Published in final edited form as:

Am J Prev Med. 2006 December ; 31(6): 455–463.

Neighborhoods and Obesity in Older Adults: The Baltimore Memory Study

Thomas A Glass, PhD¹, Meghan D. Rasmussen, MPA², and Brian S. Schwartz, MD, MS³

¹ Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Department of Epidemiology, Baltimore MD

² College of Law, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse NY

³ Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Division of Occupational and Environmental Health, Baltimore MD

Abstract

Background—Obesity has reached epidemic proportions. Although its causes are not well understood, its increasing prevalence is not likely to be due to genetic factors or underlying biology. This has led to interest in the role of environmental factors, although few studies have focused on the role of the social environment. This study investigated whether neighborhood psychosocial hazards independent of individual risk factors were associated with increased odds of obesity.

Methods—Baseline data were analyzed in 2005 from a cohort study of 1140 randomly selected community-dwelling men and women aged 50–70 years from 65 contiguous neighborhoods in Baltimore MD. Body mass index (BMI in kg/m²) was calculated from measured height and weight at baseline (2001–2002). People with BMI ≥30 were considered obese. Multilevel logistic regression was used to examine associations between a 12-item scale of neighborhood psychosocial hazards and the odds of obesity.

Results—Thirty-eight percent of the cohort were obese. Residents of neighborhoods in the highest quartile of the Multidimensional Neighborhood Hazards scale were nearly twice as likely to be obese compared to residents in the least-hazardous neighborhoods (53% vs 27%). After adjustment for age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, household wealth, alcohol consumption, tobacco use, self-reported physical activity, and dietary intake, living in more hazardous neighborhoods was associated with a graded increase in the odds of obesity. This association was partially mediated by physical activity.

Conclusions—Even after controlling for a large set of demographic, behavioral, and socioeconomic individual-level risk factors, living in a neighborhood with greater psychosocial hazards was independently associated with obesity.

INTRODUCTION

Rates of obesity have increased dramatically in the last several decades resulting in an emerging global epidemic.^{1–3} The rate of growth of the epidemic over this timeframe renders implausible explanations that involve changes in biology or genetics. Although several individual-level risk factors for obesity have been identified, population rates of obesity are

Correspondence and reprint requests: Thomas A. Glass, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Department of Epidemiology, 615 N. Wolfe Street, Baltimore MD 21205, E-mail: tglass@jhsph.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

No financial conflict of interest was reported by the authors of this paper.

determined by a complex interplay of genetic, environmental, behavioral, and cultural factors. A comprehensive understanding of how these factors interact is currently lacking.

Treatment and prevention efforts continue to be costly and have limited effect.^{4,5} It is unlikely that treating those who are obese on an individual basis will have a significant public health impact if each treated case is replaced by large numbers of new cases.⁶ A recent report by the United States Institute of Medicine⁷ summarizes an emerging consensus: Environmental factors play a role, and environmental solutions will be required to address the epidemic.

Several models have been proposed to explain the “obesogenic environment.”^{8–12} One set of studies has focused on the built environment (urban design, transportation, land use, and physical activity)^{13–17} or the local food environment.^{18–22} Among these, the strongest findings have been from studies of suburban or exurban communities.^{16, 23} A second group of studies looks at socioeconomic deprivation at the community or neighborhood level.^{24–32} These studies show that places in which people are poor are associated with obesity. The reasons for this association, however, are unclear. This is partly because most previous studies have used single and relatively crude summary measures of economic deprivation that do not allow for testing of specific hypotheses about what underlies the association. Much of the existing literature has been hampered by other problems including same-source bias (getting information on neighborhoods and outcomes from the same people), and using census tracts or postal districts as proxies for residential neighborhoods.

The purpose of this study was to test the hypothesis that living in a neighborhood with more psychosocial hazards is associated with individual obesity, independent of known risk factors (race/ethnicity, individual education, and income) and health behaviors (physical activity and diet). This hypothesis was motivated by animal and human research showing a link between environmental stress, cortisol production, and increasing body mass.^{33–36} This study overcomes the limitations of previous studies in four ways: (1) the use of sociologically real neighborhoods (rather than administrative units); (2) state-of-the-art measurement of one specific aspect of neighborhood conditions; (3) collection of data on persons and places separately; and (4) the ability to contrast competing hypotheses about what makes neighborhoods important. Data from a population-based cohort of adults aged 50–70 years recruited from strategically chosen neighborhoods in the Baltimore City (MD) in the U.S. are used in the analysis.

METHODS

Study Design

The Baltimore Memory Study is a multilevel cohort study of risk factors for cognitive decline in Baltimore City residents. The residents were sampled at random from a predetermined study area consisting of 65 contiguous urban neighborhoods selected to contain the full spectrum of socioeconomic conditions. The methods are described elsewhere.³⁷ A cross-sectional analysis of baseline data was performed.

Subject Selection and Recruitment

Using a sampling frame based on the Baltimore Department of Assessments and Taxation, all residential addresses in the study area were identified and linked to telephone numbers after carefully accounting for apartment buildings and other multi-resident dwellings. Six random samples were drawn from this sampling frame, and households were called up to ten times to determine eligibility and recruitment. Eligibility was determined on 2351 subjects (aged 50–70 years, living at selected household, lived in Baltimore at least 5 years) and of these subjects, 60.8% were scheduled for an enrollment visit. Of the 1403 scheduled for an appointment, 1140

(81.3%) were enrolled and subsequently tested. The study was approved by the Committee for Human Research of the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. All participants provided written, informed consent before testing and were paid \$50 for their participation.

Data Collection

Data on individual study participants were collected at the study clinic (in northern Baltimore City) by trained research assistants during three study visits, averaging 16 months apart. During the first study visit, a structured interview obtained information on self-reported date of birth and age in years, gender, race/ethnicity (using the Census 2000 method³⁸), housing and residential history, and smoking and alcohol consumption history. Body mass index (BMI) was computed based on measured weight (in kilograms) divided by measured height (in meters) squared. Respondents were classified as overweight (BMI>24.9) and obese (BMI>29.9) based on Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines (www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/bmi/adult_BMI/about_adult_BMI.htm).

Individual-Level Measures

Socioeconomic status was assessed using an instrument specifically designed for the study to assess individual and household educational attainment and wealth.³⁷ Utilized variables included an ordinal index of educational attainment (nine levels) and household wealth (income plus assets) in dollars (five levels).

Physical activity was measured using the Yale Physical Activity Survey (YPAS), a 43-item self-report instrument designed for epidemiologic studies of older adults.³⁹ The YPAS has been shown to have favorable reliability and validity as assessed by correlation with objective methods.⁴⁰ Based on previous studies of obesity, two variables were used: vigorous physical activity and leisure-time walking intensity. Dietary behavior (usual eating habits in the past year) was obtained from the Block 98.2 Food-Frequency Questionnaire,⁴¹ which was filled out by study participants at home before the second study visit. Based on prior studies^{40, 42} and strength of association with obesity, percentage of calories from fat and total kilocalories of dietary intake were used in the analysis.

Neighborhood Measures

Neighborhood boundaries were created by the Baltimore City Department of Planning based on community definitions of existing neighborhoods. Thus the spatial unit is named “city neighborhoods,” not census units or ZIP codes that are used as proxies for neighborhoods in most studies. Data on neighborhood characteristics came from the 2000 U.S. Census, and the Baltimore City Departments of Planning, Public Works, and Police. Block-level census data were recombined into neighborhoods by the U.S. Census Bureau. Block-level census data, the smallest level of aggregation available, is not normally made available to researchers for confidentiality reasons. By special request, the Census Bureau tabulated this lowest-level data to the precise boundaries of the Baltimore neighborhoods. Number and location of violent crimes, offsite liquor licenses, and 911 emergency telephone calls were individually mapped and aggregated at the neighborhood level using geographic information systems (GIS). Participants were linked to their neighborhood of residence by their home address at baseline.

Three summary scales were examined: the Townsend Index of Socioeconomic Deprivation and two variables created specifically for this study. The Townsend Index is a standard summary measure of neighborhood socioeconomic deprivation developed specifically for use in public health research that combines information on crowding, home ownership, unemployment, and availability of a car.⁴³ Secondly, an Index of Neighborhood Affluence was created from information on neighborhood wealth based on prior studies.^{44, 45} This index combined information on percentage of residents with a bachelors’ degrees or higher;

percentage with per capita income of \$20,000 or greater; 30% or more of residents working in professional, administrative or management occupations; median family income of \$50,000 or greater; median house value of \$75,000 or greater; and one quarter or more of school-aged children enrolled in private school.

In order to test whether psychosocial hazards were more closely associated with obesity than these two socioeconomic variables, the Neighborhood Psychosocial Hazards (NPH) scale was also created. Using a two-step method, theory and prior studies were used to choose 20 variables hypothesized to indicate (or measure) psychosocial hazards, defined as stable and visible features of neighborhood environments that give rise to a heightened state of vigilance, alarm, or fear in residents.^{46, 47} Second, factor analysis identified a final set of 12 items that were found to be measuring one underlying concept (or factor). These included both census variables and non-census indicators of psychosocial hazards. To create the final scale, each variable was standardized (z-score) and the 12 values were summed. This yielded a normally distributed scale (range -19.0 to 19.2; mean=0.1; SD=9.6). For modeling, the NPH scale was divided into quartiles to test across levels of neighborhood psychosocial hazards. A fuller description of the 12 final indicators in the NPH is shown in an appendix.

Statistical Analyses

The main objectives of this analysis were to evaluate whether: (1) NPH was associated with odds of obesity; (2) the association was independent of individual-level risk factors for obesity, and partially independent of hypothesized mediators (physical activity and diet); and (3) associations of the NPH differed when compared to two other measures of neighborhoods that focus more narrowly on socioeconomic characteristics. Bivariate associations were evaluated using chi-squared tests for pairs of ordinal variables, and one-way analysis of variance for unbalanced designs for pairs of continuous and discrete variables.

Random effects (multilevel) logistic regression models were used to examine associations of the three neighborhood metrics with obesity, controlling for individual-level confounders and mediators. By fitting a random intercept for each neighborhood, the models took account of the correlation among persons within a neighborhood, yielding more accurate standard errors and unbiased maximum likelihood parameter estimates.⁴⁸ The interpretation of parameters is analogous to the standard logistic regression model.

Ten subjects were missing height or weight data and were excluded from the analysis. Another eight subjects were excluded because they lived in a neighborhood where it was impossible to calculate the NPH due to small sample sizes. Models were constructed sequentially based on a priori theory. Model 1 included known sociodemographic confounders (e.g., age, gender, and race/ethnicity); Model 2 included individual socioeconomic status (education and household wealth); Model 3 added health behaviors known to be associated with risk of obesity (smoking and alcohol consumption); and Models 4 and 5 included two hypothesized mediators of the influence of the NPH on obesity: physical activity and diet (total kilocalorie intake and percent calories from fat). All models included three dummy variables to indicate increasing levels of NPH by quartile (lowest level of psychosocial hazards served as the reference category). A final set of models was estimated replacing the NPH with the Townsend Index and the Index of Neighborhood Affluence (Table 4). All statistical analyses were performed using SAS version 8.2 (SAS Institute, Cary NC, 2001).

RESULTS

Study subjects were 66% female, 41% non-Hispanic black/African American, and 54% non-Hispanic white or white/Native American, and had a mean (SD) age of 59 (6) years. Overall, 79% of study participants with valid data on height and weight were overweight (BMI>24.9)

and 38% were obese (BMI>29.9) (Table 1). Women, African Americans, those with less education, nonsmokers, less-frequent drinkers, and those with lower household wealth were more likely to be obese (Table 1). Significant trends were also seen for those reporting less vigorous physical activity and higher percent of calories from fat.

Next, differences in individual characteristics across quartiles of NPH were examined (Table 2). Those living in neighborhoods with more psychosocial hazards were more likely to be overweight and obese. Residents of the most hazardous neighborhoods had average BMI scores 3.7 points higher than the least hazardous neighborhoods. Other than gender, all variables showed trends in association with obesity across levels of the NPH. While a strong association was observed between race/ethnicity and NPH, there was still reasonable overlap in the distributions; 11% of residents in the highest quartile neighborhoods were white and 8 and 41 percent of residents in the least and next to least hazardous neighborhoods were African American respectively. Finally, higher NPH scores were associated with less physical activity and less healthy diets.

Random effects logistic regression was next used to evaluate the association between NPH and obesity controlling for individual covariates (Table 3). Controlling for age, gender, and race/ethnicity (Model 1), the odds of obesity increased across all levels of NPH compared to the lowest level. Obesity prevalence ranged from 70% higher in the low-moderate quartile to more than twice as high in the two highest quartiles. After adjusting for individual and household socioeconomic status, a significant increased odds of obesity was seen across each level of the NPH ($OR_{low-mod}=1.58$; $OR_{high-mod}=1.91$; $OR_{high}=1.93$) (Model 2). Adjustment for smoking and alcohol consumption resulted in no reduction in the magnitude of associations with NPH (Model 3). Controlling for diet (Model 4) attenuated the NPH association slightly ($OR_{mod-low}=1.60$; $OR_{mod-high}=2.00$; $OR_{high}=2.03$). Adjustment for vigorous physical activity and leisure walking resulted in a further small decline in the NPH odds ratios, suggestive of some degree of mediation. However, even after controlling for the entire set of confounders and mediators, living in a neighborhood with a higher NPH remained associated with a 52%–96% increased odds of obesity (Model 5).

Finally, Table 4 presents results comparing the associations of the NPH with obesity to those of two other measures of neighborhood socioeconomic characteristics. The three models shown are estimated using the same model and covariates as Model 5. The Townsend Index showed a weaker association with obesity across all levels compared to the NPH. A significant increased odds was seen for the high-moderate quartile compared to the lowest quartile and for the test of linear trend. The index of neighborhood affluence was unrelated to odds of obesity.

DISCUSSION

Although associations between individual-level socioeconomic status and obesity have been repeatedly observed, the relationship between neighborhood characteristics and obesity is less clear. This study adds to the evidence that neighborhood social and economic factors may be related to adult obesity. The main finding is that after adjusting for a large set of important individual-level risk factors, including household socioeconomic status, a significant association was found between the NPH and obesity in an older, community-based, adult population in a major U.S. urban area. Because these results are based on cross-sectional analyses, it is not possible to establish causal effects. However, given that people living in their current neighborhood for less than 5 years were excluded from participating in the study, these findings are unlikely to result from recent moves of people into or out of their neighborhood as a function of body mass. Importantly (though not shown), neighborhood factors were found

to be more strongly related to obesity than to overweight in this adult population. This provides additional evidence that the risk factors for overweight and obesity may differ in adults.

Although the study of neighborhoods and health has grown rapidly over the past decade, several important weaknesses have been identified. First, the vast majority of studies use administrative areas (like ZIP codes, postal districts, or census tracts) as proxies for residential neighborhoods. These fail to capture true neighborhood boundaries and may lead to misclassification of exposure to environmental factors. Second, previous studies have been limited to crude measures like poverty or median income. This has impeded the testing of specific hypotheses about how neighborhoods matter.^{49, 50} This study addresses both these limitations. A measure of neighborhood psychosocial hazards was developed and validated to test a specific, biologically plausible hypothesis about how neighborhood conditions might be related to obesity. The NPH is composed of a variety of types of variables, taken from sources other than study participants that were found in factor analysis to be closely related to one another. The material and psychosocial aspects of neighborhoods are assumed to be complex and closely interrelated. However, the contribution of psychosocially mediated processes (like stress) and material deprivation are not mutually exclusive. Due to this considerable conceptual overlap, the three neighborhood measures were not included in a single model. Correlations among these factors range from a -0.65 between Townsend and Affluence to 0.87 for Townsend and the NPH. These represent three batches of covariance that emphasize different but interrelated facets of the neighborhood atmosphere, not distinct analytically separable phenomenon.

The association between the NPH and obesity was not substantially mediated through dietary intake or physical activity. Dietary behavior was only assessed at the second study visit, and although it was designed to assess usual eating patterns in the previous year, these data may be biased assessments of baseline diet. Further, obese individuals who are attempting to lose weight may consume fewer calories, or may under-report intake. Differential measurement error in this self-report instrument is a possibility, making this test of mediation inconclusive. The association between NPH and obesity was reduced slightly when self-reported physical activity was added (Model 5), indicating this association may be mediated, at least in part, by the impact of neighborhoods on physical activity. These findings corroborate other studies showing that area of residence is associated with physical activity.^{14, 51} However, the main finding is that neighborhood characteristics may exert an independent influence on risk of obesity. This suggests that pathways other than food availability or physical activity may be involved.

Neighborhood deprivation may operate through at least three pathways. First, deprivation may reduce walking^{52–54} and outdoor physical activity^{27, 55} due, in part, to perceptions of safety and fear of crime.^{47, 56} Second, the association may be purely economic (poor people can afford only cheap, calorie-dense foods that are more likely to lead to obesity).⁵⁷ Finally, living in a socioeconomically deprived neighborhood may expose residents to psychosocial hazards leading to chronic activation of, and dysregulation of, the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal (HPA) axis response.³⁴ The NPH was independently related to obesity, while the more commonly employed deprivation measures were more weakly associated (Townsend Index) or were not associated (Index of Neighborhood Affluence). These data are consistent with the theory that prolonged exposure to environments that evoke vigilance, threat, and alarm, the *a priori* hypothesis, may be an important and modifiable contributor to the epidemic of obesity. Beyond the behavioral pathways examined, living in psychosocially hazardous neighborhoods might plausibly lead to increased body weight through stress pathways.^{33, 36} In humans, the presence of psychosocial hazards results in increased glucocorticoid secretion, which in turn promotes visceral adiposity and the metabolic syndrome.^{34, 58} This effect operates directly through the central appetite regulation system.⁵⁹ These data are consistent with an

environmental stress theory for the role of the social environment in obesity, but remains speculative given that biomarkers of HPA axis dysregulation were not included in this analysis.

Strengths of this study include: (1) greater precision in the measurement of individual socioeconomic status (with the addition of household assets as well as income); (2) ability to adjust for diet and physical activity; (3) use of multi-level models to account for correlations of persons within neighborhoods; (4) a rich array of neighborhood measures independent of study participants that were combined into a scale using factor analysis; and (5) availability of a neighborhood geography that may be more valid than census tracts. This study is an important advance over previous studies, which were mainly ecologic in design, because it combined information gathered separately on people and places.⁶⁰

A potential criticism is that these results may be explained by the overwhelming influence of socioeconomic status or race/ethnicity on obesity. Neighborhood associations may represent residual confounding due to unmeasured heterogeneity in individual social position or race/ethnicity.⁶¹ It is not possible to completely rule this out. However, several factors mitigate this criticism. First, the multilevel models used adjust for the similarity among people living in the same neighborhood and the effect of individual and household economic status using strong measures of education and household wealth. Second, several indicators that make up the NPH are not likely to be direct measures of socioeconomic status (e.g., street conditions, 911 calls, and rates of marital disruption). Third, recent findings using National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) data suggest that socioeconomic disparities in obesity narrowed significantly between 1971 and 2000,⁶² making residual confounding less likely. Finally, stronger associations were observed for the NPH compared to standard measures of deprivation (Townsend) or affluence. Drewnowski and Specter⁵⁷ argue that obesity is associated with socioeconomic position because healthy food is too expensive compared to energy-dense foods. The absence of an association between neighborhood affluence and obesity is suggestive of alternative pathways.

Another potential criticism is that no adjustment was made for chronic disease or disability. However, a growing literature on the health consequences of living in deprived neighborhoods shows that poor health may lie on the causal pathway.^{63–65} Therefore, adjustment for these factors would lead to an underestimation of the association of neighborhood conditions and obesity. However, these models were refit after adjusting for the presence of disability; the main inferences were unchanged.

The public health significance of these findings may lie in the additional evidence provided that neighborhood conditions can alter population patterns of obesity. The urgency of developing environmental strategies to reduce the burden of disease that results directly and indirectly from obesity is increasing. These data support the importance of focusing on places rather than (or in addition to) the individuals who live in those places. These results suggest the potential utility of community-level interventions that might lead to reductions in psychosocial hazards. Several components of the NPH are amenable to change including public safety, crime rates, vacant housing, and educational attainment. Ecologic approaches to obesity prevention have begun to be tested focusing on urban design and food availability.⁶⁶

In previous centuries, major advances in the control of infectious diseases like cholera and tuberculosis came from environmental changes involving public sanitation. The modern epidemics of obesity, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease may require a return to this basic strategy. These studies suggest that community redevelopment, housing policy, and blight-reduction, in addition to other benefits, may contribute to improvements in population health.

Acknowledgements

Grant support: This work was supported by a grant from the National Institute of Aging (R01 AG19604, Dr. Schwartz, PI)

References

1. Flegal KM. The obesity epidemic in children and adults: current evidence and research issues. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1999;31(11 Suppl):S509–14. [PubMed: 10593520]
2. Flegal KM, Carroll MD, Ogden CL, Johnson CL. Prevalence and trends in obesity among US adults, 1999–2000. *Jama* 2002;288(14):1723–7. [PubMed: 12365955]
3. Ogden CL, Carroll MD, Flegal KM. Epidemiologic trends in overweight and obesity. *Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am* 2003;32(4):741–60. [PubMed: 14711060]vii
4. Doak C. Large-scale interventions and programmes addressing nutrition-related chronic diseases and obesity: examples from 14 countries. *Public Health Nutr* 2002;5(1A):275–7. [PubMed: 12027295]
5. Stettler N. Environmental factors in the etiology of obesity in adolescents. *Ethn Dis* 2002;12(1):S1–41. 5. [PubMed: 11913619]
6. Brownell KD. Obesity and managed care: a role for activism and advocacy? *Am J Manag Care* 2004;10(6):353–4. [PubMed: 15209478]
7. Koplan, JP.; Liverman, CT.; Kraak, VA. Preventing Childhood Obesity: Health in the Balance. Washington, DC: Institute of Medicine, Committee on Prevention of Obesity in Children and Youth; 2005.
8. Drewnowski A. Obesity and the food environment: dietary energy density and diet costs. *Am J Prev Med* 2004;27(3 Suppl):154–62. [PubMed: 15450626]
9. Brownell, KD.; Horgen, KB. Food Fight: The Insider Story of the Food Industry, America's Obesity Crisis, and What We Can Do About It. New York, NY: Contemporary Books/McGraw-Hill; 2004.
10. Egger G, Swinburn B. An "ecological" approach to the obesity pandemic. *Bmj* 1997;315(7106):477–80. [PubMed: 9284671]
11. Hill JO, Peters JC. Environmental contributions to the obesity epidemic. *Science* 1998;280(5368):1371–4. [PubMed: 9603719]
12. Swinburn B, Egger G, Raza F. Dissecting obesogenic environments: the development and application of a framework for identifying and prioritizing environmental interventions for obesity. *Prev Med* 1999;29(6 Pt 1):563–70. [PubMed: 10600438]
13. Ellaway A, Macintyre S. Does where you live predict health related behaviours? : a case study in Glasgow. *Health Bulletin* 1996;54(6):443–6. [PubMed: 8990608]
14. Ellaway A, Macintyre S, Bonnefoy X. Graffiti, greenery, and obesity in adults: secondary analysis of European cross sectional survey. *Bmj* 2005;331(7517):611–2. [PubMed: 16113034]
15. Ewing R, Schmid T, Killingsworth R, Zlot A, Raudenbush S. Relationship between urban sprawl and physical activity, obesity, and morbidity. *Am J Health Promot* 2003;18(1):47–57. [PubMed: 13677962]
16. Booth KM, Pinkston MM, Poston WS. Obesity and the built environment. *J Am Diet Assoc* 2005;105(5 Suppl 1):S110–7. [PubMed: 15867906]
17. Frank LD, Andresen MA, Schmid TL. Obesity relationships with community design, physical activity, and time spent in cars. *Am J Prev Med* 2004;27(2):87–96. [PubMed: 15261894]
18. Bowman SA, Gortmaker SL, Ebbeling CB, Pereira MA, Ludwig DS. Effects of fast-food consumption on energy intake and diet quality among children in a national household survey. *Pediatrics* 2004;113(1 Pt 1):112–8. [PubMed: 14702458]
19. Burdette HL, Whitaker RC. Neighborhood playgrounds, fast food restaurants, and crime: Relationships to overweight in low-income preschool children. *Preventive Medicine: An International Journal Devoted to Practice & Theory* 2004;38(1):57–63.
20. Cheng TO. Fast food and obesity in China. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2003;42(4):773. [PubMed: 12932622]
21. French SA, Harnack L, Jeffery RW. Fast food restaurant use among women in the Pound of Prevention study: dietary, behavioral and demographic correlates. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 2000;24(10):1353–9. [PubMed: 11093299]

22. French SA, Story M, Neumark-Sztainer D, Fulkerson JA, Hannan P. Fast food restaurant use among adolescents: associations with nutrient intake, food choices and behavioral and psychosocial variables. *International Journal of Obesity & Related Metabolic Disorders* 2001;25(12):1823–33. [PubMed: 11781764]
23. Morland K, Wing S, Diez Roux A, Poole C. Neighborhood characteristics associated with the location of food stores and food service places. *Am J Prev Med* 2002;22(1):23–9. [PubMed: 11777675]
24. Ellaway A, Anderson A, Macintyre S. Does area of residence affect body size and shape? *International Journal of Obesity & Related Metabolic Disorders* 1997;21(4):304–8. [PubMed: 9130028]
25. Cubbin C, Hadden WC, Winkleby MA. Neighborhood context and cardiovascular disease risk factors: the contribution of material deprivation. *Ethn Dis* 2001;11(4):687–700. [PubMed: 11763293]
26. Liu GC, Cunningham C, Downs SM, Marrero DG, Fineberg N. A spatial analysis of obesogenic environments for children. *Proc AMIA Symp* 2002:459–63. [PubMed: 12463866]
27. Diez Roux AV. Residential environments and cardiovascular risk. *J Urban Health* 2003;80(4):569–89. [PubMed: 14709706]
28. Giles-Corti B, Macintyre S, Clarkson JP, Pikora T, Donovan RJ. Environmental and lifestyle factors associated with overweight and obesity in Perth, Australia. *Am J Health Promot* 2003;18(1):93–102. [PubMed: 13677967]
29. Robert SA. Neighborhood socioeconomic context and adult health. The mediating role of individual health behaviors and psychosocial factors. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1999;896:465–8. [PubMed: 10681952]
30. Robert SA, Reither EN. A multilevel analysis of race, community disadvantage, and body mass index among adults in the US. *Soc Sci Med* 2004;59(12):2421–34. [PubMed: 15474198]
31. Sundquist J, Malmstrom M, Johansson SE. Cardiovascular risk factors and the neighbourhood environment: a multilevel analysis. *Int J Epidemiol* 1999;28(5):841–5. [PubMed: 10597980]
32. van Lenthe FJ, Mackenbach JP. Neighbourhood deprivation and overweight: the GLOBE study. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 2002;26(2):234–40. [PubMed: 11850756]
33. Bjorntorp P. Do stress reactions cause abdominal obesity and comorbidities? *Obes Rev* 2001;2(2):73–86. [PubMed: 12119665]
34. Chrousos GP. The role of stress and the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal axis in the pathogenesis of the metabolic syndrome: neuro-endocrine- and target tissue-related causes. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 2000;24 (Suppl 2):S50–5. [PubMed: 10997609]
35. Drapeau V, Therrien F, Richard D, Tremblay A. Is visceral obesity a physiological adaptation to stress? *Panminerva Med* 2003;45(3):189–95. [PubMed: 14618117]
36. Epel ES, Blackburn EH, Lin J, Dhabhar FS, Adler NE, Morrow JD, et al. Accelerated telomere shortening in response to life stress. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2004;101(49):17312–5. [PubMed: 15574496]
37. Schwartz BS, Glass TA, Bolla KI, Stewart WF, Glass G, Rasmussen M, et al. Disparities in cognitive functioning by race/ethnicity in the Baltimore Memory Study. *Environ Health Perspect* 2004;112(4):314–320. [PubMed: 14998746]
38. Grieco, EM.; Cassidy, RC. Overview of race and Hispanic origin. *Census 2000 Brief*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census; 2001.
39. Dipietro L, Caspersen CJ, Ostfeld AM, Nadel ER. A survey for assessing physical activity among older adults. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1993;25(5):628–42. [PubMed: 8492692]
40. Young DR, Jee SH, Appel LJ. A comparison of the Yale Physical Activity Survey with other physical activity measures. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2001;33(6):955–61. [PubMed: 11404661]
41. Block G, Hartman AM, Naughton D. A reduced dietary questionnaire: development and validation. *Epidemiology* 1990;1(1):58–64. [PubMed: 2081241]
42. Wirfalt AK, Jeffery RW, Elmer PJ. Comparison of food frequency questionnaires: the reduced Block and Willett questionnaires differ in ranking on nutrient intakes. *Am J Epidemiol* 1998;148(12):1148–56. [PubMed: 9867258]
43. Townsend, P.; Phillimore, P.; Beattie, A. *Health and Deprivation: Inequality and the North*. London: Croom Helm; 1988.
44. Krieger N, Chen JT, Waterman PD, Soobader MJ, Subramanian SV, Carson R. Geocoding and monitoring of US socioeconomic inequalities in mortality and cancer incidence: does the choice of

- area-based measure and geographic level matter? : the Public Health Disparities Geocoding Project. *Am J Epidemiol* 2002;156(5):471–82. [PubMed: 12196317]
45. Krieger, N.; Zierler, S.; Hogan, JW.; Waterman, P.; Chen, J.; Lemieux, K., et al. Geocoding and measurement of neighborhood socioeconomic position: A U.S. perspective. In: Kawachi, I.; Berkman, LF., editors. *Neighborhoods and Health*. New York: Oxford University Press; 2003. p. 147-178.
 46. Taylor SE, Repetti RL, Seeman T. Health psychology: what is an unhealthy environment and how does it get under the skin? *Annual Review of Psychology* 1997;48:411–47.
 47. Ross CE, Mirowsky J. Neighborhood disadvantage, disorder, and health. *J Health Soc Behav* 2001;42(3):258–76. [PubMed: 11668773]
 48. Pinheiro JC, Bates DM. Approximations to the Log-likelihood function in the nonlinear mixed effects model. *J Computational Graphical Stat* 1995;4:12–35.
 49. Macintyre, S.; Ellaway, A. Neighborhoods and health: an overview. In: Kawachi, I.; Berkman, LF., editors. *Neighborhoods and Health*. New York: Oxford University Press; 2003. p. 20-42.
 50. Sampson RJ, Morenoff JD, Gannon Rowley T. Assessing "neighborhood effects": Social processes and new directions in research. *Annual Review of Sociology* 2002;28:443–478.
 51. Anonymous. From the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Neighborhood safety and the prevalence of physical inactivity--selected states, 1996. *Jama* 1999;281(15):1373. [PubMed: 10217042]
 52. Humpel N, Owen N, Leslie E. Environmental factors associated with adults' participation in physical activity: a review. *Am J Prev Med* 2002;22(3):188–99. [PubMed: 11897464]
 53. Saelens BE, Sallis JF, Black JB, Chen D. Neighborhood-based differences in physical activity: an environment scale evaluation. *Am J Public Health* 2003;93(9):1552–8. [PubMed: 12948979]
 54. Giles-Corti B, Donovan RJ. Socioeconomic status differences in recreational physical activity levels and real and perceived access to a supportive physical environment. *Prev Med* 2002;35(6):601–1. [PubMed: 12460528]
 55. Fisher KJ, Li F, Michael Y, Cleveland M. Neighborhood-level influences on physical activity among older adults: a multilevel analysis. *J Aging Phys Act* 2004;12(1):45–63. [PubMed: 15211020]
 56. Ross CE. Fear of victimization and health. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 1993;9:159–75.
 57. Drewnowski A, Specter SE. Poverty and obesity: the role of energy density and energy costs. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2004;79(1):6–16. [PubMed: 14684391]
 58. Epel E, Lapidus R, McEwen B, Brownell K. Stress may add bite to appetite in women: a laboratory study of stress-induced cortisol and eating behavior. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 2001;26(1):37–49. [PubMed: 11070333]
 59. Tataranni PA, Larson DE, Snitker S, Young JB, Flatt JP, Ravussin E. Effects of glucocorticoids on energy metabolism and food intake in humans. *Am J Physiol* 1996;271(2 Pt 1):E317–25. [PubMed: 8770026]
 60. Macintyre S, Maciver S, Sooman A. Area, class and health: Should we be focusing on places or people? *Journal of Social Policy* 1993;22(2):213–234.
 61. Kaufman JS, Cooper RS, McGee DL. Socioeconomic status and health in blacks and whites: the problem of residual confounding and the resiliency of race. *Epidemiology* 1997;8(6):621–8. [PubMed: 9345660]
 62. Zhang Q, Wang Y. Trends in the association between obesity and socioeconomic status in U.S. adults: 1971 to 2000. *Obes Res* 2004;12(10):1622–32. [PubMed: 15536226]
 63. Sundquist K, Winkleby M, Ahlen H, Johansson SE. Neighborhood socioeconomic environment and incidence of coronary heart disease: a follow-up study of 25,319 women and men in Sweden. *Am J Epidemiol* 2004;159(7):655–62. [PubMed: 15033643]
 64. Nordstrom CK, Diez Roux AV, Jackson SA, Gardin JM. The association of personal and neighborhood socioeconomic indicators with subclinical cardiovascular disease in an elderly cohort. The cardiovascular health study. *Social Science & Medicine* 2004;59(10):2139–2147. [PubMed: 15351479]
 65. Cohen DA, Farley TA, Mason K. Why is poverty unhealthy? Social and physical mediators. *Soc Sci Med* 2003;57(9):1631–41. [PubMed: 12948572]

66. Gittelsohn J, Merkle S, Story M, Stone EJ, Steckler A, Noel J, et al. School climate and implementation of the Pathways study. *Prev Med* 2003;37(6 Pt 2):S97–106. [PubMed: 14636814]

Table 1
Summary of selected study variables in the Baltimore Memory Study cohort by obesity status

	Full sample	Percent obese
Variable:	<i>n</i> (%)	(BMI > 29.9)
Entire BMS cohort ^{a*}	1119 (100)	421 (38%)
Age		
50 – 55	359 (32%)	42%
56 – 60	294 (26%)	42%
61 – 65	233 (21%)	42%
66 – 70	247 (22%)	45%
		<i>p</i> = 0.93 [†]
Gender		
Male	390 (34%)	34%
Female	743 (66%)	47%
		<i>p</i> < 0.0001
Race/ethnicity		
African-American	470 (41%)	53%
Other/multi R/E	55 (5%)	40%
White	608 (54%)	35%
		<i>p</i> < 0.0001
Years of education		
less than 12	164 (15%)	52%
12 yrs.	251 (22%)	53%
13–15 yrs	228 (20%)	48%
16 – 17.5 yrs.	215 (19%)	31%
> 17.5 yrs	274 (24%)	33%
		<i>p</i> < 0.0001
Household wealth (income and assets, log transformed)		
Low quartile	286 (25.1%)	45%
Mid-low quartile	283 (24.8%)	53%
Mid-high quartile	286 (25.1%)	45%
High quartile	285 (25.0%)	27%
		<i>p</i> < 0.0001
Currently smoking?		
Yes	241 (21%)	34%
No	892 (79%)	45%
		<i>p</i> < 0.0034
Alcoholic drinks/month		
None	465 (41%)	53%
1–10	334 (30%)	42%
10–40	206 (18%)	27%
>40	121 (11%)	33%
		<i>p</i> < 0.0001
Percent calories from fat		
lowest quartile	252 (25%)	35%
low-mod quartile	257 (25%)	43%
high-mod quartile	257 (25%)	45%
highest quartile	255 (25%)	48%
		<i>p</i> = 0.02
Total dietary intake in Kilocalories		
lowest quartile	252 (25%)	42%
low-mod quartile	256 (25%)	45%
high-mod quartile	256 (25%)	38%
highest quartile	257 (25%)	46%
		<i>p</i> = 0.21
Vigorous physical activity		
None	266 (26%)	50%
Moderate	392 (38%)	46%
High	368 (36%)	34%
		<i>p</i> < 0.0001
Leisure walking intensity		
None	257 (25%)	49%
Moderate	370 (36%)	42%
High	398 (39%)	39%
		<i>p</i> = 0.03

^aTotal sample size used in Table 1 excludes 10 subjects missing information on body mass index and 8 subjects missing information neighborhood data (total missing = 18).

* *p* values are for Chi-square tests of whether the groups within each cell are significantly different.

Table 2
Associations of the Neighborhood Multidimensional Hazards scale (in quartiles) with obesity and selected covariates

Variable	Lowest quartile	Low-moderate quartile	High-moderate quartile	High quartile	Test for differences across columns
All participants	% or mean (SD) 219 (19%)	% or mean (SD) 446 (39%)	% or mean (SD) 225 (20%)	% or mean (SD) 245 (22%)	
Obese (percent)	27.4	43.3	46.9	52.5	< 0.0001
Body mass index (mean)	27.5 (5.5)	30.0 (6.8)	30.0 (7.3)	31.2 (7.2)	< 0.0001
Age in years (mean)	59.3 (5.7)	59.1 (6.0)	59.6 (6.1)	59.6 (6.1)	< 0.0001
Female sex (percent)	62.6	67.5	61.8	68.6	0.259
Race/ethnicity					
% African-American	7.8	40.8	32.4	81.6	
% Other/multi R/E	2.7	3.1	7.1	6.9	
% White	89.5	56.1	60.4	11.4	
Years of education (mean)	17.1 (3.1)	15.0 (3.8)	13.7 (3.7)	12.8 (3.5)	< 0.0001
Household wealth (median income plus assets, in dollars)	426,300	149,000	84,285	58,200	< 0.0001
Percent currently smoking	11.9	19.3	25.8	29.0	< 0.0001
Drinks per month	22.4 (35)	12.5 (24)	16.1 (43)	9.5 (23)	< 0.0001
Calories from fat (percent)	37.4 (8.6)	36.9 (7.9)	36.0 (7.5)	37.8 (7.2)	< 0.0001
Total dietary intake (Kilocalories)	1723 (621)	1731 (914)	1885 (1022)	1940 (1177)	< 0.0001
Vigorous physical activity score	20.2 (15.9)	15.9 (16.1)	14.4 (16.4)	13.1 (16.4)	< 0.0001
Leisure walking intensity	14.3 (9.7)	11.8 (10.0)	13.1 (10.8)	13.1 (11.7)	< 0.0001

Table 3

Associations of individual and neighborhood level (bold) risk factors for obesity (BMI > 29.9) in 50–70 year old subjects in the Baltimore Memory Study using random-effects logistic regression

Parameter	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.
Individual intercept	0.26		0.57		0.85		0.26		0.34	
Age (in years)	0.99	0.18 – 0.36	0.99	0.27 – 1.19	0.92	0.40 – 1.84	0.95	0.09 – 0.76	0.91	0.11 – 1.06
Race/ethnicity AA ^d vs. white	1.61	0.81 – 1.22	1.39	0.80 – 1.22	1.36	0.74 – 1.15	1.56	0.75 – 1.20	1.50	0.72 – 1.16
		1.21 – 2.15		1.02 – 1.87		1.00 – 1.85		1.13 – 2.16		1.08 – 2.09
Other vs. white	0.92	0.51 – 1.67	0.86	0.47 – 1.57	0.98	0.53 – 1.80	1.28	0.66 – 2.47	1.27	0.65 – 2.46
Female sex	1.70	1.31 – 2.21	1.70	1.30 – 2.21	1.54	1.17 – 2.03	1.35	1.00 – 1.81	1.29	0.96 – 1.74
MNHI Low-mod vs. low ^b	1.70	1.18 – 2.46	1.58	1.07 – 2.31	1.60	1.09 – 2.36	1.60	1.07 – 2.41	1.52	1.01 – 2.30
High-mod vs. low	2.13	1.41 – 3.20	1.91	1.25 – 2.93	1.93	1.25 – 2.97	2.00	1.26 – 3.17	1.91	1.20 – 3.05
High vs. low	2.04	1.30 – 3.20	1.93	1.21 – 3.10	1.97	1.22 – 3.17	2.03	1.22 – 3.37	1.96	1.18 – 3.28
Respondent education	---	---	0.81	0.67 – 0.97	0.76	0.63 – 0.92	0.76	0.62 – 0.93	0.78	0.64 – 0.96
Household wealth (low quintile) ^c	---	---	0.79	0.55 – 1.13	0.86	0.59 – 1.24	0.82	0.55 – 1.22	0.80	0.53 – 1.20
(3rd quintile)	---	---	1.51	1.06 – 2.16	1.43	0.99 – 2.05	1.45	0.99 – 2.14	1.45	0.98 – 2.14
(4th quintile)	---	---	0.81	0.56 – 1.17	0.79	0.54 – 1.14	0.71	0.48 – 1.06	0.73	0.49 – 1.09
(5th quintile)	---	---	0.70	0.43 – 1.14	0.68	0.42 – 1.11	0.65	0.39 – 1.09	0.65	0.39 – 1.08
Current smoking (yes vs. no)	---	---	---	---	0.55	0.39 – 0.76	0.51	0.36 – 0.73	0.49	0.35 – 0.71
Alcoholic drinks per month	---	---	---	---	0.96	0.89 – 1.03	0.96	0.89 – 1.04	0.96	0.89 – 1.04
Percent of calories from fat	---	---	---	---	---	---	1.39	1.17 – 1.66	1.40	1.17 – 1.66
Total Kcal dietary intake	---	---	---	---	---	---	1.00	0.76 – 1.32	1.01	0.76 – 1.32
Vigorous PA - mod vs none	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.98	0.69 – 1.38
high vs. none	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.69	0.48 – 1.00
Liesure walking mod vs. none	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.87	0.61 – 1.24
high vs. none	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.80	0.56 – 1.14
–2 log likelihood	1477.3		1453.5		1430.2		1267.7		1258.5	
Change in model fit		23.8		23.3		162.5		9.2		

^a AA = African American

^b Mod = Moderate

^c The second quintile of household wealth was used as the reference group.

Table 4

Contrast of associations^a between the Multidimensional Neighborhood Hazard scale, the Townsend Index and the Index of Neighborhood Affluence with odds of obesity

	Neighborhood measure		
	Multidimensional neighborhood scale hazard Adjusted OR (95% CI)	Townsend index of socioeconomic deprivation Adjusted OR (95% confidence interval)	Index of neighborhood affluence Adjusted OR (95% confidence interval)
Lowest quartile	1.00	1.00	1.00
Low-moderate quartile	1.52 (1.01 – 2.30)	1.04 (0.70 – 1.55)	0.91 (0.60 – 1.38)
High-moderate quartile	1.91 (1.20 – 3.05)	1.53	0.83 (0.56 – 1.24)
Highest quartile	1.96 (1.18 – 3.28)	1.48	0.63 (0.39 – 1.02)
Test of linear trends	$p = 0.008$	$p = 0.015$	$p = 0.061$

^a All models were adjusted for the following covariates: age, race/ethnicity, sex, education, household wealth, smoking, alcohol consumption, dietary fat intake, total kilocalories of energy intake, vigorous physical activity, and frequency of walking, and nesting of persons within neighborhoods

^b The test for a linear trend is based on fitting a separate analysis using the same model and the same covariates, but replacing the separate quartile-specific effects with a single degree of freedom test with four levels of the neighborhood measure.

CI, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio

Appendix
Definition, Ranges and Central Tendency of Final Indicators in the Neighborhood Psychosocial Hazards scale (n =64)

Indicators	Range	Mean (SD)	Median	Source
Neighborhood Psychosocial Hazards scale (NPH) ^a	-19.0-19.2	0.1 (9.6)	-0.9	
Indicators of social disorganization				
Percent single parent families	12.1-85.4	47.6 (20.8)	45.4	2000 Census ^b
Percent of adults without a high school degree or equivalent	1.9-59.3	25.6 (15.0)	22.1	2000 Census
Percent of adults divorced, separated or widowed	13.2-77.0	25.6 (15)	43.3	2000 Census
Indicators of public safety				
Number of 911 calls per person per year (1998-2001, log transformed ^c)	0.1-6.8	1.6 (1.1)	1.4	Baltimore CitiStat
Violent crimes occurring in the neighborhood (log transformed ^c)	0-210	37.3 (47)	19.5	Baltimore Police Dept.
Indicators of physical disorder				
Percent vacant houses (log transformed ^c)	1.3-51.8	14.2 (10)	10.7	2000 Census
Number of complaints about street conditions	0-67	16.9 (13)	15.5	Dept. of Public Works
Number liquor stores or off-site liquor licenses	0-17	4.4 (4.9)	3.0	MD State liquor control board
Indicators of economic deprivation				
Per capita income (log transformed) ^{c/d}	7501-75155	20847 (13K)	17,532	2000 Census
Index of working class (z-score transformed)	-8.6-4.7	-1.8 (3.6)	-1.5	2000 Census
Percent of adults unemployed (log transformed ^c)	0-31.7	10.8 (8)	8.3	2000 Census
Percent of all families living in poverty	0-50	16.3 (14)	13.6	2000 Census

^aThe NPH was based on results of a factor analysis (not shown). The scale was created by adding z-transformed versions of each of the 12 indicators.

^bAll neighborhood indicators based on census data were derived by re-aggregating block-level census data to align with named city neighborhoods. This was done by the bureau of the Census by special request.

^cIndicators that are log transformed in the creation of the complete scale are shown in this table in their untransformed metric.

^dThis indicator was reverse coded in the creation of the NPH