

The Price of Violence

Long term effects of assault on labor force participation and health

Petra Ornstein, Uppsala university



Information on the impact of assault is useful for:

- Meeting the needs of assault victims
- Policy decisions through information on expected benefit of crime reduction strategies
- Sociological understanding of violence



UPPSALA Identification problem

Robust connection between assault and ill-health (in women), but what are the causal effects?

- Focus: Violence -> ill-health
 Lack of studies on causal link! (Ehrensaft et al, 2006; Kilpatrick et al., 1997; Lindhorst and Oxford, 2008; Stevenson & Wolfers, 2006)
- Reverse causation substance abuse -> violence exposure (Kilpatrick et al, 1997)
- Confounding Lack of resources -> stress -> ill health (Aizer, 2010) -> violence exposure



UPPSALA UNIVERSITET Identification strategy

- Large-scale and high-quality longitudinal data
- Follow individuals previous to assault
- Rich background information
- Propensity score matching

Improvements on previous studies

- Identification
- Including men
- Large sample (-> Heterogenous effects)
- Long term effects
- Objective measures



Setup

DATA

- Micro data from administrative registers
- LOUISE/LISA: Swedish population 16-64 years 1994-2008
- Cause of death Register
- National Inpatient Care Register

SELECTED SAMPLE

- Registered in Sweden at least two consecutive years in 1997-2002
- Not hospitalized because of assault previous to 1998
- Cases have been hospitalized with cause of injury "assault" in 1998-2002
- Matches are selected on information 1-4 years prior to the assault

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS



Pre-assault characteristics:

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

assaulted, a random sample non-assaulted

| Wom | nen | Men | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Unselected | Assaulted | Unselected | Assaulted | |
| sample | | sample | | |
| 37.7 (0.045) | 35.9*** | 37.4 (0.014) | 32.6*** (0.139) | |
| | (0.252) | | | |
| 12.4 (0.01) | 11.1*** | 12.09 (0.003) | 11.097*** | |
| | (0.052) | | (0.025) | |
| 42.9 (0.2) | 20.9*** (1.0) | 36.3 (0.1) | 10.9*** (0.4) | |
| 7.3 (0.1) | 13.9*** (0.9) | 7.4 (0.0) | 13.2*** (0.5) | |
| 15.3 (0.2) | 13.9 (0.9) | 13.1 (0.0) | 6.6*** (0.3) | |
| 10.8 (0.1) | 26.1*** (1.1) | 2.4 (0.0) | 4.2*** (0.3) | |
| 14.1 (0.19) | 33.6*** (1.75) | 8.0 (0.046) | 17.1*** (0.677) | |
| | | | | |
| 5.0 (0.1) | 16.5*** (0.9) | 3.4 (0.0) | 8.0*** (0.4) | |
| 27 (0.37) | 81.7*** (3.41) | 17.8 (0.095) | 40.0*** (1.339) | |
| | | | | |
| 55.8 (0.2) | 81.7*** (1.0) | 35.4 (0.1) | 58.6*** (0.7) | |
| 4.0(0.1) The Price of | 34.9*** (1.2) | 4.1 (0.0) | 22.5*** (0.6) | |
| | | | U U | |
| | WomUnselected sample $37.7 (0.045)$ $12.4 (0.01)$ $42.9 (0.2)$ $7.3 (0.1)$ $15.3 (0.2)$ $10.8 (0.1)$ $14.1 (0.19)$ $5.0 (0.1)$ $27 (0.37)$ $55.8 (0.2)$ $4.0 (0.1)$ The Price of | WomenUnselectedAssaultedsample $37.7 (0.045)$ 35.9^{***} (0.252) $37.7 (0.045)$ 35.9^{***} (0.252) $12.4 (0.01)$ 11.1^{***} (0.052) $42.9 (0.2)$ $20.9^{***} (1.0)$ $7.3 (0.1)$ $13.9^{***} (0.9)$ $15.3 (0.2)$ $13.9 (0.9)$ $10.8 (0.1)$ $26.1^{***} (1.1)$ $14.1 (0.19)$ $33.6^{***} (1.75)$ $5.0 (0.1)$ $16.5^{***} (0.9)$ $27 (0.37)$ $81.7^{***} (3.41)$ $55.8 (0.2)$ $81.7^{***} (1.0)$ $4.0 (0.1)$ The Price of Violence | WomenNUnselectedAssaultedUnselectedsamplesample $37.7 (0.045)$ 35.9^{***} $37.4 (0.014)$ (0.252) $12.4 (0.01)$ 11.1^{***} $12.09 (0.003)$ (0.052) $42.9 (0.2)$ $20.9^{***} (1.0)$ $36.3 (0.1)$ $7.3 (0.1)$ $13.9^{***} (0.9)$ $7.4 (0.0)$ $15.3 (0.2)$ $13.9 (0.9)$ $13.1 (0.0)$ $10.8 (0.1)$ $26.1^{***} (1.1)$ $2.4 (0.0)$ $14.1 (0.19)$ $33.6^{***} (1.75)$ $8.0 (0.046)$ $5.0 (0.1)$ $16.5^{***} (0.9)$ $81.7^{***} (3.41)$ $17.8 (0.095)$ $55.8 (0.2)$ $81.7^{***} (1.0)$ $35.4 (0.1)$ $4.0 (0.1)$ The Price of Violence | |



UPPSALA Missing Data

- D_i: Assault victimization
- Y_{i1}: Potential outcome for unit i after assault
- Y_{i0}: Potential outcome for unit i, not assaulted

For individual i=1,...,N we observe $Y_i = Y_{i1} D_i + (1 - D_i) Y_{i0}$

-> Never both potential outcomes!



EVALUATION PROBLEM

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET Identifying Assumption 1: SUTVA

Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption:

 $\{Y_{i1}, Y_{i0}\}$ are functions of D_i and the individual only.

(Unobservable) effect of assault for individual *i*: $\Delta_i = Y_{i1} - Y_{i0}$

Average effect of assault on the assaulted = ATT = $E(\Delta|D=1) = E(Y_1|D=1) - E(Y_0|D=1)$



UPPSALA Identifying Assumption 2: CIA

Weak Unconfoudedness:

Y₀ is independent of D conditional on X

Propensity score: p(X) = P(D=1|X)Enough: Y_0 indep of D | p(X) (Rosenbaum & Rubin, 1983)

 $\begin{aligned} \mathsf{ATT}(\mathsf{p}(\mathsf{X})) &= \mathsf{E}(\mathsf{Y}_1 | \mathsf{D} = 1, \mathsf{p}(\mathsf{X})) - \mathsf{E}(\mathsf{Y}_0 | \mathsf{D} = 1, \mathsf{p}(\mathsf{X})) \\ &= \mathsf{E}(\mathsf{Y}_1 | \mathsf{D} = 1, \mathsf{p}(\mathsf{X})) - \mathsf{E}(\mathsf{Y}_0 | \mathsf{D} = 0, \mathsf{p}(\mathsf{X})) \end{aligned}$

EVALUATION PROBLEM



UNIVERSITET Identifying Assumption 3: Overlap

For all assaulted, there are non-assaulted with the same characteristics as those of the assaulted:

P(D=1|X)<1; X

ATT=E(ATT(p(X)))



UPPSALA UNIVERSITET Matching: Basic Idea

Match assaulted to non-assaulted with similar characteristics (here: close values on p(X)) {k(1,i),..., k(M,i)} the M nearest matches for *i* Define:

$$\tilde{Y}_{i1} = Y_{i1} | D = 1$$

 $\tilde{Y}_{i0} = Y_{k(j,i)} / M | D = 0; j = 1,..., M$

Estimator: $ATT_M = (\tilde{Y}_{i1} - \tilde{Y}_{i0})/N; \quad 1, ..., N$



UPPSALA UNIVERSITET Matching In Practice

Risk set matching: $p(X_t)$ (Li et. al., 2001)

- No future information, controls may become assaulted
- ATT now instead of possibly later: lower bound on ATT
- Parametric estimation: $logit(p(X_{it})) = \beta X_{it}$

Separate estimations based on sex & employment

X_t = {age t, years of schooling t, employment, disposable income t, days on sickness benefits and disability benefits t, hospital visits t, hospitalization for mental problem t, marital/cohabiting status t, recent separation from partner t, number of children, age of children, and custody}

Nearest neighbor with replacement, 5 matches

MATCHING



Estimated propensity score:

Bias of order $O_p(N^{-1/\dim(X)})$ Bias correction -> Reduces bias to $O_p(N^{-1/2})$ Match values: $\tilde{Y}_{i0} = {}_j Y_{k(j,i)}/M|D=0; j=1,...,M$ Regression estimate: $\mu_0(X)=E(\tilde{Y}_0|X)$ (matches) Bias corrected match value:

$$Y_bias_{k(j,i)} = Y_{k(j,i)} + \mu_0(X_i) - \mu_0(X_{k(j,i)})$$
(Abadie & Imbens, 2012)



UPPSALA Inference: V(ATT_M)

Define:

$$K_M(i)$$
= #copies of match i /M
 $K'_M(i)$ = #copies of match i /M²

$$V(ATT_{M}) = {}_{i}[D_{i}(Y_{i1} - Y_{i0} - ATT)^{2} + (1-D_{i})\sigma^{2}(K_{M}(i)^{2} - K_{M}(i))^{2}]$$

$$\sigma^{2} = V(ATT)$$

(Abadie et. al, 2004; Abadie & Imbens, 2006)



UPPSALA Assessing Assumptions

1) Overlap

- 2) Unconfoundedness
 - Check match quality
 - Selection on observables only: Plausible?
 - Sensitivity analysis







Right tail of propensity score distribution for assault in1998, women not working 1997.

MATCHING



UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Match Quality

| | Wo | men | Men | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| | Matched | Assaulted | Matched | Assaulted | |
| | controls | | controls | | |
| Age | 36.1 (0.25) | 35.9 (0.25) | 32.5 (0.14) | 32.6 (0.14) | |
| Years of schooling | 11.1 (0.052) | 11.1 (0.053) | 11.1 (0.025) | 11.1 (0.025) | |
| Married (%) | 21.6 (1.1) | 21.1 (1.0) | 10.8 (0.4) | 10.9 (0.4) | |
| Newly separated (%) | 12.2 (0.8) | 14.0 (0.9) | 13.0 (0.5) | 13.2 (0.5) | |
| Child <4 | 15.2 (0.9) | 13.8 (0.9) | 6.9 (0.4) | 6.6 (0.3) | |
| Single parent | 26.1 (1.1) | 25.9 (1.1) | 4.2 (0.3) | 4.2 (0.3) | |
| Sick leave (mean, year 1-4) | 31.4 (1.71) | 33.6 (1.77) | 16.0 (0.65) | 17.1 (0.68) | |
| Any DI (last 4 years, %) | 16.6 (1.0) | 16.5 (0.9) | 8.2 (0.4) | 8.0 (0.4) | |
| Sick leave or DI (year 1-4) | 79.4 (3.34) | 79.8 (3.29) | 40.4 (1.37) | 39.9 (1.33) | |
| In-care patient (%) | 81.2 (1.0) | 81.6 (1.0) | 60.0 (0.7) | 58.6 (0.7) | |
| Mental problem diagnose | 32.9 (1.2) | 34.5 (1.2) | 21.1 (0.6) | 22.5* (0.6) | |
| (%) | | | | | |
| Working (%) | 38.5 (1.2) | 38.3 (1.2) | 51.0 (0.7) | 50.8 (0.7) | |
| Real income + transactions ($m^{*}e^{n}p \in Q_{1}Q_{1}^{*}S_{H} \otimes 0.05$, * p<0.1 | 109,000 (4,579) | 106,000 (1,285) | 90,000 (752) | 91,000 (977) | |
| Risk occupation (%) | 21.1 (1.0) The Pr | ice of Violence 22.4 (1.1) | 5.3 (0.3) | 5.1 (0.3) 17 | |
| i | | 1 5 7 / | 25.000 | 5 205 | |

RESULTS

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Probability of not working: Women





Probability of not working: Men

RESULTS







Direct effects of physical injury







Direct effects of physical injury







UNIVERSITET

Heterogeneity







UPPSALA Heterogeneity



GRAPHICAL EVIDENCE



UNIVERSITET Days on sickness insurance, women



GRAPHICAL EVIDENCE



Days on sickness insurance, men





Summing up...

- Large selection and large causal effect of violence on both employment and sickness insurance uptake
- Physical injuries explain majority of effect in men, have little explanatory power in women
- Larger impact on sick leave for employed than unemployed
- Larger impact for women than for men but *large* effects for men as well
- Effects remain over time





Short-term effects of assault on employment probability

| | Wo | men | Men | | |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|
| Unemployed: | | | | | |
| Assault | -0.077*** | -0.071*** | -0.060*** | -0.059*** | |
| | (0.014) | (0.013) | (0.010) | (0.009) | |
| # observations | 1888 | 1871 | 5090 | 5048 | |
| Employed: | | | | | |
| Assault | -0.107*** | -0.104*** | -0.074*** | -0.070*** | |
| | (0.020) | (0.019) | (0.008) | (0.008) | |
| # observations | 1176 | 1176 | 5272 | 5263 | |
| Assault year | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| Bias correction | | Yes | | Yes | |

Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

| UPPSALA UNIVERSITET | Lor F | ng terr probat | n impa pility of | act of a f empl | ا assau oyme | ESTIMAT It on nt | ION RES | ULTS |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---|----------------------|------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Years after assault: | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Unemployed | | | | | | | | |
| women | | | | | | | | |
| Assault | -0.071*** | -0.074*** | -0.081*** | -0.087*** | -0.112*** | -0.094*** | -0.082*** | -0.101*** |
| | (0.013) | (0.014) | (0.014) | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.016) | (0.016) | (0.016) |
| # obs | 1871 | 1859 | 1839 | 1817 | 1797 | 1753 | 1718 | 1694 |
| Employed women | | | | | | | | |
| Assault | -0.104*** | -0.119*** | -0.125*** | -0.109*** | -0.088*** | -0.101*** | -0.124*** | -0.117*** |
| | (0.019) | (0.020) | (0.021) | (0.021) | (0.021) | (0.021) | (0.021) | (0.021) |
| # obs | 1176 | 1178 | 1170 | 1160 | 1158 | 1148 | 1134 | 1132 |
| Unemployed men | | | | | | | | |
| Assault | -0.059*** | -0.056*** | -0.055*** | -0.066*** | -0.081*** | -0.096*** | -0.080*** | -0.072*** |
| | (0.009) | (0.009) | (0.010) | (0.010) | (0.010) | (0.010) | (0.010) | (0.010) |
| # obs | 5048 | 4994 | 4914 | 4841 | 4780 | 4635 | 4545 | 4481 |
| Employed men | | | | | | | | |
| assault | -0.070*** | -0.064*** | -0.059*** | -0.061*** | -0.068*** | -0.077*** | -0.074*** | -0.069*** |
| | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.009) | (0.009) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) |
| # obs | 5263 ^{Stan} | dard zerger s in | n par enthe ses. | *************************************** | ** B 12.95, * | p<3083 | 5053 | 5033 |





Short-term effects of assault on days on sickness insurance (Absolute numbers).

| | Wor | men | Men | | |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|
| Unemployed: | | | | | |
| Assault | 8.921** | 7.562** | 5.105 | 8.386*** | |
| | (3.742) | (3.702) | (3.472) | (2.114) | |
| # observations | 1888 | 1871 | 5090 | 5048 | |
| Employed: | | | | | |
| Assault | 43.986*** | 43.961*** | 19.435*** | 19.373*** | |
| | (5.687) | (5.782) | (1.945) | (1.923) | |
| # observations | 1176 | 1176 | 5272 | 5263 | |
| Assault year | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| Bias correction | | Yes | | Yes | |

Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

ESTIMATION RESULTS



UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Long term impact of assault on sickness insurance uptake

| Years since assault | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|------------------|-----------|--|--|
| Unemployed women | | | | | | | |
| Assault | 7.562** | 11.351*** | 14.278*** | 15.893*** | 19.100*** | | |
| | (3.702) | (4.288) | (4.676) | (4.826) | (5.073) | | |
| # obs | 1871 | 1859 | 1839 | 1817 | 1797 | | |
| Employed women | | | | | | | |
| Assault | 43.961*** | 40.453*** | 32.670*** | 31.230*** | 30.058*** | | |
| | (5.782) | (6.154) | (6.139) | (6.191) | (6.361) | | |
| # obs | 1176 | 1178 | 1170 | 1160 | 1158 | | |
| Unemployed men | | | | | | | |
| Assault | 8.094*** | 4.573** | 5.373** | 5.573** | 5.699** | | |
| | (1.999) | (2.255) | (2.486) | (2.691) | (2.792) | | |
| # obs | 5048 | 4994 | 4914 | 4841 | 4780 | | |
| Employed men | | | | | | | |
| Assault | 19.373*** | 13.522*** | 11.612*** | 12.368*** | 12.005*** | | |
| | (1.923) | (1.963) | (2.072) | (2.163) | (2.202) | | |
| # obs | 5263 | 5239 | $01 ** 5207_{5} * n$ | <u>≤0 1</u> 5171 | 5127 | | |
| The Price of Violence | | | | | | | |



UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Match Quality: Women

| X in t-1 | Unemployed/ Absent | | | | Employed | |
|------------------------|--------------------|----------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------|
| | Unselected | controls | assaulted | Unselected | controls | assaulted |
| age | 43.19*** | 35.27 | 35.70 | 42.79*** | 36.69 | 36.26 |
| years of schooling | 11.44*** | 10.67 | 10.71 | 12.48*** | 11.78 | 11.71 |
| married | 0.41*** | 0.19 | 0.18 | 0.51*** | 0.27 | 0.26 |
| not cohabiting | 0.46*** | 0.74 | 0.76 | 0.38*** | 0.66 | 0.68 |
| newly separated | 0.09*** | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.05*** | 0.15 | 0.14 |
| single parent | 0.10*** | 0.27 | 0.26 | 0.08*** | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| no. of children | 0.42*** | 0.52 | 0.50 | 0.46 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| risk occupation | 0.14*** | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.43 | 0.41 | 0.43 |
| Sickleave (4 years) | 22.17*** | 31.01 | 34.18 | 12.86*** | 32.75 | 33.01 |
| DI (4 years) | 78.81 | 77.43 | 73.29 | 5.27 | 5.28 | 7.10 |
| Sick/DI (last 4 years) | 97.78 | 106.92 | 105.72 | 17.60*** | 37.03 | 38.17 |
| in-care patient | 1.00*** | 0.87 | 0.85 | 1.00*** | 0.75 | 0.76 |
| psychiatric problem | 0.08*** | 0.42 | 0.43 | 0.02*** | 0.19 | 0.21 |
| real income (4 years) | 893.25 | 956.08 | 951.15 | 1313.94*** | 1230.40 | 1238.30 |

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

MATCHING



UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Match Quality: Men

| X in t-1 | Unemployed/ Absent | | | | Employed | |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------|-----------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| | Unselected | controls | assaulted | Unselected | controls | assaulted |
| age | 42.72*** | 33.78* | 33.23 | 42.39*** | 32.27 | 32.01 |
| years of schooling | 11.39*** | 10.81 | 10.80 | 12.14*** | 11.39 | 11.38 |
| married | 0.32*** | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.47*** | 0.15 | 0.14 |
| not cohabiting | 0.53*** | 0.76 | 0.78 | 0.39*** | 0.68 | 0.68 |
| newly separated | 0.08*** | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.06*** | 0.14 | 0.13 |
| single parent | 0.02*** | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.02*** | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| no. of children | 0.19*** | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.45*** | 0.29 | 0.27 |
| risk occupation | 0.04 | 0.04* | 0.03 | 0.08*** | 0.07 | 0.08 |
| Sickleave (4 years) | 19.23*** | 22.25 | 23.85 | 6.68*** | 10.36 | 10.77 |
| DI (4 years) | 70.60*** | 49.91 | 44.69 | 2.27 | 2.05 | 1.76 |
| Sick/DI (last 4 | 87.97*** | 71.66 | 68.22 | 8.80*** | 12.33 | 12.46 |
| years) | | | | | | |
| in-care patient | 1.0*** | 0.68 | 0.67 | 1.00*** | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| psychiatric problem | 0.11*** | 0.32* | 0.34 | 0.02*** | 0.11 | 0.12 |
| realpineome*(4<0.05, * | p 99.1 .90*** | 713.07 | 706.90 | 1650.36*** | 1127.88 | 1113.69 |
| years) | | The Pr | ice of Violence | | | 32 |



UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

•••

Excerpt from p(X_t)-estimation

| Outcome: Assault in t | | | (log odds) | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|
| WOMEN | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| #children | -0.197 | -0.855 | 0.523 | 0.013 | -0.072 |
| #children ² | -0.090 | 0.165*** | 0.125*** | 0.005 | 0.080 |
| Age* #children | 0.004 | 0.011 | -0.029 | -0.004 | -0.008 |
| single any last 4 years | 1.071*** | 0.443* | 1.041*** | 0.939*** | 0.943*** |
| newly separated | 0.539* | -0.024 | 0.081 | -0.061 | 0.324 |
| single parent | 0.648** | 0.840*** | 0.376 | 0.098 | 0.365 |
| years of schooling | 1.118* | -0.567 | 0.615 | -0.367 | -0.632** |
| (years of schooling) ² | -0.054* | 0.018 | -0.034 | 0.010 | 0.018 |
| Mental problem, since 87 | 0.942** | 1.485*** | 0.964*** | 1.070*** | 1.267*** |
| Mental problem in t-1 | 0.761 | 0.662 | 0.403 | 1.236** | 0.352 |
| Mental problem in t-2 | -1.227 | 0.763 | 0.926 | 0.153 | 0.402 |
| Mental problem in t-3 | 0.595 | -0.237 | 0.780 | 1.273* | 1.104** |
| Mental problem in t-4 | -1.236 | -0.098 | 1.351** | 1.021** | 0.472 |
| No. of hospitalizations, last | 0.050 | 0.160** | 0.125** | 0.108** | 0.109*** |
| 4 | | | | | |
| Any hospital care, last 4 | -0.345 | 0.440 | 0.525 | 0.698* | 0.433 |
| Any hospital care, since 87 | -0.106 | -0.703** | -0.596* | -0.863*** | -1.077*** |
| Any hospital care in t-1 | -0.257 | -0.537 | 0.008 | -0.827** | 0.242 |
| Any hospital care t-2 | -0.249 | -0.346 | -0.986*** | -1.068*** | -1.227*** |
| Any hospital care t-3 | -0.899** | -1 Th42 4766 o | f VidleAce*** | -1.794*** | -1.000*** |

33