rate that could influence both exposure and outcome variable ~~in this study~~. To our knowledge, this is one of the first studies ~~controlled for crime rate~~ to examine the association between district-level perceived neighborhood safety and health outcome after adjusting for district-level crime rate.

In sum, our study showed that district-level perceived safety was associated with residents' poor self-rated health even after controlling for demographic influences, SES, district-level crime rate, and individual-level perceived safety. Our study results evoke the importance of local authorities (or governments) to make efforts toward improving neighborhood safety to enhance residents' health.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the independent variables and their associations with self-rated poor health (N=7761)

Variables	Total	Prevalence of poor self-rated health	
	N	N (%)	p-values
<i>Individual level variables (N=7761)</i>			
Sex			<0.0001
Male	3547	599 (16.9)	
Female	4214	1021 (24.2)	
Age (years)			<0.0001
15-19	536	17 (3.2)	
20-29	973	26 (2.7)	
30-39	1577	92 (5.8)	
40-49	1425	185 (13.0)	
50-59	1139	242 (21.2)	
60-69	1130	482 (42.7)	
70 or more	981	576 (58.7)	
Job Status			<0.0001
Employed	3199	293 (9.2)	
Unemployed	4562	1327 (29.1)	
Education Level			<0.0001
Elementary school or less	1143	664 (58.1)	
Middle school	703	271 (38.5)	
High school	2483	433 (17.4)	
College graduate	572	46 (8.0)	
University graduate	2516	185 (7.4)	
Graduate school or more	344	21 (6.1)	
Marital status			0.151
Married/cohabiting	5059	1031 (20.4)	
Others	2702	589 (21.8)	
Individual-level safety			<0.0001
Safe	6777	1361 (20.1)	
Unsafe	984	259 (26.3)	
<i>Household level variables (N=3665)</i>			
Household Income			
1,000,000 KRW or less	770		
1,010,000-2,000,000 KRW	772		
2,010,000-3,000,000 KRW	656		
3,010,000-4,000,000 KRW	510		
4,010,000-5,000,000 KRW	345		
Above 5,000,000 KRW	612		
<i>District level variables (N=25)</i>			
District-level perceived safety (mean (SD))^a	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Range</u>
	0.87	0.08	0.68-0.98

1
2
3
4
5 **District-level crime rate (mean (SD))^b** 4.63 2.94 2.25-16.31
6

7 ^a District-specific average of individual-level safety

8 ^b Expressed in number/year/1000persons
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 2. Associations between district-level perceived safety and poor self-rated health

	Unadjusted		Adjusted ^a					
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
District-level perceived safety ^b	0.83***	(0.76, 0.91)	0.87*	(0.78, 0.97)	0.88*	(0.79, 0.98)	0.86**	(0.77, 0.96)
Individual-level perceived safety					0.83	(0.66, 1.04)	0.82	(0.65, 1.04)
District-level crime rate							0.97	(0.93, 1.01)

^a Adjusted for sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and household-level income

^b Aggregated responses about neighborhood safety among residents in the same district. The variables was included in the data analysis after standardization

* p-value<0.05, ** p-value<0.01, *** p-value<0.001

1
2
3 Acknowledgments: None
4
5
6

7
8 Competing interests: None
9
10

11
12 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
13 not-for-profit sectors.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

REFERENCES

1. Tseloni A, Mailley J, Farrell G, Tilley N. Exploring the international decline in crime rates. *European Journal of Criminology*. 2010;7(5):375-394.
2. McCall PL, Land KC, Parker KF. Heterogeneity in the rise and decline of city-level homicide rates, 1976–2005: A latent trajectory analysis. *Social Science Research*. 2011;40(1):363-378.
3. Sampson RJ, Raudenbush SW, Earls F. Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*. 1997;277(5328):918-924.
4. Patterson EB. Poverty, income inequality, and community crime rates. *Criminology*. 1991;29(4):755-776.
5. Krug EG, Mercy JA, Dahlberg LL, Zwi AB. The world report on violence and health. *The lancet*. 2002;360(9339):1083-1088.
6. Gary TL, Stark SA, LaVeist TA. Neighborhood characteristics and mental health among African Americans and whites living in a racially integrated urban community. *Health & Place*. 2007;13(2):569-575.
7. Tucker-Seeley RD, Subramanian S, Li Y, Sorensen G. Neighborhood safety, socioeconomic status, and physical activity in older adults. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2009;37(3):207-213.
8. Green G, Gilbertson JM, Grimsley MF. Fear of crime and health in residential tower blocks A case study in Liverpool, UK. *The European Journal of Public Health*. 2002;12(1):10-15.
9. Ziersch AM, Baum FE, MacDougall C, Putland C. Neighbourhood life and social capital: the implications for health. *Social science & medicine*. 2005;60(1):71-86.
10. Raudenbush SW. *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Vol 1: Sage; 2002.
11. Kruger DJ, Reischl TM, Gee GC. Neighborhood social conditions mediate the association between physical deterioration and mental health. *American journal of community psychology*. 2007;40(3-4):261-271.
12. Wen M, Hawkey LC, Cacioppo JT. Objective and perceived neighborhood environment, individual SES and psychosocial factors, and self-rated health: An analysis of older adults in Cook County, Illinois. *Social science & medicine*. 2006;63(10):2575-2590.
13. White M, Kasl SV, Zahner GE, Will JC. Perceived crime in the neighborhood and mental health of women and children. *Environment and Behavior*. 1987;19(5):588-613.
14. Idler EL, Benyamini Y. Self-rated health and mortality: a review of twenty-seven community studies. *J Health Soc Behav*. Mar 1997;38(1):21-37.
15. Supreme Prosecutors' Office Republic Of Korea. *Analytical Report on Crimes (2008)*. 2009.
16. Curry A, Latkin C, Davey-Rothwell M. Pathways to depression: The impact of neighborhood violent crime on inner-city residents in Baltimore, Maryland, USA. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2008;67(1):23-30.
17. Sundquist K, Theobald H, Yang M, Li X, Johansson S-E, Sundquist J. Neighborhood violent crime and unemployment increase the risk of coronary heart disease: a multilevel study in an urban setting. *Social science & medicine*. 2006;62(8):2061-2071.
18. O'Campo P, Xue X, Wang M-C, Caughy M. Neighborhood risk factors for low birthweight in Baltimore: a multilevel analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*. 1997;87(7):1113-1118.
19. Warr M. Fear of victimization. *Public Perspective*. 1993;5:25-28.
20. Romer D, Jamieson KH, Aday S. Television news and the cultivation of fear of crime. *Journal of communication*. 2003;53(1):88-104.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
21. Lipschultz JH, Hilt ML. *Crime and local television news: Dramatic, breaking, and live from the scene*. Routledge; 2002.
22. Gerbner G. Cultivation analysis: An overview. *Mass Communication and Society*. 1998;1(3-4):175-194.
23. Meier RF, Short JF. CRIME AS HAZARD: PERCEPTIONS OF RISK AND SERIOUSNESS*. *Criminology*. 1985;23(3):389-400.
24. Carpiano RM. Toward a neighborhood resource-based theory of social capital for health: Can Bourdieu and sociology help? *Social science & medicine*. 2006;62(1):165-175.
25. Rodrigues CD. Civil democracy, perceived risk, and insecurity in Brazil: An extension of the systemic social control model. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2006;605(1):242-263.
26. Gibson CL, Zhao J, Lovrich NP, Gaffney MJ. Social integration, individual perceptions of collective efficacy, and fear of crime in three cities. *Justice Quarterly*. 2002;19(3):537-564.
27. Roman CG, Chalfin A. Fear of walking outdoors: a multilevel ecologic analysis of crime and disorder. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2008;34(4):306-312.
28. Kim S-S, Chung Y, Perry MJ, Kawachi I, Subramanian S. Association between interpersonal trust, reciprocity, and depression in South Korea: A prospective analysis. *PloS one*. 2012;7(1):e30602.
29. Stockdale SE, Wells KB, Tang L, Belin TR, Zhang L, Sherbourne CD. The importance of social context: neighborhood stressors, stress-buffering mechanisms, and alcohol, drug, and mental health disorders. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2007;65(9):1867-1881.

STROBE 2007 (v4) checklist of items to be included in reports of observational studies in epidemiology*
Checklist for cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies (combined)

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses	6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6-7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6-7
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7-9
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7-9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7-9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	9
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	9

		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	10
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	10
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time <i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	10
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	10
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	10-13
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	13
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	13
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	17

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Association between district-level safety and self-rated health: a multilevel study in an urban setting

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-004695.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Jun-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Kim, Seung-Sup; Korea University, Department of Public Health Sciences Choi, Jaesung; Sungkyunkwan University, Department of Economics Park, Kisoo; Korea University, Department of Healthcare Management Chung, Yeonseung; Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Department of Mathematical Sciences Park, Sangjo; Seoul National University, Department of Communication Heo, Jongho; San Diego State University & University of California, San Diego, Public Health Joint Doctoral Program
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Public health, Sociology
Keywords:	perceived neighborhood safety, self-rated health, neighborhood crime rate, Seoul Welfare Panel Study, multilevel analysis

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6 **Association between district-level safety and self-rated health:**
7
8 **a multilevel study in an urban setting**
9
10

11
12
13 Seung-Sup Kim MD, ScD, Jaesung Choi PhD, Kisoo Park PhD, Yeonseung Chung PhD, Sangjo
14 Park BA, Jongho Heo*
15

16
17 Seung-Sup Kim

18 Department of Public Health Sciences, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea, Department
19 of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, US, Department of
20 Environmental and Occupational Health, The George Washington University School of Public
21 Health and Health Services, Washington, DC, US
22
23

24
25 Jaesung Choi

26 Department of Economics, Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, Republic of Korea
27

28
29 Kisoo Park

30 Department of Healthcare Management, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea
31

32
33 Yeonseung Chung

34 Department of Mathematical Sciences, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology,
35 Daejeon, Republic of Korea
36

37
38 Sangjo Park

39 Master's program, Department of Communication, Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of
40 Korea
41

42
43 Jongho Heo

44 Public Health Joint Doctoral Program, San Diego State University & University of California,
45 San Diego, US
46

47 Corresponding Author: Jongho Heo

48 Contact: +1-619-793-9738

49 Fax: +1-619-594-5888

50 E-mail: joheo@ucsd.edu

51 Public Health Joint Doctoral Program, San Diego State University & University of California,
52 San Diego, 9245 Sky Park Court, Ste. 100s, San Diego, CA, 92123, USA
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Association between district-level safety and self-rated health:
7
8 a multilevel study in an urban setting
9
10

11
12
13 **Abstract**
14

15
16 **Objectives:** Several studies have reported the relationship between resident's perceived
17 neighborhood safety and their health outcomes. However, those studies suffered from
18 unreliability of neighborhood safety measure and potential residual confounding related to crime
19 rates. In this study, using multilevel analysis to account for the hierarchical structure of the data,
20 we examined associations between district-level safety and self-rated health after adjusting for
21 potential confounders including district-level crime rate.
22
23

24
25 **Design:** Cross-sectional study
26

27
28 **Setting:** We used the 1st wave of Seoul Welfare Panel Study, which has 7,761 individuals from
29 3,665 households in 25 administrative districts in Seoul, South Korea. District-level safety was
30 obtained by aggregating responses from the residents that are representative samples for each
31 administrative district in Seoul. To examine an association between district-level safety and
32 residents' self-rated health, we used mixed effects logistic regression.
33

34
35 **Results:** Our results showed that higher district-level perceived safety, an aggregated measure of
36 district residents' responses on neighborhood safety, was significantly associated with poor self-
37 rated health after controlling for sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and
38 household-level income (OR: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.78-0.97). Furthermore, this association was still
39 robust when we additionally adjusted for district-level crime rate (OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.77-0.95).
40
41

42
43 **Conclusions:** Our study highlights the importance of improving neighborhood perceived safety
44 to enhance residents' health.
45

46
47
48 **Keywords:** perceived neighborhood safety, self-rated health, neighborhood crime rate, Seoul
49 Welfare Panel Study, multilevel analysis
50
51

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Multilevel analytic frame was used to examine an association between district-level safety and residents' self-rated health using representative samples of metropolis, Seoul, South Korea.
- We succeed in adjusting for potential confounders such as district-level crime rate in our analytic model, which past studies have failed.
- Causal relationships cannot be inferred from the cross-sectional data of this study.

INTRODUCTION

Crime is one of the major problems in many metropolitan areas across countries. Although city crime rates have dropped globally since the mid-1990s,¹ there are still large variations and dramatic fluctuations across cities.² Past criminological studies revealed that variations in crime rates were explained by characteristics of metropolitan areas, such as population sizes, ethnic heterogeneity, geographic mobility, economic segregation, unemployment rate, poverty level and degree of social integration and control.²⁻⁴ Thus, many governments have made great efforts to reduce the crime rates especially in metropolitan areas by intervening in those characteristics to ensure the safety of their residents.

Safety from crime is not only an essential human need in daily life, but also a prerequisite to human health.⁵ A body of past studies has reported the relationship between residents' perceptions of neighborhood safety and their health outcomes.^{6,7} For example, one UK survey with 407 adults reported that fear of crime was significantly associated with self-rated health and mental well-being.⁸ Ziersch and Baum¹⁰ showed that perceived neighborhood safety was related to physical and mental health among 2,400 residents in western suburbs of Adelaide, Australia.

However, these earlier studies suffer from the following limitations. First, most of the previous studies used individual-level neighborhood perceived safety as an exposure variable, which could be influenced by several factors such as prior individual experience of victimization or individual health conditions other than neighborhood-level safety.^{11,12} This could be particularly a critical issue in previous cross-sectional studies because of the potential reverse causation, meaning that the sick are more likely to perceive their neighborhood as unsafe.^{7,13} The second limitation is lack of representativeness of samples within the operationalized definition of

1
2
3 neighborhood. Few studies had enough sample size or the sample size within neighborhood to be
4
5 representative for each neighborhood.^{6,8,14} Unless the responses are obtained from a
6
7 representative sample of participants within each neighborhood, aggregated perceived
8
9 neighborhood measures can potentially be prone to measurement errors. The final limitation is
10
11 that previous studies did not adjust for district-level crime rate as a potential confounder although
12
13 crime-rate has been reported to influence perception of neighborhood safety as well as residents'
14
15 health outcomes.
16
17
18
19

20
21 In this study, we assessed the district-level safety, which was obtained by aggregating responses
22
23 from the residents that are representative samples for each administrative district in Seoul, the
24
25 capital of South Korea. Then, using multilevel analysis to account for the hierarchical structure
26
27 of the data, we examined the association between district-level perceived safety and self-rated
28
29 health after adjusting for potential confounders including district-level crime rate.
30
31
32
33
34

35 36 **METHODS**

37 38 **Study population**

39
40
41 Data were obtained from the Seoul Welfare Panel Study (SWPS), which tracked a representative
42
43 sample of households residing in 25 administrative districts in Seoul, South Korea. The SWPS
44
45 was launched in 2008 by the Seoul Welfare Foundation. The 1st wave of the survey was
46
47 conducted in 2008 and its supplementary survey targeting the low-income households was
48
49 implemented in 2009. The SWPS was suspended after the 2nd wave of the survey was conducted
50
51 in 2010 September. The survey employed a two-stage stratified cluster sampling approach where
52
53 a representative sample of census tracts for each district was first drawn, and then households
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 were randomly selected within those sampled census tracts at baseline. A household
4
5 representative answered household survey and all members of a household whose age is 15 or
6
7 older were interviewed. A total of 7,761 individuals completed the interviews in Wave 1. The
8
9 SWPS have been publicly released [<http://panel.welfare.seoul.kr>]. Because all respondents
10
11 answered on questionnaire items we used in this study, we were able to conduct our analyses
12
13 based on the entire sample participated in the first wave of SWPS without listwise deletion or
14
15 missing value imputation for handling missing data. The final sample used in the data analysis of
16
17 this research consists of 7,761 individuals from 3,665 households from 25 administrative districts
18
19 in Seoul. The number of households in each district was 146.6 on average, ranging from 108 to
20
21 198. This research received IRB exemption from Division of Research Affairs at the San Diego
22
23 State University.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Exposure: district-level perceived safety**

31
32
33 District-level perceived safety was assessed through the household survey using a question about
34
35 how much a household representative agrees with the following statement: ‘My current
36
37 residential environment is unsafe’. Respondents answered in a five level ordinal scale from
38
39 “strongly agree” (coded as 1) to “strongly disagree” (coded as 5). The answer was then
40
41 dichotomized into “unsafe” (coded as 0) for the response, 1-2 and “safe” (coded as 1) for the
42
43 response, 3-5. The binary responses from household representatives were aggregated to calculate
44
45 an administrative district-level perceived neighborhood safety by taking a weighted average of
46
47 household-specific perceived safety within each district with the household size used as weight.
48
49 Such aggregation results in that the district-level perceived neighborhood safety is essentially
50
51 sample proportion of individuals who answered “safe” within each district.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Outcome: poor self-rated health

Poor self-rated health was assessed through the individual interview using the question “How would you rate your overall health?” This question is on the ordinal level, ranging from “very good” (coded as 1) to “very poor” (coded as 5). The response was then dichotomized into “good health” (coded as 0) for response, 1-3 and “poor health” (coded as 1) for response, 4-5. Although self-rated health cannot assess multi-dimensional aspects of health conditions, it is known to be a reliable predictor of life-expectancy after adjusting for other health indicators.¹⁵

Covariates

We included several confounders in the data analysis. For individual-level confounders, we have sex, age group (15-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, and 70 or more), education level (elementary or less, junior high school, high school, college graduate, university graduate, and graduate school or more), marital status (married or cohabiting vs. others), and job status (employed vs. unemployed), household income with six categories (1,000,000 KRW or less; 1,010,000-2,000,000 KRW; 2,010,000-3,000,000 KRW; 3,010,000-4,000,000 KRW; 4,010,000-5,000,000 KRW; and Above 5,000,000 KRW), and individual-perception of district safety (unsafe vs. safe). Because neighborhood safety was assessed solely from the household survey, we assigned the value of perceived neighborhood safety measured from each household representative to all members of the household.

We considered district-level crime rate as a potential covariate at district-level because it can influence residents’ health as well as perceived safety. District-level crime rates for each of 25 administrative district (‘Gu’) in Seoul were collected from the ‘Analytical report on crimes,

1
2
3 2008' that is annually published by supreme prosecutors' office in South Korea.¹⁶ District-level
4
5 crime rate was calculated by dividing the total number of crimes by the total number of residents
6
7 in each district (expressed in number/year/1,000 persons). Using an administrative district
8
9 identifier in the SWPS, we linked the official crime rate of each administrative district to our
10
11 final dataset of the SWPS.
12

13 14 15 16 **Data analysis**

17
18 Mixed effect logistic regression was used to investigate the association between district-level
19
20 safety and self-rated health. Because of the hierarchical structure in our data (i.e., individuals are
21
22 nested in households, which in turn are nested in districts), within-household and within-district
23
24 correlations were incorporated using household-specific and district-specific random intercepts.
25
26 We made stepwise adjustments of potential confounders in the data analysis. First, we adjusted
27
28 for potential confounders including sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and
29
30 household-level income. Second, we additionally adjusted for district-level crime rate. Finally,
31
32 we examined the association after adjusting for individual perception of district safety in addition
33
34 to all of the previously mentioned confounders. All of the confounders were included as
35
36 categorical variables, and the district-level perceived safety was included after standardization
37
38 for simple interpretation in the model. All computations were done using R statistical software.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **RESULTS**

49
50
51 Table 1 presents the distribution of the study population and the prevalence of poor self-rated
52
53 health by each of the individual-level, household-level, and district-level characteristics. Overall,
54
55 poor self-rated health was reported at 20.9% (1,620 out of 7,761 participants). The proportion
56
57

1
2
3 was higher for women and showed an increasing pattern with age. Lower proportions were
4
5 observed for participants in lower education levels. The unemployed and people living in an
6
7 unsafe neighborhood exhibited higher prevalence of poor self-rated health compared to the
8
9 employed and those living in a safe neighborhood. Household income were fairly equally
10
11 distributed in the SWPS. As to the district-level perceived safety and crime rate, given the
12
13 overall mean of each variable, relative size of each standard deviation shows that there were
14
15 considerable variations among the 25 districts.
16
17
18
19

20
21 District-level perceived safety was significantly associated with poor self-rated health while
22
23 different sets of confounders being step-wisely adjusted (Table 2). Living in a district where its
24
25 safety level is 1 standard deviation (0.08) higher resulted in 13% lower odds of reporting self-
26
27 rated poor health status (OR: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.78, 0.97) after adjusting for sex, age, education
28
29 level, job status, marital status, and household-level income. When additionally adjusted for
30
31 district-level crime rate, this association was slightly attenuated but still significant (OR: 0.86,
32
33 95% CI: 0.77, 0.95). When we adjusted for individual perception of district safety in addition to
34
35 previously mentioned potential confounders, the magnitude of this association was remained
36
37 significant (OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.77, 0.96).
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **DISCUSSION**

45
46 Evidence from our study indicated that district-level perceived safety, which was assessed by
47
48 aggregating responses from residents in each district, was significantly associated with poor self-
49
50 rated health even after controlling for demographic information, SES, and district-level crime
51
52 rate. Notably, this association was still robust when we additionally adjusted for individual
53
54 perception of district safety.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our findings are in line with previous research that showed associations between perceived
4 neighborhood safety and health outcomes. Past studies have also reported that residents who
5 perceived that their neighborhood had more severe problems were more likely to experience
6 greater anxiety, stress, and depression.^{6,17} The studies sampled women, children, and the elderly
7 also provided consistent evidence of a relationship between perceived crime risk and physical
8 health.^{7,14}

9
10
11 In this study, district-level crime rate was not associated with self-rated health in the fully
12 adjusted model. Furthermore, our post-hoc analysis showed that there was no statistically
13 significant relationship between district crime rate and residents' self-rated health regardless of
14 adjustment of confounders, although district-level crime rate could be a major influence on
15 district-level safety. This finding is different from past studies that reported a significant
16 relationship between district crime rate and residents' health such as coronary heart disease¹⁸ and
17 low birth weight.¹⁹

18
19
20 The differential association between district-level perceived safety and crime rate in relation to
21 self-rated health could be explained in three ways. First, mass media may increase individual-
22 level perceived neighborhood insecurity regardless of their neighborhood crime rates, especially
23 when they reported the crime in ways of exaggeration.^{20,21} The mass media tend to emphasize
24 criminal stories which can draw attention from audience.²² Previous studies called this
25 phenomenon as "cultivation effect" meaning that exposure to the world of television cultivates
26 exaggerated perceptions of viewers and magnifies viewers' fear about crime.²³ The residents who
27 watched news about neighborhood crimes are more likely to perceive their neighborhood more
28 vulnerable regions to crime regardless of regional crime rate.²¹

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Second, different types of crime would have different effects on the perceived risk or fear of crime. For example, murder, rape, and personal theft may have higher effects on the fear of crime than larceny and auto-theft. Hence, total crime rate that was used in this research might not be sophisticated enough to capture the association between the prevalence of crime in the district and the residents' health condition.²⁴ However, when we conducted a post-hoc analysis using a different measure, '5 index crime rate', which includes major five serious crimes (i.e. murder, robbery, rape, assault and theft) that has been adopted by Korean police to indicate violent crime rate, still we could not find association with residents' self-rated health.

Finally, if social and physical resources of neighborhood are deteriorated or deprived, residents tend to perceive neighborhood safety more irrespective of the objective neighborhood crime rate.²⁵ The poor quality of social and physical environment, such as dilapidated houses or having no formal or informal neighborhood networks, may work as a trigger to make residents perceive their neighborhood dangerous.^{26,27}

There could be several pathways linking district-level perceived neighborhood safety to resident's self-rated health. First, higher district-level perceived safety can cause less outdoor physical activities^{7,28} leading to poor health. Second, elevated district-level perceived safety may aggravates social supports or deteriorates physical environments, in turn, it may harm mental and physical outcomes.²⁹ Last, elevated district-level perceived safety may be a latent stressor causing chronic stress status that could undermine residents' mental health.³⁰

Our study has several limitations. First, potential reverse causation is of concern due to its cross-sectional study design, implying that people with poor-self rated health are more likely to perceive their neighborhood as unsafe. Future studies are required to examine the causal

1
2
3 association between district-level perceived safety and health outcomes. Second, this study
4
5 assessed perceived neighborhood safety through a single-item measure. This item may not reflect
6
7 multi-dimensional aspects of the neighborhood safety.
8
9

10
11 Despite these limitations, our study has the strength in that we used representative samples for
12
13 each operationalized administrative district, which enabled multilevel analysis using a district-
14
15 level aggregate measure of perceived safety whereas most of the previous studies used individual
16
17 reporting of perceived safety as an exposure variable. Furthermore, to our knowledge, this is one
18
19 of the first studies to examine the association between district-level perceived neighborhood
20
21 safety and health outcome after adjusting for district-level crime rate.
22
23
24

25
26 In sum, our study showed that district-level perceived safety was associated with residents' poor
27
28 self-rated health even after controlling for demographic influences, SES, and district-level crime
29
30 rate. Our study results evoke the importance of local authorities (or governments) to make efforts
31
32 toward improving neighborhood perceived safety to enhance residents' health.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the independent variables and their associations with self-rated poor health (N=7761)

Variables	Total	Prevalence of poor self-rated health	
	N	N (%)	p-values
<i>Individual level variables (N=7,761)</i>			
Sex			<0.0001
Male	3,547	599 (16.9)	
Female	4,214	1,021 (24.2)	
Age (years)			<0.0001
15-19	536	17 (3.2)	
20-29	973	26 (2.7)	
30-39	1,577	92 (5.8)	
40-49	1,425	185 (13.0)	
50-59	1,139	242 (21.2)	
60-69	1,130	482 (42.7)	
70 or more	981	576 (58.7)	
Job Status			<0.0001
Employed	3,199	293 (9.2)	
Unemployed	4,562	1,327 (29.1)	
Education Level			<0.0001
Elementary school or less	1,143	664 (58.1)	
Middle school	703	271 (38.5)	
High school	2,483	433 (17.4)	
College graduate	572	46 (8.0)	
University graduate	2,516	185 (7.4)	
Graduate school or more	344	21 (6.1)	
Marital status			0.151
Married/cohabiting	5,059	1,031 (20.4)	
Others	2,702	589 (21.8)	
Individual-level safety			<0.0001
Safe	6,777	1,361 (20.1)	
Unsafe	984	259 (26.3)	
<i>Household level variables (N=3,665)</i>			
Household Income			
1,000,000 KRW or less	770		
1,010,000-2,000,000 KRW	772		
2,010,000-3,000,000 KRW	656		
3,010,000-4,000,000 KRW	510		
4,010,000-5,000,000 KRW	345		
Above 5,000,000 KRW	612		
<i>District level variables (N=25)</i>			
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Range</u>
District-level perceived safety (mean (SD))^a	0.87	0.08	0.68-0.98
District-level crime rate (mean (SD))^b	4.63	2.94	2.25-16.31

1
2
3 ^a District-specific average of individual-level safety
4

5 ^b Expressed in number/year/1,000 persons
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 2. Associations between district-level perceived safety and poor self-rated health

	Unadjusted		Adjusted ^a					
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
District-level perceived safety ^b	0.83***	(0.76, 0.91)	0.87*	(0.78, 0.97)	0.86**	(0.77, 0.95)	0.86**	(0.77, 0.96)
District-level crime rate					0.97	(0.93, 1.01)	0.97	(0.93,1.01)
Individual perception of district safety							0.82	(0.65,1.04)

^a Adjusted for sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and household-level income

^b Aggregated responses about neighborhood safety among residents in the same district. The variables was included in the data analysis after standardization

* p-value<0.05, ** p-value<0.01

1
2
3 Acknowledgments: None
4

5 Competing interests: None
6

7
8 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
9 not-for-profit sectors.
10

11 Contributorship Statement: SSK coordinated the design, analysis and writing the manuscript. JC,
12 KP, YC, SP, JH participated in the design, analysis and in preparing the manuscript. All of the
13 authors contributed to read, edited and approved of the final draft of the manuscript.
14

15
16 Data Sharing Statement: No additional data available
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

1. Tseloni A, Mailley J, Farrell G, et al. Exploring the international decline in crime rates. *European Journal of Criminology*. 2010;7(5):375-394.
2. McCall PL, Land KC, Parker KF. Heterogeneity in the rise and decline of city-level homicide rates, 1976–2005: A latent trajectory analysis. *Social Science Research*. 2011;40(1):363-378.
3. Sampson RJ, Raudenbush SW, Earls F. Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*. 1997;277(5328):918-924.
4. Patterson EB. Poverty, income inequality, and community crime rates. *Criminology*. 1991;29(4):755-776.
5. Krug EG, Mercy JA, Dahlberg LL, et al. The world report on violence and health. *The lancet*. 2002;360(9339):1083-1088.
6. Gary TL, Stark SA, LaVeist TA. Neighborhood characteristics and mental health among African Americans and whites living in a racially integrated urban community. *Health & Place*. 2007;13(2):569-575.
7. Tucker-Seeley RD, Subramanian S, Li Y, et al. Neighborhood safety, socioeconomic status, and physical activity in older adults. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2009;37(3):207-213.
8. Green G, Gilbertson JM, Grimsley MF. Fear of crime and health in residential tower blocks A case study in Liverpool, UK. *The European Journal of Public Health*. 2002;12(1):10-15.
9. Latkin CA, Curry AD. Stressful neighborhoods and depression: a prospective study of the impact of neighborhood disorder. *Journal of health and social behavior*. 2003:34-44.
10. Ziersch AM, Baum FE, MacDougall C, et al. Neighbourhood life and social capital: the implications for health. *Social science & medicine*. 2005;60(1):71-86.
11. Raudenbush SW. *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Vol 1: Sage; 2002.
12. Kruger DJ, Reischl TM, Gee GC. Neighborhood social conditions mediate the association between physical deterioration and mental health. *American journal of community psychology*. 2007;40(3-4):261-271.
13. Wen M, Hawkey LC, Cacioppo JT. Objective and perceived neighborhood environment, individual SES and psychosocial factors, and self-rated health: An analysis of older adults in Cook County, Illinois. *Social science & medicine*. 2006;63(10):2575-2590.
14. White M, Kasl SV, Zahner GE, et al. Perceived crime in the neighborhood and mental health of women and children. *Environment and Behavior*. 1987;19(5):588-613.
15. Idler EL, Benyamini Y. Self-rated health and mortality: a review of twenty-seven community studies. *J Health Soc Behav*. Mar 1997;38(1):21-37.
16. Supreme Prosecutors' Office Republic of Korea. *Analytical Report on Crimes (2008)*. 2009.
17. Curry A, Latkin C, Davey-Rothwell M. Pathways to depression: The impact of neighborhood violent crime on inner-city residents in Baltimore, Maryland, USA. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2008;67(1):23-30.
18. Sundquist K, Theobald H, Yang M, et al. Neighborhood violent crime and unemployment increase the risk of coronary heart disease: a multilevel study in an urban setting. *Social science & medicine*. 2006;62(8):2061-2071.
19. O'Campo P, Xue X, Wang M-C, et al. Neighborhood risk factors for low birthweight in Baltimore: a multilevel analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*. 1997;87(7):1113-1118.
20. Warr M. Fear of victimization. *Public Perspective*. 1993;5:25-28.
21. Romer D, Jamieson KH, Aday S. Television news and the cultivation of fear of crime. *Journal of communication*. 2003;53(1):88-104.
22. Lipschultz JH, Hilt ML. *Crime and local television news: Dramatic, breaking, and live from the scene*. Routledge; 2002.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
23. Gerbner G. Cultivation analysis: An overview. *Mass Communication and Society*. 1998;1(3-4):175-194.
24. Meier RF, Short JF. CRIME AS HAZARD: PERCEPTIONS OF RISK AND SERIOUSNESS*. *Criminology*. 1985;23(3):389-400.
25. Carpiano RM. Toward a neighborhood resource-based theory of social capital for health: Can Bourdieu and sociology help? *Social science & medicine*. 2006;62(1):165-175.
26. Rodrigues CD. Civil democracy, perceived risk, and insecurity in Brazil: An extension of the systemic social control model. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2006;605(1):242-263.
27. Gibson CL, Zhao J, Lovrich NP, et al. Social integration, individual perceptions of collective efficacy, and fear of crime in three cities. *Justice Quarterly*. 2002;19(3):537-564.
28. Roman CG, Chalfin A. Fear of walking outdoors: a multilevel ecologic analysis of crime and disorder. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2008;34(4):306-312.
29. Kim S-S, Chung Y, Perry MJ, et al. Association between interpersonal trust, reciprocity, and depression in South Korea: A prospective analysis. *PloS one*. 2012;7(1):e30602.
30. Stockdale SE, Wells KB, Tang L, et al. The importance of social context: neighborhood stressors, stress-buffering mechanisms, and alcohol, drug, and mental health disorders. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2007;65(9):1867-1881.

1
2
3 Jongho Heo, MPH, Doctoral student
4 Public Health Joint Doctoral Program,
5 San Diego State University & University of California, San Diego 9245
6 Sky Park Court, Ste. 100, San Diego, CA 92123
7 Phone: (619) 793-9738
8 E-mail: joheo@ucsd.edu; jjongho77@gmail.com
9

10
11 Editor-in-Chief
12 BMJ open
13

14
15
16
17
18 **Dear Editor-in-Chief in the BMJ open**
19

20 | This is the 2nd revision of our manuscript, “Association between district-level safety and self-
21 rated health: a multilevel study in an urban setting”. We really appreciate that the reviewer
22 provided precious comments on how to improve the manuscript.
23
24
25
26
27

28 Sincerely yours,
29 Jongho Heo on behalf of co-authors
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Association between district-level safety and self-rated health: a multilevel study in an urban setting

Seung-Sup Kim MD, ScD, Jaesung Choi PhD, Kisoo Park PhD, Yeonseung Chung PhD, Sangjo Park BA, Jongho Heo*

Seung-Sup Kim

Department of Public Health Sciences, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea, Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, US, Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, The George Washington University School of Public Health and Health Services, Washington, DC, US

Jaesung Choi

Department of Economics, Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Kisoo Park

Department of Healthcare Management, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Yeonseung Chung

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Daejeon, Republic of Korea

Sangjo Park

Master's program, Department of Communication, Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Jongho Heo

Public Health Joint Doctoral Program, San Diego State University & University of California, San Diego, US

Corresponding Author: Jongho Heo

Contact: +1-619-793-9738

Fax: +1-619-594-5888

E-mail: joheo@ucsd.edu

Public Health Joint Doctoral Program, San Diego State University & University of California, San Diego, 9245 Sky Park Court, Ste. 100s, San Diego, CA, 92123, USA

1
2
3
4 Association between district-level safety and self-rated health:
5
6 a multilevel study in an urban setting
7
8
9

10
11 **Abstract**
12

13 **Objectives:** Several studies have reported the relationship between resident's perceived
14 neighborhood safety and their health outcomes. However, those studies suffered from
15 unreliability of neighborhood safety measure and potential residual confounding related to crime
16 rates. In this study, using multilevel analysis to account for the hierarchical structure of the data,
17 we examined associations between district-level safety and self-rated health after adjusting for
18 potential confounders including ~~individual-level perceived neighborhood safety and~~ district-level
19 crime rate.
20
21
22

23
24 **Design:** Cross-sectional study
25

26 **Setting:** We used the 1st wave of Seoul Welfare Panel Study, which has 7,761 individuals from
27 3,665 households in 25 administrative districts in Seoul, South Korea. District-level safety was
28 obtained by aggregating responses from the residents that are representative samples for each
29 administrative district in Seoul. To examine an association between district-level safety and
30 residents' self-rated health, we used mixed effects logistic regression.
31
32

33
34 **Results:** Our results showed that higher district-level perceived safety, an aggregated measure of
35 district residents' responses on neighborhood safety, was significantly associated with poor self-
36 rated health after controlling for sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and
37 household-level income demographic influences and SES (OR: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.78-0.97).
38 Notably Furthermore, this association was still robust even when we additionally adjusted for
39 district-level crime rate and individual-level perceived neighborhood safety district-level crime
40 rate (OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.77-0.95). ~~(OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.77-0.96).~~
41
42
43

44 **Conclusions:** Our study highlights the importance of improving neighborhood perceived safety
45 to enhance residents' health.
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 **Keywords:** perceived neighborhood safety, self-rated health, neighborhood crime rate, Seoul
53 Welfare Panel Study, multilevel analysis
54
55

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Multilevel analytic frame was used to examine an association between district-level safety and residents' self-rated health using representative samples of metropolis, Seoul, South Korea.
- We succeed in adjusting for potential confounders such as [district-level crime rate](#) ~~individual-level perceived neighborhood safety and district-level crime rate~~ in our analytic model, which past studies have failed.
- Causal relationships cannot be inferred from the cross-sectional data [of this study.](#) -

INTRODUCTION

Crime is one of the major problems in many metropolitan areas across countries. Although city crime rates have dropped globally since the mid-1990s,¹ there are still large variations and dramatic fluctuations across cities.² Past criminological studies revealed that variations in crime rates were explained by characteristics of metropolitan areas, such as population sizes, ethnic heterogeneity, geographic mobility, economic segregation, unemployment rate, poverty level and degree of social integration and control.²⁻⁴ Thus, many governments have made great efforts to reduce the crime rates especially in metropolitan areas by intervening in those characteristics to ensure the safety of their residents.

Safety from crime is not only an essential human need in daily life, but also a prerequisite to human health.⁵ A body of past studies has reported the relationship between residents' perceptions of neighborhood safety and their health outcomes.^{6,7} For example, one UK survey with 407 adults reported that fear of crime was significantly associated with self-rated health and mental well-being.⁸ Ziersch and Baum¹⁰ showed that perceived neighborhood safety was related to physical and mental health among 2,400 residents in western suburbs of Adelaide, Australia.

However, these earlier studies suffer from the following limitations. First, most of the previous studies used individual-level neighborhood perceived safety as an exposure variable, which could be influenced by several factors such as prior individual experience of victimization or individual health conditions other than neighborhood-level safety.^{11,12} This could be particularly a critical issue in previous cross-sectional studies because of the potential reverse causation, meaning that the sick are more likely to perceive their neighborhood as unsafe.^{7,13} The second limitation is lack of representativeness of samples within the operationalized definition of

1
2
3 neighborhood. Few studies had enough sample size or the sample size within neighborhood to be
4
5 representative for each neighborhood.^{6,8,14} Unless the responses are obtained from a
6
7 representative sample of participants within each neighborhood, aggregated perceived
8
9 neighborhood measures can potentially be prone to measurement errors. The final limitation is
10
11 that previous studies did not adjust for district-level crime rate as a potential confounder although
12
13 crime-rate has been reported to influence perception of neighborhood safety as well as residents'
14
15 health outcomes.
16
17
18
19

20
21 In this study, we assessed the district-level safety, which was obtained by aggregating responses
22
23 from the residents that are representative samples for each administrative district in Seoul, the
24
25 capital of South Korea. Then, using multilevel analysis to account for the hierarchical structure
26
27 of the data, we examined [the](#) associations between district-level [perceived](#) safety and self-rated
28
29 health after adjusting for potential confounders including ~~individual-level perceived~~
30
31 ~~neighborhood safety and~~ district-level crime rate.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **METHODS**

39 **Study population**

40
41
42
43 Data were obtained from the Seoul Welfare Panel Study (SWPS), which tracked a representative
44
45 sample of households residing in 25 administrative districts in Seoul, South Korea. The SWPS
46
47 was launched in 2008 by the Seoul Welfare Foundation. The 1st wave of the survey was
48
49 conducted in 2008 and its supplementary survey targeting the low-income households was
50
51 implemented in 2009. The SWPS was suspended after the 2nd wave of the survey was conducted
52
53 in 2010 September. The survey employed a two-stage stratified cluster sampling approach where
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a representative sample of census tracts for each district was first drawn, and then households
4
5 were randomly selected within those sampled census tracts at baseline. A household
6
7 representative answered household survey and all members of a household whose age is 15 or
8
9 older were interviewed. A total of 7,761 individuals completed the interviews in Wave 1. The
10
11 SWPS have been publicly released [<http://panel.welfare.seoul.kr>]. Because all respondents
12
13 answered on questionnaire items we used in this study, we were able to conduct our analyses
14
15 based on the entire sample participated in the first wave of SWPS without listwise deletion or
16
17 missing value imputation for handling missing data. The final sample used in the data analysis of
18
19 this research consists of 7,761 individuals from 3,665 households from 25 administrative districts
20
21 in Seoul. The number of households in each district was 146.6 on average, ranging from 108 to
22
23 198. This research received IRB exemption from Division of Research Affairs at the San Diego
24
25 State University.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 **Exposure: district-level perceived ~~neighborhood~~ safety**

34
35 District-level perceived ~~Pereceived-neighborhood~~ safety was assessed through the household
36
37 survey using a question about how much a household representative agrees with the following
38
39 statement: ‘My current residential environment is unsafe’. Respondents answered in a five level
40
41 ordinal scale from “strongly agree” (coded as 1) to “strongly disagree” (coded as 5). The answer
42
43 was then dichotomized into “unsafe” (coded as 0) for the response, 1-2 and “safe” (coded as 1)
44
45 for the response, 3-5. The binary responses from household representatives were aggregated to
46
47 calculate an administrative district-level perceived neighborhood safety by taking a weighted
48
49 average of household-specific perceived safety within each district with the household size used
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 as weight. Such aggregation results in that the district-level perceived neighborhood safety is
4 essentially sample proportion of individuals who answered “safe” within each district.
5
6
7

8 9 **Outcome: poor self-rated health**

10
11
12 Poor self-rated health was assessed through the individual interview using the question “How
13 would you rate your overall health?” This question is on the ordinal level, ranging from “very
14 good” (coded as 1) to “very poor” (coded as 5). The response was then dichotomized into “good
15 health” (coded as 0) for response, 1-3 and “poor health” (coded as 1) for response, 4-5. Although
16 self-rated health cannot assess multi-dimensional aspects of health conditions, it is known to be a
17 reliable predictor of life-expectancy after adjusting for other health indicators.¹⁵
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Covariates**

28
29
30 We included several confounders in the data analysis. For individual-level confounders, we have
31 sex, age group (15-19-~~yrs~~, 20-29-~~yrs~~, 30-39-~~yrs~~, 40-49-~~yrs~~, 50-59-~~yrs~~, 60-69-~~yrs~~, and 70-~~years~~ or
32 more), education level (elementary or less, junior high school, high school, college graduate,
33 university graduate, and graduate school or more), marital status (married or cohabiting vs.
34 others), and job status (employed vs. unemployed), household income with six categories
35 (1,000,000 KRW or less; 1,010,000-2,000,000 KRW; 2,010,000-3,000,000 KRW; 3,010,000-
36 4,000,000 KRW; 4,010,000-5,000,000 KRW; and Above 5,000,000 KRW), and individual-
37 level-perception of district neighborhood-safety (unsafe vs. safe). Because neighborhood safety
38 was assessed solely from the household survey, we assigned the value of perceived
39 neighborhood safety measured from each household representative to all members of the
40 household.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 We considered district-level crime rate as a potential covariate at district-level because it can
4 influence residents' health as well as perceived safety. District-level crime rates for each of 25
5 administrative district ('Gu') in Seoul were collected from the 'Analytical report on crimes,
6 (2008)' that is annually published by supreme prosecutors' office in South Korea.¹⁶ District-level
7 crime rate was calculated by dividing the total number of crimes by the total number of residents
8 in each district (Expressed in number/year/1,000 persons). Using an administrative district
9 identifier in the SWPS, we linked the official crime rate of each administrative district to our
10 final dataset of the SWPS.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Data analysis

23
24 Mixed effect logistic regression was used to investigate the association between district-level
25 safety and self-rated health. Because of the hierarchical structure in our data (i.e., individuals are
26 nested in households, which in turn are nested in districts), within-household and within-district
27 correlations were incorporated using household-specific and district-specific random intercepts.
28 We made stepwise adjustments of potential confounders in the data analysis. First, we adjusted
29 for potential confounders including sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and
30 household-level income. Second, we ~~additionally adjusted for~~ ~~district-level crime rate.~~
31 ~~individual level perceived neighborhood safety to the previously listed confounders for~~
32 ~~adjustment.~~ Finally, we examined the association after adjusting for individual perception of
33 district safety~~individual level perceived neighborhood safety~~ ~~district level crime rate~~ in addition
34 to all of the previously mentioned confounders. All of the confounders were included as
35 categorical variables, and the district-level perceived safety was included after standardization
36 for simple interpretation in the model. All computations were done using R statistical software.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the distribution of the study population and the prevalence of poor self-rated health by each of the individual-level, household-level, and district-level characteristics. Overall, poor self-rated health was reported at 20.9% (1,620 out of 7,761 participants). The proportion was higher for women and showed an increasing pattern with age. Lower proportions were observed for participants in lower education levels. The unemployed and people living in an unsafe neighborhood exhibited higher prevalence of poor self-rated health compared to the employed and those living in a safe neighborhood. Household income were fairly equally distributed in the SWPS. As to the district-level [perceived](#) safety and crime rate, given the overall mean of each variable, relative size of each standard deviation shows that there were considerable variations among the 25 districts.

District-level [perceived](#) safety was significantly associated with poor self-rated health while different sets of confounders being step-wisely adjusted (Table 2). Living in a district where its safety level is 1 standard deviation (0.08) higher resulted in 13% lower odds of reporting self-rated poor health status (OR: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.78, 0.97) after adjusting for sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and household-level income. When [additionally](#) adjusted for [district-level crime rate, this association was slightly attenuated but still significant \(OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.77, 0.95\).](#) ~~individual level safety, this association was slightly attenuated but still significant (OR: 0.88, 95% CI: 0.79, 0.98).~~ When we ~~controlled adjusted for for individual perception of district safety~~ [district-level crime](#) in addition to previously mentioned potential

1
2
3 | [confounders](#), the magnitude of this association was ~~slightly increased and re~~ remained significant
4
5 (OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.77, 0.96).
6
7

10 DISCUSSION

11
12 Evidence from our study indicated that district-level perceived safety, which was assessed by
13 aggregating responses from residents in each district, was significantly associated with poor self-
14 rated health even after controlling for demographic information, ~~and SES~~, [and district-level](#)
15 [crime rate](#). Notably, this association was still robust when we additionally adjusted for ~~district-~~
16 ~~level crime rate and~~ individual [reporting perception](#) of ~~perceived neighborhood~~ [district](#) safety.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Our findings are in line with previous research that showed associations between perceived
26 neighborhood safety and health outcomes. Past studies have also reported that residents who
27 perceived that their neighborhood had more severe problems were more likely to experience
28 greater anxiety, stress, and depression.^{6,17} The studies sampled women, children, and the elderly
29 also provided consistent evidence of a relationship between perceived crime risk and physical
30 health.^{7,14}
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 In this study, district-level crime rate was not associated with self-rated health in the fully
41 adjusted model. Furthermore, our post-hoc analysis showed that there was no statistically
42 significant relationship between district crime rate and residents' self-rated health regardless of
43 [adjustment of confounder](#) ~~seovariate adjustment~~, although district-level crime rate could be a
44 major influence on district-level safety. This finding is different from past studies that reported a
45 significant relationship between district crime rate and residents' health such as coronary heart
46 disease¹⁸ and low birth weight.¹⁹
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The differential association between district-level perceived safety and crime rate in relation to
4 self-rated health could be explained by-in three ways. First, mass media may increase individual-
5
6
7
8 level perceived neighborhood insecurity regardless of their neighborhood crime rates, especially
9
10 when they reported the crime in ways of exaggeration.^{20,21} The mass media tend to emphasize
11
12 criminal stories which can draw attention from audience.²² Previous studies called this
13
14 phenomenon as "cultivation effect" meaning that exposure to the world of television cultivates
15
16 exaggerated perceptions of viewers and magnifies viewers' fear about crime.²³ The residents who
17
18 watched news ~~on~~ about neighborhood crimes are more likely to ~~may~~ perceive their neighborhood
19
20 more vulnerable regions to crime regardless of regional crime rate. Moreover, mass media may
21
22 also increase the individual level perceived neighborhood safety regardless of their objective
23
24 neighborhood crime rates.²¹
25
26
27
28
29

30 Second, different types of crime would have different effects on the perceived risk or fear of
31
32 crime. For example, murder, rape, and personal theft may have higher effects on the fear of
33
34 crime than larceny and auto-theft. Hence, total crime rate that was used in this research might not
35
36 be sophisticated enough to clearly capture the association between the prevalence of crime in the
37
38 district and the residents' health condition.²⁴ However, when we conducted a post-hoc analysis
39
40 using a different measure, '5 index crime rate', which includes major five serious crimes (i.e.
41
42 murder, robbery, rape, assault and theft) that has been adopted by Korean police to indicate
43
44 violent crime rate, still we could not find any association with residents' self-rated health.
45
46
47
48
49

50 Finally, if social and physical resources of neighborhood are deteriorated or deprived, residents
51
52 tend to perceive neighborhood safety more irrespective of the objective neighborhood crime
53
54 rate.²⁵ The poor quality of social and physical environment, such as dilapidated houses or having
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 no formal or informal neighborhood networks, may work as a trigger to make residents perceive
4
5 their neighborhood dangerous.^{26,27}
6
7

8
9 There could be several pathways linking district-level perceived neighborhood safety to
10
11 ~~resident's self-rated health irrespective of neighborhood crime rate and individual level~~
12 ~~perceived neighborhood safety~~. First, higher district-level perceived safety can cause less
13
14 outdoor physical activities^{7,28} leading to poor health. Second, elevated district-level perceived
15
16 safety ~~may iteratively~~ aggravates social supports or deteriorates physical environments, in turn, it
17
18 may harm mental and physical outcomes.²⁹ Last, elevated district-level perceived safety may be
19
20 a latent stressor causing chronic stress status that could undermine residents' mental health.³⁰
21
22
23
24
25

26 Our study has several limitations. First, potential reverse causation is of concern due to its cross-
27
28 sectional study design, implying that people with poor-self rated health are more likely to
29
30 perceive their neighborhood as unsafe. Future studies are required to examine the causal
31
32 association between district-level perceived safety and health outcomes. However, because the
33 association was still significant after adjusting for individual perceived safety, which is a critical
34 pathway of this reverse causation, so we believe that the potential reverse causation cannot fully
35 explain the observed association. Second, this study assessed perceived neighborhood safety
36
37 through a single-item measure. This item may not reflect multi-dimensional aspects of the
38
39 neighborhood safety.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Despite these limitations, our study has the strength in that we used representative samples for
50
51 each operationalized administrative district, which enabled multi-level analysis using ~~an~~ district-
52
53 level aggregate measure of perceived safety whereas most of the previous studies used individual
54
55 reporting of perceived safety as an exposure variable. Furthermore, to our knowledge, this is one
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of the first studies to examine the association between district-level perceived neighborhood
4 safety and health outcome after adjusting for district-level crime rate.
5
6
7

8
9 In sum, our study showed that district-level perceived safety was associated with residents' poor
10 self-rated health even after controlling for demographic influences, SES, and district-level crime
11 rate, and individual-level perceived safety. Our study results evoke the importance of local
12 authorities (or governments) to make efforts toward improving neighborhood perceived safety to
13 enhance residents' health.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the independent variables and their associations with self-rated poor health (N=7761)

Variables	Total	Prevalence of poor self-rated health	
	N	N (%)	p-values
<i>Individual level variables (N=7,761)</i>			
Sex			<0.0001
Male	3,547	599 (16.9)	
Female	4,214	1,021 (24.2)	
Age (years)			<0.0001
15-19	536	17 (3.2)	
20-29	973	26 (2.7)	
30-39	1,577	92 (5.8)	
40-49	1,425	185 (13.0)	
50-59	1,139	242 (21.2)	
60-69	1,130	482 (42.7)	
70 or more	981	576 (58.7)	
Job Status			<0.0001
Employed	3,199	293 (9.2)	
Unemployed	4,562	1,327 (29.1)	
Education Level			<0.0001
Elementary school or less	1,143	664 (58.1)	
Middle school	703	271 (38.5)	
High school	2,483	433 (17.4)	
College graduate	572	46 (8.0)	
University graduate	2,516	185 (7.4)	
Graduate school or more	344	21 (6.1)	
Marital status			0.151
Married/cohabiting	5,059	1,031 (20.4)	
Others	2,702	589 (21.8)	
Individual-level safety			<0.0001
Safe	6,777	1,361 (20.1)	
Unsafe	984	259 (26.3)	
<i>Household level variables (N=3,665)</i>			
Household Income			
1,000,000 KRW or less	770		
1,010,000-2,000,000 KRW	772		
2,010,000-3,000,000 KRW	656		
3,010,000-4,000,000 KRW	510		
4,010,000-5,000,000 KRW	345		
Above 5,000,000 KRW	612		
<i>District level variables (N=25)</i>			
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Range</u>
District-level perceived safety (mean (SD)) ^a	0.87	0.08	0.68-0.98
District-level crime rate (mean (SD)) ^b	4.63	2.94	2.25-16.31

1
2
3 ^a District-specific average of individual-level safety
4

5 ^b Expressed in number/year/1,000 persons
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 2. Associations between district-level perceived safety and poor self-rated health

	Unadjusted		Adjusted ^a					
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
District-level perceived safety ^b	0.83***	(0.76, 0.91)	0.87*	(0.78, 0.97)	0.86**	(0.77, 0.95)	0.86**	(0.77, 0.96)
<u>District-level crime rate</u>					<u>0.97</u>	<u>(0.93, 1.01)</u>	<u>0.97</u>	<u>(0.93,1.01)</u>
<u>Individual perception of district safety</u>							<u>0.82</u>	<u>(0.65,1.04)</u>

^a Adjusted for sex, age, education level, job status, marital status, and household-level income

^b Aggregated responses about neighborhood safety among residents in the same district. The variables was included in the data analysis after standardization

* p-value<0.05, ** p-value<0.01

1
2
3 Acknowledgments: None
4
5

6
7
8 Competing interests: None
9

10
11
12 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
13 not-for-profit sectors.
14
15

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

REFERENCES

1. Tseloni A, Mailley J, Farrell G, Tilley N. Exploring the international decline in crime rates. *European Journal of Criminology*. 2010;7(5):375-394.
2. McCall PL, Land KC, Parker KF. Heterogeneity in the rise and decline of city-level homicide rates, 1976–2005: A latent trajectory analysis. *Social Science Research*. 2011;40(1):363-378.
3. Sampson RJ, Raudenbush SW, Earls F. Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*. 1997;277(5328):918-924.
4. Patterson EB. Poverty, income inequality, and community crime rates. *Criminology*. 1991;29(4):755-776.
5. Krug EG, Mercy JA, Dahlberg LL, Zwi AB. The world report on violence and health. *The lancet*. 2002;360(9339):1083-1088.
6. Gary TL, Stark SA, LaVeist TA. Neighborhood characteristics and mental health among African Americans and whites living in a racially integrated urban community. *Health & Place*. 2007;13(2):569-575.
7. Tucker-Seeley RD, Subramanian S, Li Y, Sorensen G. Neighborhood safety, socioeconomic status, and physical activity in older adults. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2009;37(3):207-213.
8. Green G, Gilbertson JM, Grimsley MF. Fear of crime and health in residential tower blocks A case study in Liverpool, UK. *The European Journal of Public Health*. 2002;12(1):10-15.
9. Latkin CA, Curry AD. Stressful neighborhoods and depression: a prospective study of the impact of neighborhood disorder. *Journal of health and social behavior*. 2003:34-44.
10. Ziersch AM, Baum FE, MacDougall C, Putland C. Neighbourhood life and social capital: the implications for health. *Social science & medicine*. 2005;60(1):71-86.
11. Raudenbush SW. *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Vol 1: Sage; 2002.
12. Kruger DJ, Reischl TM, Gee GC. Neighborhood social conditions mediate the association between physical deterioration and mental health. *American journal of community psychology*. 2007;40(3-4):261-271.
13. Wen M, Hawkey LC, Cacioppo JT. Objective and perceived neighborhood environment, individual SES and psychosocial factors, and self-rated health: An analysis of older adults in Cook County, Illinois. *Social science & medicine*. 2006;63(10):2575-2590.
14. White M, Kasl SV, Zahner GE, Will JC. Perceived crime in the neighborhood and mental health of women and children. *Environment and Behavior*. 1987;19(5):588-613.
15. Idler EL, Benyamini Y. Self-rated health and mortality: a review of twenty-seven community studies. *J Health Soc Behav*. Mar 1997;38(1):21-37.
16. Supreme Prosecutors' Office Republic Of Korea. *Analytical Report on Crimes (2008)*. 2009.
17. Curry A, Latkin C, Davey-Rothwell M. Pathways to depression: The impact of neighborhood violent crime on inner-city residents in Baltimore, Maryland, USA. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2008;67(1):23-30.
18. Sundquist K, Theobald H, Yang M, Li X, Johansson S-E, Sundquist J. Neighborhood violent crime and unemployment increase the risk of coronary heart disease: a multilevel study in an urban setting. *Social science & medicine*. 2006;62(8):2061-2071.
19. O'Campo P, Xue X, Wang M-C, Caughy M. Neighborhood risk factors for low birthweight in Baltimore: a multilevel analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*. 1997;87(7):1113-1118.
20. Warr M. Fear of victimization. *Public Perspective*. 1993;5:25-28.
21. Romer D, Jamieson KH, Aday S. Television news and the cultivation of fear of crime. *Journal of communication*. 2003;53(1):88-104.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
22. Lipschultz JH, Hilt ML. *Crime and local television news: Dramatic, breaking, and live from the scene*. Routledge; 2002.
23. Gerbner G. Cultivation analysis: An overview. *Mass Communication and Society*. 1998;1(3-4):175-194.
24. Meier RF, Short JF. CRIME AS HAZARD: PERCEPTIONS OF RISK AND SERIOUSNESS*. *Criminology*. 1985;23(3):389-400.
25. Carpiano RM. Toward a neighborhood resource-based theory of social capital for health: Can Bourdieu and sociology help? *Social science & medicine*. 2006;62(1):165-175.
26. Rodrigues CD. Civil democracy, perceived risk, and insecurity in Brazil: An extension of the systemic social control model. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2006;605(1):242-263.
27. Gibson CL, Zhao J, Lovrich NP, Gaffney MJ. Social integration, individual perceptions of collective efficacy, and fear of crime in three cities. *Justice Quarterly*. 2002;19(3):537-564.
28. Roman CG, Chalfin A. Fear of walking outdoors: a multilevel ecologic analysis of crime and disorder. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2008;34(4):306-312.
29. Kim S-S, Chung Y, Perry MJ, Kawachi I, Subramanian S. Association between interpersonal trust, reciprocity, and depression in South Korea: A prospective analysis. *PLoS one*. 2012;7(1):e30602.
30. Stockdale SE, Wells KB, Tang L, Belin TR, Zhang L, Sherbourne CD. The importance of social context: neighborhood stressors, stress-buffering mechanisms, and alcohol, drug, and mental health disorders. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2007;65(9):1867-1881.

STROBE 2007 (v4) checklist of items to be included in reports of observational studies in epidemiology*
Checklist for cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies (combined)

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses	6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6-7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6-7
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7-9
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7-9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7-9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	9
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	9

		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	10
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	10
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time <i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	10
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	10
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	10-13
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	13
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	13
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	17

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.