

# Association between relative income and mental health in adults during the COVID-19 pandemic in Korea: Insights from a community health survey

Short title: Relative Income and Mental Health during COVID-19

Min Hui Moon<sup>1,2</sup>, Min Hyeok Choi<sup>1,2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Preventive and Occupational & Environmental Medicine, Medical College, Pusan National University, Yangsan, Republic of Korea

<sup>2</sup>Office of Public Healthcare Service, Pusan National University Yangsan Hospital, Yangsan, Republic of Korea

\*Corresponding author

E-mail: come2mh@gmail.com (MHC)

**NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Conceptualization: Min Hyeok Choi.

Data curation: Min Hui Moon.

Formal analysis: Min Hui Moon.

Investigation: Min Hui Moon, Min Hyeok Choi.

Methodology: Min Hui Moon, Min Hyeok Choi.

Supervision: Min Hyeok Choi.

Validation: Min Hui Moon, Min Hyeok Choi.

Writing – original draft: Min Hui Moon, Min Hyeok Choi.

## Abstract

People of lower socioeconomic status are much more likely to be vulnerable to COVID-19. This study aimed to compare the associations between mental health according to relative national and community income levels during the COVID-19 pandemic. Mental health inequalities according to income level during the COVID-19 pandemic were assessed using the Korea Community Health Survey before (2019) and after the COVID-19 pandemic (2021). Univariate analyses were used to calculate the perceived stress and depression rates according to the risk factor categories. A multivariate logistic regression analysis was performed to identify the association between two types of income levels (Korean or community) and perceived stress and depression. In addition, we investigated the effect of relative income levels by subgroup (gender and region) on perceived stress and the experience of depression. During COVID-19, although depression crude rates increased (from 6.24% to 7.2%), perceived stress crude rates remained similar. In addition, as for mental health inequality according to community income level, even after adjusting for each independent variable, perceived stress [Odds Ratio (OR): 1.31, 95% Confidence Interval (CI): 1.31–1.32] and experience of depression (OR: 1.63, 95% CI: 1.62–1.63) increased as the income level

decreased. The effect of relative income level on perceived stress rate was found to be more pronounced in urban areas than in rural areas in terms of community income levels. Contrarily, the effect of relative income level on the depression rate was found to be weaker. Our findings demonstrated that mental health inequalities based on income level were more likely to occur during the COVID-19 pandemic and that disparities in community income levels may better reflect mental health inequalities.

## Introduction

The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic has significantly impacted mental health worldwide, including stress, anxiety, and depression worldwide [1,2]. According to a 2021 OECD report (Hewlett, E. et al.), the prevalence of depression in OECD countries has approximately doubled since the COVID-19 pandemic, with the prevalence being the highest in Korea at 36.8% among OECD countries [3]. During the COVID-19 pandemic, social distancing and containment measures had a direct impact on mental health [4-6]. Several previous studies have reported that large-scale infectious diseases can cause emotional confusion and difficulties such as depression and anxiety [7-12]. Cao et al. [7] and Shevlin et al. [11] explored the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and social isolation on mental health, and Lee et al. [9] investigated factors related to fear of the COVID-19 infection and its psychological and social impact. Furthermore, studies have shown that social isolation due to COVID-19 and fear and awareness of the infection increases symptoms of depression and anxiety [4].

Mental health related to stress and depression is affected by socioeconomic risk factors such as education level, occupation, and income level. According to Patel et al.'s [13] study on the effect of income level on mental health inequality among representative socioeconomic factors, 33 surveys conducted in 20 countries reported that the lower the

income level, the higher the risk of depression. Hong et al. [14] found that inequality based on income level is more pronounced in mental health than in physical health, doubling the size of inequality over 10 years. Several other studies have consistently shown that people with lower socioeconomic status are more vulnerable to mental health problems [13-18]. Several studies have identified mental health inequality according to income level at the national level. Meanwhile, Song A and Kim W [15] studied income inequality at the national as well as community levels. As income inequality at the community level has a significant impact on social capital and access to healthcare infrastructure, measuring health gaps is more useful than income inequality at the national level [15,16].

The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated health inequalities among populations with low socioeconomic status. For example, the lower the education level, income level, or unstable employment status, the higher the risk of COVID-19 infection, and the higher the critical severity and mortality rate [19-25]. Hall et al. [19] examined the impact of income inequality on daily life and mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic. The results showed that the low-income population had difficulty purchasing food and daily necessities, and their health status deteriorated because of a lack of time and resources for proper healthcare. Owing to this influence, the low-income group showed unstable mental health conditions, such as stress and depression, compared to the high-income group.

Previous studies have confirmed that a) mental health issues, such as stress and depression, deteriorated due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and b) there were differences in mental health according to income level [13-15]. These studies were often limited to income inequality at the national level; few studies have analyzed the relationship between income inequality and mental health at the community level, which can reflect the accessibility of healthcare infrastructure in the region.

This study aimed to identify changes in mental health according to income level

before (2019) and after (2021) the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, it was conducted to provide a policy basis for improving mental health inequality by comparing the patterns of health inequality according to income at the national and community levels.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to:

- 1) Identify and compare levels of perceived stress and depression according to income level during the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 2) During the COVID-19 pandemic, we analyzed the relationship between perceived stress and the experience of depression on mental health according to the relative income levels of the total (Korean income level) and local (community income level) population.
- 3) Investigate the effect of relative income levels by subgroup (gender and region) on perceived stress and experiences of depression.

## Materials and methods

### Data and study population

Data were obtained from the Korea Community Health Survey (KCHS). Since 2008, the Community Health Survey (CHS) has been conducted annually by the Korea Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The CHS is a large-scale survey in which about 220,000 people nationwide participate from August to October every year and includes questions on chronic disease screening, health behavior, food intake, and socioeconomic status. Survey data were used as official national indicators such as health level, health behavior, food and nutrition intake, and chronic disease prevalence in Korea (Korea Community Health Survey Guidelines, website: <http://chs.kdca.go.kr/>). This survey was conducted in the form of a 1:1 interview with a surveyor visiting households of adults aged 19 or older residing in 255 cities,

counties, and districts in Korea. Research participants were selected through probability proportional sampling and systematic sampling every year. This study selected 449,234 people, excluding those who did not respond, as the final study participants out of 458,341 people who participated in community health surveys in 2019 and 2021.

## Variables

### Dependent variables

The dependent variables included perceived stress and depression. Perceived stress and depression are representative indicators of mental health, and stress plays an important role in predicting depression [26-28]. Several studies have demonstrated that exposure to perceived stress and experiences of depression are associated with poor health outcomes and affect socioeconomic imbalance [29-31]. Low socioeconomic status is associated with a high prevalence of stress and depression; mental health in low-income groups is particularly aggravated by persistent poverty and income inequality [32-34]. Perceived stress was assessed using the question, “How stressful do you feel in your daily life?” with response options of “feel very much,” “feel a lot,” “feel a little bit,” and “hardly feel it.” For the analysis, those who responded “I feel it very much” and “I feel it a lot” were classified as those who usually feel stress in my daily life, and those who answered “I feel it a little” and “I hardly feel it” was classified as a person who doesn't. The experience of depression was surveyed using the following question: “Did you feel sadness or despair enough to bother you in your daily life for more than 2 weeks in the last year?” Their answer was recorded as “yes” or “no.” In this study, a participant was defined as one who answered “yes.”

### Independent variables

The health inequality variable, considered a major factor in this study, was income

level. The income level is an indicator of socioeconomic status that can be used to directly measure the material resources available to individuals. It is a representative indicator of socioeconomic inequality and is widely used because it implies that income inequality affects health outcomes. Income level is closely related to health; the lower the income level, the higher the rate of unhealthy states [35,36]. The income level used in this study was the equalized income calculated by dividing household income by the square root of the household members. The Korean income level reconstructs the average income level of the entire population into the third quintile, and the community income level is set by dividing it into third quintiles based on the average income level of 255 cities, counties, and districts.

The general factors associated with perceived stress and experience of depression were included as independent variables after reviewing studies that previously reported mental health risk factors [37-39]. Demographic variables included gender (men or women), age group (19–29, 30–64, or  $\geq 65$ ), and area of residence (urban or rural). Social-economic parameters included education level ( $\leq$ middle school,  $\leq$ high school, or college or above), job status (economic activity or non-economic activity), marital status (married or not married) and the basic livelihood condition. Health behavior factors included current smoking (yes or no), high-risk drinking (men: drinking seven standard drinks or more over once a week, women: drinking five standard drinks or more over once a week), and walking practice (walking activity for  $\geq 30$  min,  $\geq$  five days in the previous week).

## Statistical analysis

Perceived stress and depression rates were calculated by performing univariate analysis according to the dependent variables. Statistically significant differences in perceived stress and experiences of depression were verified by performing the Rao-Scott chi-square test. The association between two types of income levels (Korean and community income

levels) and mental health (perceived stress and experience of depression) was analyzed by performing a complex-sample multivariate logistic regression analysis to adjust for other variables. Subgroup analysis was performed based on two types of income levels (Korean and community income levels), gender, and area of residence. Statistical significance was set at a p-value of <0.05. All statistical analyses were performed using SAS 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA).

## Ethical considerations

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Pusan National University Hospital (IRB No. 04-2022-030). All the participants provided written informed consent for the KCHS. The survey was conducted after sufficiently explaining to the participants that the results would be used for statistical purposes only and that confidentiality was guaranteed. The need for informed consent was waived by the IRB because the data were analyzed anonymously.

## Results

Table 1 shows the general characteristics of the study population. The total number of participants was 449,234, and the number of weighted analysis participants was 84,491,967 (41,590,294 in 2019 and 42,901,673 in 2021). The proportions of men and women were similar (49.66% in 2019 and 49.62% in 2021), and those aged 30–64 years were the most common subgroup population (63.73% in 2019 and 62.75% in 2021). Regarding population distribution by Korean income levels, Q1 (high) had the highest, followed by Q2 and Q3. The same was found for community income levels. The perceived stress rates were 24.78% in 2019 and 2021. The experience of depression rates are 6.25% and 7.2% in 2019 and 2021,

respectively.

**Table 1. General characteristics of the study population.**

		2019			2021		
		N	Weight N	Weight %	N	Weight N	Weight %
<b>Total</b>		223,288	41,590,294	100.00	225,946	42,901,673	100.00
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Men</b>	100,076	20,653,435	49.66	103,022	21,287,731	49.62
	<b>Women</b>	123,212	20,936,859	50.34	122,924	21,613,942	50.38
<b>Age group</b>	<b>19–29</b>	22,727	7,169,375	17.24	24,313	7,128,368	16.62
	<b>30–64</b>	127,860	26,506,490	63.73	128,100	26,921,724	62.75
	<b>≥65</b>	72,701	7,914,429	19.03	73,533	8,851,581	20.63
<b>Area of residence</b>	<b>Urban</b>	124,739	33,750,880	81.15	127,315	34,870,498	81.28
	<b>Rural</b>	98,549	7,839,414	18.85	98,631	8,031,175	18.72
<b>Education</b>	<b>Middle school</b>	79,077	8,303,254	19.96	72,123	7,962,562	18.56
	<b>High school</b>	63,962	12,329,258	29.64	65,490	12,488,195	29.11
	<b>College and above</b>	80,249	20,957,782	50.39	88,333	22,450,916	52.33
<b>Job status</b>	<b>Economically active</b>	138,739	26,473,047	63.65	141,544	27,324,490	63.69
	<b>Non-active</b>	84,549	15,117,247	36.35	84,402	15,577,183	36.31
<b>Marital status</b>	<b>Married</b>	148,579	26,627,752	64.02	142,120	26,190,336	61.05
	<b>Not married</b>	74,709	14,962,542	35.98	83,826	16,711,337	38.95
<b>Korea income level<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Q1 (high)</b>	75,415	18,462,860	44.39	80,798	19,667,569	45.84
	<b>Q2 (middle)</b>	74,948	14,451,252	34.75	70,232	13,493,676	31.45
	<b>Q3 (low)</b>	72,925	8,676,182	20.86	74,916	9,740,428	22.70
<b>Community income level<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Q1 (high)</b>	76,829	15,797,359	37.98	77,732	16,008,586	37.31
	<b>Q2 (middle)</b>	71,527	13,580,193	32.65	72,386	13,889,434	32.38
	<b>Q3 (low)</b>	74,932	12,212,742	29.36	75,828	13,003,653	30.31
<b>Basic livelihood condition</b>	<b>Yes</b>	8,837	1,312,334	3.16	10,692	1,694,212	3.95
	<b>No</b>	214,451	40,277,960	96.84	215,254	41,207,461	96.05
<b>Smoking status</b>	<b>Yes</b>	186,250	33,694,788	81.02	189,588	35,342,643	82.38
	<b>No</b>	37,038	7,895,506	18.98	36,358	7,559,030	17.62
<b>High-risk drinking<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Yes</b>	198,249	36,136,004	86.89	205,720	38,690,084	90.18
	<b>No</b>	25,039	5,454,290	13.11	20,226	4,211,589	9.82
<b>Physical activity<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>Yes</b>	89,671	18,967,814	45.61	93,778	19,377,491	45.17
	<b>No</b>	133,617	22,622,480	54.39	132,168	23,524,182	54.83
<b>Perceived stress</b>	<b>Yes</b>	49,319	10,305,831	24.78	50,169	10,630,372	24.78
	<b>No</b>	173,969	31,284,463	75.22	175,777	32,271,301	75.22
<b>Experience of depression</b>	<b>Yes</b>	13,731	2,598,126	6.25	16,129	3,088,224	7.20
	<b>No</b>	209,557	38,992,168	93.75	209,817	39,813,449	92.80

<sup>a</sup>Categorized using equivalent income; Q1: high-income level; Q2: middle-income level; Q3:

low-income level

<sup>b</sup>Drinking alcohol: men who drank seven standard drinks or more once a week; women who drank five standard drinks or more once a week

<sup>c</sup>Walking activity  $\geq 30$  minutes,  $\geq$  five days in the last week.

Table 2 shows perceived stress and experiences of depression according to the factors identified in 2019 and 2021. Perceived stress is significantly higher in women than in men in both 2019 and 2021 ( $p < 0.0001$ ). It was most common in the 30–64 subgroup population, followed by those aged 19–29 and  $\geq 65$  years. Perceived stress according to the Korean income level was significantly higher as the relative income level increased, and the community income level was also confirmed by the same result. The number of people living in urban areas was higher than in rural areas. Economic activity was significantly higher than in the non-economic activity group ( $p < 0.0001$ ). Depression was significantly higher in women than in men in both 2019 and 2021 and occurred most commonly in the  $\geq 65$  years age group. In 2019 and 2021, the experience of depression rates of lowest Korean income group (Q3) is significantly higher. Community income levels showed the same results ( $p < 0.0001$ ).

**Table 2. Perceived stress and experience of depression according to factors during the COVID-19 pandemic.**

		Perceived stress				Experience of depression			
		2019		2021		2019		2021	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender	Men	20,789	20.77	21,384	20.76	4,350	4.35	5,315	5.16
	Women	28,530	23.16	28,785	23.42	9,381	7.61	10,814	8.80
	<i>p-value</i> <sup>a</sup>	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	
Age group	19–29	6,164	27.12	6,377	26.23	1,212	5.33	1,479	6.08
	30–64	31,118	24.34	32,499	25.37	7,385	5.78	8,845	6.90
	$\geq 65$	12,037	16.56	11,293	15.36	5,134	7.06	5,805	7.89
	<i>p-value</i>	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	

Area of residence	Urban	29,908	23.98	30,809	24.20	8,002	6.41	9,513	7.47
	Rural	19,411	19.70	19,360	19.63	5,729	5.81	6,616	6.71
	<i>p</i> -value	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	
Education	Middle school	14,977	18.94	12,720	17.64	6,071	7.68	6,431	8.92
	High school	14,005	21.90	14,807	22.61	3,859	6.03	4,613	7.04
	College and above	20,337	25.34	22,642	25.63	3,801	4.74	5,085	5.76
	<i>p</i> -value	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	
Job status	Economically active	32,579	23.48	33,707	23.81	6,539	4.71	8,034	5.68
	Non-active	16,740	19.80	16,462	19.50	7,192	8.51	8,095	9.59
	<i>p</i> -value	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	
Marital status	Married	31,855	21.44	30,680	21.59	7,679	5.17	8,507	5.99
	Not married	17,464	23.38	19,489	23.25	6,052	8.1	7,622	9.09
	<i>p</i> -value	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	
Korean income level	Q1 (high)	17,713	23.49	19,217	23.78	3,328	4.41	4,217	5.22
	Q2 (middle)	16,244	21.67	15,456	22.01	4,071	5.43	4,381	6.24
	Q3 (low)	15,362	21.07	15,496	20.68	6,332	8.68	7,531	10.05
	<i>p</i> -value	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	
Community income level	Q1 (high)	17,237	22.44	17,670	22.73	3,313	4.31	3,964	5.10
	Q2 (middle)	15,551	21.74	16,074	22.21	3,786	5.29	4,523	6.25
	Q3 (low)	16,531	22.06	16,425	21.66	6,632	8.85	7,642	10.08
	<i>p</i> -value	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	
Basic livelihood condition	Yes	2,761	31.24	3,132	29.29	1,443	16.33	1,930	18.05
	No	46,558	21.71	47,037	21.85	12,288	5.73	14,199	6.60
	<i>p</i> -value	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	
Smoking status	Yes	10,406	28.10	10,288	28.30	2,391	6.46	2,776	7.64
	No	38,913	20.89	39,881	21.04	11,340	6.09	13,353	7.04
	<i>p</i> -value	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	
High-risk drinking	Yes	6,887	27.51	5,745	28.40	1,418	5.66	1,439	7.11
	No	42,432	21.40	44,424	21.59	12,313	6.21	14,690	7.14
	<i>p</i> -value	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	
Physical activity	Yes	18,727	20.88	19,411	20.70	4,914	5.48	5,947	6.34
	No	30,592	22.90	30,758	23.27	8,817	6.60	10,182	7.70
	<i>p</i> -value	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	

<sup>a</sup> Results of the Rao-Scott chi-square test

Table 3 presents the influence of the two types of income levels (Korean and community income levels) on perceived stress and experiences of depression by gender. Both Korean and community income levels were significant factors for perceived stress and depression after adjusting for the impacts of other factors in both 2019 and 2021. The odds ratio (OR) of Korean income level of perceived stress was 1.30 (95% Confidence Interval (CI) 1.30–1.30,  $p < 0.0001$ ) and 1.29 (95% CI 1.28–1.29,  $p < 0.0001$ ) in 2019 and 2021, respectively. According to the community income level, the perceived stress for the low-income level group was 1.26 (95% CI 1.26–1.26) and 1.31 (95% CI 1.31–1.32) in 2019 and 2021, respectively, compared to the high-income level group. The experience of depression was significantly lower in the high-income group than in the low-income group ( $p < 0.0001$ ). According to the community income level, perceived stress and experience of depression were both high in the low-income group (2019 OR 1.55, 95% CI 1.55–1.56, 2021 OR 1.63, 95% CI 1.62–1.63). Comparing before and after the COVID-19 pandemic, perceived stress by income level decreased and increased at the Korean and community income level, respectively. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the magnitude of inequality in the experience of depression increased for both types.

**Table 3. Influence of the two types of income levels (Korean or community income levels) on perceived stress and experience of depression by gender based on complex-sample multivariate logistic regression analysis.**

		Perceived stress				Experience of depression			
		2019		2021		2019		2021	
		Adj OR <sup>a</sup> (95% CI <sup>b</sup> )	<i>p</i> - value	Adj OR <sup>a</sup> (95% CI <sup>b</sup> )	<i>p</i> - value	Adj OR <sup>a</sup> (95% CI <sup>b</sup> )	<i>p</i> - value	Adj OR <sup>a</sup> (95% CI <sup>b</sup> )	<i>p</i> - value
Total									
Korean income level	Q1	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
	Q2	1.09 (1.09-1.09)	<.0001	1.10 (1.10-1.11)	<.0001	1.21 (1.21-1.22)	<.0001	1.17 (1.17-1.18)	<.0001
	Q3	1.30 (1.30-1.30)	<.0001	1.29 (1.28-1.29)	<.0001	1.72 (1.71-1.72)	<.0001	1.73 (1.72-1.73)	<.0001
Community income level	Q1	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
	Q2	1.07	<.0001	1.11	<.0001	1.12	<.0001	1.11	<.0001

		(1.07-1.07)		(1.11-1.11)		(1.11-1.12)		(1.11-1.12)	
	<b>Q3</b>	1.26 (1.26-1.26)	<.0001	1.31 (1.31-1.32)	<.0001	1.55 (1.55-1.56)	<.0001	1.63 (1.62-1.63)	<.0001
<b>Men</b>									
	<b>Q1</b>	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
<b>Korean income level</b>	<b>Q2</b>	1.04 (1.04-1.04)	<.0001	1.08 (1.08-1.09)	<.0001	1.15 (1.14-1.15)	<.0001	1.13 (1.12-1.14)	<.0001
	<b>Q3</b>	1.21 (1.20-1.21)	<.0001	1.24 (1.23-1.24)	<.0001	1.64 (1.63-1.65)	<.0001	1.75 (1.74-1.76)	<.0001
	<b>Q1</b>	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
<b>Community income level</b>	<b>Q2</b>	1.05 (1.04-1.05)	<.0001	1.08 (1.08-1.08)	<.0001	1.12 (1.11-1.13)	<.0001	1.08 (1.08-1.09)	<.0001
	<b>Q3</b>	1.20 (1.20-1.20)	<.0001	1.27 (1.26-1.27)	<.0001	1.48 (1.47-1.49)	<.0001	1.65 (1.64-1.66)	<.0001
<b>Women</b>									
	<b>Q1</b>	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
<b>Korean income level</b>	<b>Q2</b>	1.15 (1.14-1.15)	<.0001	1.13 (1.12-1.13)	<.0001	1.24 (1.24-1.25)	<.0001	1.19 (1.18-1.19)	<.0001
	<b>Q3</b>	1.39 (1.38-1.39)	<.0001	1.33 (1.32-1.33)	<.0001	1.71 (1.70-1.72)	<.0001	1.67 (1.66-1.68)	<.0001
	<b>Q1</b>	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
<b>Community income level</b>	<b>Q2</b>	1.10 (1.10-1.10)	<.0001	1.14 (1.14-1.14)	<.0001	1.11 (1.11-1.12)	<.0001	1.13 (1.13-1.13)	<.0001
	<b>Q3</b>	1.32 (1.31-1.32)	<.0001	1.35 (1.35-1.36)	<.0001	1.56 (1.55-1.57)	<.0001	1.59 (1.58-1.59)	<.0001

<sup>a</sup>Adj OR, adjusted odds ratio; <sup>b</sup>CI, confidence interval; adjusted for gender, age, education, job status, marital status, basic livelihood condition, smoking status, high-risk drinking, and physical activity.

Table 4 shows the results of the subgroup analysis that investigated the income level between the stress perception and experience of depression rates by gender and area of residence. Excluding the Korean income of men living in rural areas in 2021, the magnitude of inequality in stress perception was statistically significant ( $p < 0.0001$ ). The size of the inequality in experiences of depression was statistically significant in both 2019 and 2021, except for men living in rural areas with a Korean income level ( $p < 0.0001$ ). In both 2019 and 2021, the stress perception rate based on Korean income level showed greater inequality in urban areas. Furthermore, community income levels showed greater inequality in urban and rural areas in 2019 and 2021, respectively. The magnitude of inequality in perceived stress by gender was higher for women in both 2019 and 2021. In addition, the magnitude of inequality in the depression recognition was larger for women than for men; however, in 2021, only the

magnitude of inequality for men living in rural areas was higher than that for women.

**Table 4. Influence of the two types of income level (Korean or community income level) on perceived stress and experience of depression by gender and region of residence based on complex-sample multivariate logistic regression analysis.**

			Perceived stress				Experience of depression				
			2019		2021		2019		2021		
			Adj OR <sup>a</sup> (95% CI <sup>b</sup> )	<i>p</i> -value	Adj OR <sup>a</sup> (95% CI <sup>b</sup> )	<i>p</i> -value	Adj OR <sup>a</sup> (95% CI <sup>b</sup> )	<i>p</i> -value	Adj OR <sup>a</sup> (95% CI <sup>b</sup> )	<i>p</i> -value	
Total											
Urban	Korean income level	Q1	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		
		Q2	1.07 (1.07-1.07)	<.0001	1.12 (1.11-1.12)	<.0001	1.10 (1.10-1.11)	<.0001	1.10 (1.10-1.10)	<.0001	
		Q3	1.26 (1.26-1.26)	<.0001	1.31 (1.30-1.31)	<.0001	1.53 (1.53-1.54)	<.0001	1.63 (1.62-1.64)	<.0001	
	Community income level	Q1	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		
		Q2	1.11 (1.11-1.11)	<.0001	1.12 (1.12-1.13)	<.0001	1.23 (1.22-1.23)	<.0001	1.17 (1.17-1.17)	<.0001	
		Q3	1.33 (1.33-1.33)	<.0001	1.30 (1.30-1.30)	<.0001	1.76 (1.75-1.76)	<.0001	1.73 (1.73-1.74)	<.0001	
	Rural	Korean income level	Q1	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
			Q2	1.08 (1.07-1.08)	<.0001	1.07 (1.07-1.08)	<.0001	1.19 (1.18-1.20)	<.0001	1.18 (1.17-1.19)	<.0001
			Q3	1.25 (1.24-1.26)	<.0001	1.34 (1.33-1.35)	<.0001	1.62 (1.61-1.63)	<.0001	1.62 (1.61-1.64)	<.0001
Community income level		Q1	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		
		Q2	0.98 (0.98-0.99)	<.0001	1.01 (1.00-1.01)	0.0004	1.11 (1.10-1.12)	<.0001	1.17 (1.16-1.18)	<.0001	
		Q3	1.15 (1.15-1.16)	<.0001	1.21 (1.20-1.21)	<.0001	1.51 (1.50-1.53)	<.0001	1.71 (1.69-1.72)	<.0001	
Men											
Urban	Korean income level	Q1	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		
		Q2	1.04 (1.04-1.04)	<.0001	1.09 (1.08-1.09)	<.0001	1.12 (1.11-1.13)	<.0001	1.07 (1.07-1.08)	<.0001	
		Q3	1.21 (1.21-1.22)	<.0001	1.26 (1.25-1.26)	<.0001	1.48 (1.47-1.48)	<.0001	1.67 (1.66-1.68)	<.0001	
	Community income level	Q1	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		
		Q2	1.06 (1.06-1.06)	<.0001	1.10 (1.10-1.10)	<.0001	1.18 (1.17-1.18)	<.0001	1.16 (1.15-1.16)	<.0001	
		Q3	1.24 (1.23-1.24)	<.0001	1.25 (1.25-1.26)	<.0001	1.71 (1.70-1.73)	<.0001	1.72 (1.71-1.73)	<.0001	
Rural	Korean income level	Q1	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		
		Q2	1.07 (1.06-1.07)	<.0001	1.05 (1.04-1.06)	<.0001	1.13 (1.11-1.14)	<.0001	1.12 (1.11-1.14)	<.0001	
		Q3	1.14 (1.13-1.15)	<.0001	1.32 (1.31-1.33)	<.0001	1.48 (1.46-1.50)	<.0001	1.57 (1.55-1.59)	<.0001	
	Community income level	Q1	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		
		Q2	0.94 (0.93-0.94)	<.0001	1.00 (0.99-1.00)	0.6250	1.00 (0.98-1.01)	0.4675	1.01 (0.99-1.02)	0.3533	
		Q3	1.07 (1.06-1.08)	<.0001	1.16 (1.16-1.17)	<.0001	1.35 (1.33-1.37)	<.0001	1.80 (1.78-1.82)	<.0001	
Women											
Urban	Korean income level	Q1	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		
		Q2	1.10 (1.10-1.10)	<.0001	1.15 (1.14-1.15)	<.0001	1.09 (1.09-1.10)	<.0001	1.11 (1.11-1.12)	<.0001	
		Q3	1.31 (1.31-1.31)	<.0001	1.35 (1.34-1.35)	<.0001	1.54 (1.53-1.54)	<.0001	1.58 (1.57-1.59)	<.0001	
	Community income level	Q1	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		
		Q2	1.17 (1.16-1.17)	<.0001	1.15 (1.14-1.15)	<.0001	1.25 (1.25-1.26)	<.0001	1.17 (1.17-1.18)	<.0001	

		<b>Q3</b>	1.41 (1.41-1.42)	<.0001	1.33 (1.33-1.34)	<.0001	1.73 (1.72-1.74)	<.0001	1.69 (1.68-1.70)	<.0001
		<b>Q1</b>	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
	<b>Korean income level</b>	<b>Q2</b>	1.10 (1.09-1.11)	<.0001	1.10 (1.10-1.11)	<.0001	1.22 (1.21-1.23)	<.0001	1.21 (1.20-1.23)	<.0001
		<b>Q3</b>	1.34 (1.33-1.35)	<.0001	1.38 (1.37-1.38)	<.0001	1.68 (1.66-1.69)	<.0001	1.65 (1.63-1.66)	<.0001
<b>Rural</b>		<b>Q1</b>	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
	<b>Community income level</b>	<b>Q2</b>	1.04 (1.03-1.05)	<.0001	1.03 (1.03-1.04)	<.0001	1.19 (1.17-1.20)	<.0001	1.28 (1.27-1.30)	<.0001
		<b>Q3</b>	1.23 (1.22-1.24)	<.0001	1.27 (1.26-1.28)	<.0001	1.59 (1.57-1.60)	<.0001	1.65 (1.63-1.67)	<.0001

<sup>a</sup>Adj OR, adjusted odds ratio; <sup>b</sup>CI, confidence interval; adjusted for gender, age, education, job status, marital status, basic livelihood condition, smoking status, high-risk drinking, and physical activity.

## Discussion

This is the first study in Korea to compare mental health inequality according to relative income at the national and community levels using the CHS during the COVID-19 period. This study intended to provide basic data necessary for policy development to resolve mental health inequality caused by income gaps in the event of large-scale infectious diseases.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, although depression crude rates increased, perceived stress crude rates remained similar. In addition, regarding mental health inequality according to income level, even after adjusting for each independent variable, perceived stress and the experience of depression increased as income level decreased. Hall et al. [19] found that low-income groups had less access to resources for responding to COVID-19 and suffered more economic stress than high-income groups. These economic difficulties reportedly have a negative impact on daily life and mental health [19,40,41]. As a result of measuring perceived stress as income inequality at the national level, it decreased after the COVID-19 outbreak, while income inequality at the community level increased after the outbreak of COVID-19. When measuring inequality by income level, few previous studies have identified mental health inequality at the community income level. Moreover, in some cases, inequality due to

the income gap at the community level may be more affected than the income gap at the national level. Aneshensel CS and Sucoff CA [42] and Mair C et al. [43] found that the economic situation (income level), population composition, and characteristics of the residential environment in the area of residence have an effect on depression symptoms. This result is consistent with previous studies that used the relative income gap at the community level as a measure of health inequality and as a significant indicator for identifying the relationship between income and depressive symptoms [15,16].

In this study, perceived stress was more vulnerable in the low-income group compared to the high-income group for both income levels. Experience of depression showed the same results. While women and men in 2019 and 2021, respectively, were susceptible to experiencing depression. The result of women mental health inequality observed in this study was higher than that of men, consistent with the results observed by Almeida et al. [44]. However, after the COVID-19 pandemic, the findings that men experienced higher levels of depression than women were contradictory.

Additionally, this study confirmed the regional characteristics (urban and rural areas) related to changes in mental health inequality according to relative income levels during the COVID-19 pandemic. The effect of relative income level on perceived stress rate was found to be more pronounced in urban areas than in rural areas. On the contrary, the effect of relative income level on the depression rate was found to be weaker and more vulnerable in urban and rural areas, in terms of Korean and community income levels, respectively. This lack of consistent results has been reported in previous studies, as the impact on mental health inequality in urban and rural areas is conflicting [45-49]. In urban areas, social distancing is strongly practiced because of the high number of infected people, which may increase mental health inequality. Furthermore, mental health may be more vulnerable in rural areas because of the lack of information, access, and social support. These results indicate that the relative

income level during the COVID-19 pandemic can be expected to have different effects on mental health depending on regional characteristics; however, additional research needs to be conducted in the future.

The limitations of this study are as follows. First, the perceived stress and experience of depression used as outcome variables are values that record responses in the form of self-report rather than medical diagnosis, which raises the possibility of bias. However, because items most frequently used in national surveys were used, the possibility of comparison with other studies related to this topic is high. Second, changes in direct mental health inequalities across the subperiods of the COVID-19 pandemic were not identified. In Korea, the COVID-19 pandemic has usually been divided into three periods: the initial epidemic, delta mutation, and omicron epidemic phase. It is necessary to identify the difference in mental health inequality according to the income gap within the detailed epidemic period because the response strategies differ depending on the size of the epidemic and the impact of restrictions on socioeconomic activities, such as social distancing. In addition, future studies will need to address how inequality will change even after the end of COVID-19.

## Conclusions

This study identified aspects of mental health inequality according to relative income during the COVID-19 pandemic and changes in inequality according to two types of income levels. This study indicated inequality in mental health according to income level and differences based on gender and residential area. To alleviate mental health inequality, income inequality should be improved, and mental health policies should be intensively implemented, especially for socioeconomically unequal population groups.

## Acknowledgments

This study was supported by a 2022 research grant from Pusan National University Yangsan Hospital.

## References

1. Gibson B, Schneider B, Talamonti J, Forshaw M. Impact of inequality on mental health outcomes during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *Can Psychol.* 2021;62(1):101–26. doi: 10.1037/cap0000272.
2. Hoyt LT, Cohen AK, Dull B, Castro EM, Yazdani N. “Constant stress has become the new normal”: Stress and anxiety inequalities among US college students in the time of COVID-19. *J Adolesc Health.* 2021;68(2):270–6. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.10.030 PMID: 33288459.
3. Hewlett E, Takino S, Nishina Y, Prinz, and C. Tackling the mental health impact of the COVID-19 crisis: An integrated whole-of-society response. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). 2021.
4. Oral T, Gunlu A. Adaptation of the social distancing scale in the covid-19 era: its association with depression, anxiety, stress, and resilience in Turkey. *Int J Ment Health Addict.* 2021;20(3):1336-53. doi: 10.1007/s11469-020-00447-1 PMID: 33688310.
5. Benke C, Autenrieth LK, Asselmann E, Pané-Farré CA. Lockdown, quarantine measures, and social distancing: Associations with depression, anxiety and distress at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic among adults from Germany. *Psychiatry Res.* 2020;293. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113462 PMID: 32987222.
6. Venkatesh A, Edirappuli S. Social distancing in covid-19: what are the mental health implications?. *Bmj.* 2020;369. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1379.
7. Cao W, Fang Z, Hou G, Han M, Xu X, Dong J, Zheng J. Psychological impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on college students in China. *Psychiatry Res.* 2020;287:112934. doi:

- 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112934 PMID: 32229390.
8. Jean-Baptiste CO, Herring RP, Beeson WL, Dos Santos H, Banta JE. Stressful life events and social capital during the early phase of COVID-19 in the US. Soc Sci Humanit Open. 2020;2(1):100057. doi: 10.1016/j.ssaho.2020.100057 PMID: 34173495.
9. Lee D, Kim Y, Lee D, Hwang H, Nam S, Kim J. Inflammation and symptoms of coronavirus (COVID-19) infection in the general public, the darkening of the social environment and its effects on weapons. Korean Journal of Psychology. 2020;32(4):2119–56.
10. Lee J, Kim J, Kim M. The effect of social distancing on depression: The mediating effect of loneliness and the moderating effect of neurotic tendencies. Humanities and Social Sciences. 2021;12(3):1239–53.
11. Shevlin M, McBride O, Murphy J, Miller JG, Hartman TK, Levita L, et al. Anxiety, depression, traumatic stress and COVID-19-related anxiety in the UK general population during the COVID-19 pandemic. BJPsych Open. 2020;6(6):e125. doi: 10.1192/bjo.2020.109 PMID: 33070797.
12. Tull MT, Edmonds KA, Scamaldo K, Richmond KM, Rose JR, Gratz JP. Psychological outcomes associated with stay-at-home orders and the perceived impact of COVID-19 on daily life. Psychiatry Res. 2020;289:113098. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113098 PMID: 32434092.
13. Patel V, Burns JK, Dhingra M, Tarver L, Kohrt BA, Lund C. Income inequality and depression: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the association and a scoping review of mechanisms. World Psychiatry. 2018;17(1):76–89. doi: 10.1002/wps.20492 PMID: 29352539.
14. Hong J, Knapp M, McGuire A. Income-related inequalities in the prevalence of depression and suicidal behavior: A 10-year trend following an economic crisis. World

- Psychiatry. 2011;10(1):40–4. doi: 10.1002/j.2051-5545.2011.tb00012.x PMID: 21379355.
15. Song A, Kim W. Association between relative income and depressive symptoms in adults: Findings from a nationwide survey in Korea. *J Affect Disord.* 2020;263:236–40. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2019.11.149 PMID: 31818782
16. Tumin D, Menegay M, Shrider EA, Nau M, Tumin R. Local income inequality, individual socioeconomic status, and unmet healthcare needs in Ohio, USA. *Health Equity.* 2018;2(1):37–44. doi: 10.1089/heq.2017.0058 PMID: 30283849.
17. Santiago CD, Wadsworth ME, Stump J. Socioeconomic status, neighborhood disadvantage, and poverty-related stress: Prospective effects on psychological syndromes among diverse low-income families. *J Econ Psychol.* 2011;32(2):218-230. doi: 10.1016/j.joep.2009.10.008.
18. Zimmerman FJ, Katon W. Socioeconomic status, depression disparities, and financial strain: What lies behind the income-depression relationship? *Health Econ.* 2005;4(12):1197–215. doi: 10.1002/hec.1011 PMID: 15945040.
19. Hall LR, Sanchez K, da Graca B, Bennett MM, Powers M, Warren AM. Income differences and COVID-19: Impact on daily life and mental health. *Popul Health Manag.* 2022;25(3):384–91. doi.org/10.1089/pop.2021.0214 PMID: 34652228.
20. McGowan VJ, Bambra C. COVID-19 mortality and deprivation: pandemic, syndemic, and endemic health inequalities. *Lancet Public Health.* 2022;7(11):e966–75. doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(22)00223-7 PMID: 36334610.
21. Saarinen S, Moustgaard H, Remes H, Sallinen R, Martikainen P. Income differences in COVID-19 incidence and severity in Finland among people with foreign and native background: A population-based cohort study of individuals nested within households. *PLoS Med.* 2022;19(8):e1004038. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1004038 PMID: 35947575.
22. Green H, Fernandez R, MacPhail C. The social determinants of health and health

- outcomes among adults during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. Public Health Nurs. 2021;38(6):942–52. doi: 10.1111/phn.12959 PMID: 34403525.
23. Khanijahani A, Iezadi S, Gholipour K, Azami-Aghdash S, Naghibi DA. A systematic review of racial/ethnic and socioeconomic disparities in COVID-19. Int J Equity Health. 2021;20(1):248. doi: 10.1186/s12939-021-01582-4 PMID: 34819081.
24. De Lusignan S, Joy M, Oke J, McGagh D, Nicholson B, Sheppard J, et al. Disparities in the excess risk of mortality in the first wave of COVID-19: Cross sectional study of the English sentinel network. J Infect. 2020;81(5):785–92. doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2020.08.037 PMID: 32858068.
25. Shah GH, Shankar P, Schwind JS, Sittaramane V. The detrimental impact of the COVID-19 crisis on health equity and social determinants of health. J Public Health Manag Pract. 2020;26(4):317–19. doi: 10.1097/PHH.0000000000001200 PMID: 32433385.
26. Hammen C. Generation of stress in the course of unipolar depression. J Abnorm Psychol. 1991;100(4):555. doi: 10.1037//0021-843x.100.4.555 PMID: 1757669.
27. Fredrickson BL, Joiner T. Positive emotions trigger upward spirals toward emotional well-being. Psychological science. 2002;13(2):172–5. doi: 10.1111/1467-9280.00431 PMID: 11934003.
28. Sariusz-Skapska M, Czabała JC, Dudek D, Zieba A. Assessment of stressful life events and sense of coherence in patients with unipolar and bipolar disorder. Psychiatria Polska. 2003;37(5):836–75. PMID: 14631607.
29. Ngui EM, Khasakhala L, Ndeti D, Roberts LW. Mental disorders, health inequalities and ethics: A global perspective. Int Rev Psychiatry. 2010;22(3):235–44. doi: 10.3109/09540261.2010.485273 PMID: 20528652.
30. Thoits PA. Stress and health: Major findings and policy implications. J Health Soc Behav. 2010;51(S):S41–53. doi: 10.1177/0022146510383499 PMID: 20943582.

31. Lantz PM, House JS, Mero RP, Williams DR. Stress, life events, and socioeconomic disparities in health: Results from the Americans' Changing Lives Study. *J Health Soc Behav.* 2005;46(3):274–88. doi: 10.1177/002214650504600305 PMID: 16259149.
32. Freeman A, Tyrovolas S, Koyanagi A, Chatterji S, Leonardi M, Ayuso-Mateos JL, et al. The role of socio-economic status in depression: Results from the COURAGE (aging survey in Europe). *BMC Public Health.* 2016;16:1–8. doi: 10.1186/s12889-016-3638-0 PMID: 27760538.
33. Kim J, Shim J, Lee R. Material hardship and depression among low-income households in South Korea: Differences by household type. *Int J Soc Welf.* 2016;25(2):187–98. doi: 10.1111/ijsw.12181.
34. Lorant V, Croux C, Weich S, Delière D, Mackenbach J, Ansseau M. Depression and socio-economic risk factors: 7-year longitudinal population study. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2007;190(4):293–8. doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.105.020040 PMID: 17401034.
35. Kim D, Lee S, Ki M, Kim M, Kim S, Kim Y, Lee J. Developing Health Inequalities Indicators and Monitoring the Status of Health Inequalities in Korea. Korea Institute for Health and Social Affairs. 2013.
36. Ichiro Kawachi, M. D. *Social epidemiology.* Oxford University Press; c2014.
37. Williams DR, Yu Y, Jackson JS, Anderson NB. Racial differences in physical and mental health: Socio-economic status, stress and discrimination. *J Health Psychol.* 1997;2(3):335–51. doi: 10.1177/135910539700200305 PMID: 22013026.
38. Newmann JP, Engel RJ, Jensen JE. Age differences in depressive symptom experiences. *J Gerontol.* 1991;46(5):224–35. doi: 10.1093/geronj/46.5.P224 PMID: 1890289.
39. Potts MK, Burnam MA, Wells KB. Gender differences in depression detection: A comparison of clinician diagnosis and standardized assessment. *Psychol Assess.* 1991;3(4):609. doi: 10.1037/1040-3590.3.4.609.

40. Ettman CK, Abdalla SM, Cohen GH, Sampson L, Vivier PM, Galea S. Prevalence of depression symptoms in US adults before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(9):e2019686. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.19686 PMID: 32876685.
41. Swaziek Z, Wozniak A. Disparities old and new in US mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Fisc Stud*. 2020;41(3):709–32. doi: 10.1111/1475-5890.12244 PMID: 33362315.
42. Aneshensel CS, Sucoff CA. The neighborhood context of adolescent mental health. *J Health Soc Behav*. 1996;37:293–310. doi: 10.2307/2137258 PMID: 8997886.
43. Mair C, Roux AD, Galea S. Are neighborhood characteristics associated with depressive symptoms? A review of evidence. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2008;62(11):940–6. doi: 10.1136/jech.2007.066605 PMID: 18775943.
44. Almeida M, Shrestha AD, Stojanac D, Miller LJ. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on women's mental health. *Arch Womens Ment Health*. 2020;23:741–8. doi: 10.1007/s00737-020-01092-2 PMID: 33263142.
45. Bil JS, Buława B, Świerzawski J. Mental health and the city in the post-COVID-19 era. *Sustainability*. 2021;13(14):7533. doi: 10.3390/su13147533.
46. Richman L, Pearson J, Beasley C, Stanifer J. Addressing health inequalities in diverse, rural communities: An unmet need. *SSM Popul Health*. 2019;7:100398. doi: 10.1016/j.ssmph.2019.100398 PMID: 31011618.
47. Nepomuceno BB, Cardoso AA, Ximenes VM, Barros JPP, Leite JF. Mental health, well-being, and poverty: A study in urban and rural communities in Northeastern Brazil. *J Prev Interv Community*. 2016;44(1):63–75. doi: 10.1080/10852352.2016.1102590 PMID: 26697905.
48. Wang Z, Li X, Chen M. Catastrophic health expenditures and its inequality in elderly

485 households with chronic disease patients in China. Int J Equity Health. 2015;14:8. doi:  
 486 10.1186/s12939-015-0134-6 PMID: 25599715.

487 49. Hong J. Socio-economic inequalities in mental health and their determinants in South  
 488 Korea. PhD Thesis, The London School of Economics and Political Science. 2012.  
 489 Available from: <http://etheses.lse.ac.uk/id/eprint/494>