

Health-adjusted life expectancy in Britain, 1991-1998

Groot, Wim; Maassen van den Brink, Henriette

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Groot, W., & Maassen van den Brink, H. (2008). Health-adjusted life expectancy in Britain, 1991-1998. *Applied Economics*, 40(11), 1373-1386. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840600820671>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this document must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



Health-adjusted life expectancy in Britain, 1991-1998

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-05-0490.R1
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
JEL Code:	I10 - General < I1 - Health < I - Health, Education, and Welfare, I12 - Health Production: Nutrition, Mortality, Morbidity, Disability, etc. < I1 - Health < I - Health, Education, and Welfare
Keywords:	Health, Life expectancy

powered by ScholarOne
Manuscript Central™

HEALTH-ADJUSTED LIFE EXPECTANCY IN BRITAIN, 1991-1998*

by

Wim Groot**, Faculty of Health Sciences, Dept. of H.O.P.E., Maastricht University,
and "Scholar" Research Center for Education and Labor Market, Faculty of
Economics, University of Amsterdam

Henriëtte Maassen van den Brink, "Scholar" Research Center for Education and
Labor Market, Faculty of Economics, University of Amsterdam

Keywords: health, life expectancy

Abstract

In this paper changes in the quality of health adjusted life expectancy of the British population between 1991 and 1998 are analyzed. It is found that at all given age levels life expectancy increased during this period. Life expectancy at birth increased by 1 year for women and by 1.5 years for men. It is further found that the prevalence of health problems and handicaps has increased during the 1990s. For all age categories distinguished the self-assessment of the quality of health also declined, on average. We finally find that quality adjusted life expectancy declined between 1991 and 1998 rather than increased.

* We thank an anonymous referee for helpful comments on a previous version of this paper.

** Address: Wim Groot, Faculty of Health Sciences, Dept. of H.O.P.E., Maastricht University, P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht, The Netherlands; Telephone number: +31 - 43 - 388 1588/1727; Fax number: +31 - 43 - 367 0960; E-mail: w.groot@beoz.unimaas.nl. Henriëtte Maassen van den Brink, Faculty of General Economics, University of Amsterdam, Roetersstraat 11, 1018 WB Amsterdam, the Netherlands; E-mail: h.maassenvandenbrink@uva.nl.

HEALTH-ADJUSTED LIFE EXPECTANCY IN BRITAIN, 1991-1998

Keywords: health, life expectancy

Abstract

In this paper changes in the quality of health adjusted life expectancy of the British population between 1991 and 1998 are analyzed. It is found that at all given age levels life expectancy increased during this period. Life expectancy at birth increased by 1 year for women and by 1.5 years for men. It is further found that the prevalence of health problems and handicaps has increased during the 1990s. For all age categories distinguished the self-assessment of the quality of health also declined, on average. We finally find that quality adjusted life expectancy declined between 1991 and 1998 rather than increased.

1. Introduction

Like in many other western countries health care expenditures in Britain have risen substantially over the past decade. Between 1991 and 1999 expenditures on the National Health Service increased by 0.6 – 6.7% annually, while expenditures per capita increased by £4.35 – 42.91 annually. In 1991 health care expenditures per capita amounted to £688.22, by 1998 this had increased to £829.30.

In 2002, the British government announced a plan for even further increases in health care expenditures. It is planned that health care expenditures will increase by 7.4% annually in real terms between 2002-03 and 2007-08. Over this period expenditure on the National Health Service is planned to rise by 44% in real terms. The extra investment will increase health expenditure from 7.7% to 9.4% of gross domestic product in 2008 (Moore 2002).

An obvious question to ask is whether these expenditure increases really improve the health of the population? It is by no means obvious that higher health care expenditures lead to a better health. A classic example is Illich (1975), who claims that there is a negative causality: more health care leads to dependence, and this in turn leads to a decline in health. However, recent empirical studies suggest the opposite. For example, Rivera (2001) analyses the relation between public health expenditure and self-assessed health status. This study finds that higher per capita public health expenditures in a region are associated with better a physiological and physical health status. Using aggregate data, Berger & Messer (2002) basically confirm the cross-section data findings by Rivera (2001). Berger & Messer (2002) find that higher health care expenditures are associated with lower mortality rates.

1
2
3 However, this study also finds that countries where a larger share of health care
4 expenditures is publicly financed have higher mortality rates.
5
6

7
8 It is difficult to prove that there is a direct causal relation between health care
9 expenditure and the health status of the population. Health care expenditure also
10 need not be the most important factor. Even if expenditures are high, barriers to
11 access may be an impediment to health for all. However, the question can be asked
12 whether during a period in which health care expenditures increased year by year,
13 the health status of the population increased as well? In this paper we therefore
14 analyze whether the health state of the British population has improved in the 1990s.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 There is a small literature on the evolution of health in western countries during the
28 past twenty years. This literature does not unequivocally show that the health of the
29 population has improved over time.
30
31
32

33
34 Burström, Johannesson & Diderichsen (2003) compute the value of the
35 change in health in Sweden between 1980 and 1997. This study finds that in this
36 period life expectancy for infants in Sweden increased by 3.68 years for males and
37 2.70 years for females. Among older age groups average health status increased.
38 However, among younger age groups average health status decreased. Expected
39 quality-adjusted life years for infants increased by 2.64 years for males and 0.54
40 years for females. This study concludes that older persons in Sweden have
41 experienced considerable health gains whereas the health gains have been small or
42 non-existent for younger women.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 Cutler & Richardson (1997, 1998) use ordered probit regressions to estimate
56 the changes in the value of health capital in the United States between 1970 and
57 1990. This study finds that during this period quality-adjusted life years increased by
58
59
60

1
2
3 as much as 30%. This increase is to a large extent due to a decline in mortality rates.
4
5 Using a 3% discount rate, health improved most for the elderly and least for children.
6
7 The rate of female to male health was relatively constant over this period. At birth
8
9 women and men have nearly equal health, while at age 65 women have more health
10
11 capital than men.
12
13
14
15
16

17 In this paper we use the concept of health-adjusted life expectancy (HALE) as a
18
19 summary measure to analyze the changes in the quality of health-adjusted life
20
21 expectancy in Britain in the 1990s.¹ HALE is a summary measure of population
22
23 health. HALE estimates the average time in years that a person at a given age can
24
25 expect to live in the equivalent of full health. The morbidity or quality of life
26
27 component of HALEs is referred to as health-related quality of life (HRQL) or quality-
28
29 adjusted life years weights (QALY weights). These QALY weights are combined with
30
31 tables on life expectancy to create HALEs (for a review of the measures referred to
32
33 here and others, see Gold, Stevenson & Fryback 2002). Changes in HALE can be
34
35 decomposed into three factors: a change in life expectancy, changes in the
36
37 prevalence of diseases at any given age, and the health state conditional on the
38
39 prevalence of diseases and handicaps. As people live to an older age, the first factor
40
41 contributes positively to the HALE. However, the increase in life expectancy is partly
42
43 because the chances of surviving a serious illness are greater now than in the past.
44
45 As a result the increase in life expectancy is partly due to an increase in life years
46
47 lived in less than perfect health. Consequently, the prevalence of (chronic) diseases
48
49 has increased. So the second factor is likely to contribute negatively to HALE. Finally,
50
51 we may expect that health conditional on having survived a serious illness has
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 See Rosenberg, Fryback & Lawrence (1999) for an alternative method to calculate health adjusted life expectancy.

1
2
3 improved due to improved medical care. So, the first and the third factor are likely to
4
5 increase HALE, while the second reduces it. The net effect is therefore ambiguous.
6
7

8 In the remainder of this paper we will present empirical data on the factors that
9
10 contribute to HALE, i.e. we will analyze the evolution of life expectancy, the
11
12 prevalence of diseases and handicaps and the (subjective evaluation) of the
13
14 individual's health condition over the period 1991-1998. Data on the prevalence of
15
16 diseases and handicaps and the self-assessments of the health status are combined
17
18 to produce QALY weights. These QALY weights are used to calculate HALE by
19
20 multiplying them by the figures on life expectancy.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **2. The health capital model**

30
31
32

33 In the empirical modeling of the quality of health three concepts are distinguished.
34
35 The first is the true quality of health H^* . The true quality of health is a latent variable
36
37 that can not be observed directly. What we observe are an objective measure of the
38
39 health status of the individual, denoted by H^o , and a subjective measure of the quality
40
41 of health, H^s . The objective health measure refers to the prevalence of a number of
42
43 illnesses and handicaps among the respondents in our sample and their functional
44
45 ability. H^o refers to a vector of dummy variables on illnesses and handicaps. The
46
47 subjective measure of health, H^s , is measured by the response to the survey
48
49 question: "Compared to people of your own age, would you say your health has on
50
51 the whole been: 1) excellent, 2) good, 3) fair, 4) poor or 5) very poor?".
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 We assume that the latent quality of health variable is determined by the prevalence
60
of diseases and handicaps and other individual characteristics:

$$H^* = \beta_0 + H^o \beta_1 + X \beta_2 + \varepsilon$$

X is a vector of individual characteristics, β are vectors of coefficients and ε is a standard normal distributed random term capturing unmeasured and unmeasurable effects on the true health status. The vector X includes variables for years of education, age, marital status, number of dependent children and country of birth.

The observed health status H^s is a categorical ordered response variable. The observed health variable is assumed to be related to the latent variable in the following way:

$$H^s = i \leftrightarrow \alpha_{i-1} < H^* \leq \alpha_i, \quad i = 0, \dots, n$$

where n is the number of response categories (i.e. n ranges from 1 to 5 for our subjective health measure) and α_i are threshold levels that demarcate the different response categories. We further assume that $\alpha_0 = -\infty$ and $\alpha_n = \infty$. This specification is known in the literature as the ordered probit model (McKelvey & Zavoina 1975).

We follow Cutler & Richardson (1997, 1998) in calculating QALY weights from the estimates of the β_1 coefficients. Let $\beta_0 + H^o \beta_1 + X \beta_2$ represent the impact of health problems, handicaps and other individual characteristics on health. As $\beta_0 + H^o \beta_1 + X \beta_2$ is not scaled and can range from $-\infty$ to ∞ , the representation of the impact of

1
2
3 health problems needs to be normalized to produce a QALY weight. Following Cutler
4 & Richardson (1997, 1998) we normalize by dividing them by the difference between
5
6 the borderline between excellent health and that of a very poor health. It is thereby
7
8 assumed that an excellent health corresponds to a near perfect health and a very
9
10 poor health corresponds to near death. The individual QALY weights are defined as:
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

$$18 \quad QALYWEIGHT = \frac{\beta_0 + H^o \beta_1 + X \beta_2 - \alpha_1}{19 \quad \alpha_4 - \alpha_1}$$

20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The mean values of the QALY weights are taken as the quality of the health of the
28
29 population.
30
31
32
33

34 The final step is to calculate the quality of health adjusted life expectancy (HALE).
35
36 The HALE are calculated by multiplying the QALY weight by the age specific
37
38 remaining life expectancy.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **3. The data for calculating the quality of health**

51 The data for calculating the QALY weights are taken from the 1991 and 1998 waves
52
53 of the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS 1995). The BHPS - carried out by the
54
55 Institute of Social and Economic Research at the University of Essex - is an annual
56
57 longitudinal survey of each adult member of a nationally representative sample of
58
59 more than 5,000 households (approximately 10,000 individuals) in Great Britain. The
60

1
2
3 same individuals are interviewed in successive waves. If they leave the household all
4
5 adult members of their new household are also interviewed. Details about this survey
6
7 can be found in Taylor (1992). The sample includes all individuals aged 15 and older.
8
9 After eliminating a small number of observations with missing values on the self-
10
11 reported health status and on the health condition variables, 5416 observations on
12
13 females in 1991 and 5848 in 1998 could be used in the analyses. For males we have
14
15 4815 observations in 1991 and 5048 in 1998.
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 As was already mentioned, the subjective health measure H^s is defined by the
23
24 response to the survey question “Compared to people of your own age, would you
25
26 say that your health has on the whole been: 1) excellent, 2) good, 3) fair, 4) poor or
27
28 5) very poor?”. According to Fayers & Sprangers (2002), “There is widespread
29
30 agreement that this simple global question provides a useful summary of how
31
32 patients perceive their overall health status. This view is also borne out by the large
33
34 number of studies that have consistently shown, in a wide range of disease areas,
35
36 that SRH [Self-Reported Health] is a powerful predictor of clinical outcome and
37
38 mortality.” One advantage of using self-assessments of health for calculating QALY
39
40 weights is that the cognitive burden on respondents is lower than with other
41
42 techniques, such as the standard gamble and the time trade-off methods. In Fryback
43
44 et al. (1993) it is shown that the scores on this self-assessed overall quality of health
45
46 correlate highly with the scores of other quality of life indicators that are frequently
47
48 used in QALY analysis, such as the time trade-off assessment, the quality of well-
49
50 being index and the outcomes of a general health perception questionnaire.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 For the objective health measure H^o the response to the following survey question is
4 used: "Do you have any of the health problems or disabilities listed on this card?
5 (exclude temporary conditions)". Respondents are shown a card with a list of
6 conditions:
7
8
9
10
11

- 12 - Problems or disability connected with: arms, legs, hands, feet, back, or
13 neck (including arthritis and rheumatism);
14
- 15 - Difficulty in seeing (other than needing glasses to read normal size print);
16
- 17 - Difficulty in hearing;
18
- 19 - Skin conditions/allergies;
20
- 21 - Chest/breathing problems, asthma, bronchitis;
22
- 23 - Heart/blood pressure or blood circulation problems;
24
- 25 - Stomach/liver/kidneys or digestive problems;
26
- 27 - Diabetes;
28
- 29 - Anxiety, depression or bad nerves;
30
- 31 - Alcohol or drug related problems;
32
- 33 - Epilepsy;
34
- 35 - Migraine or frequent headaches;
36
- 37 - Other health problems.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The categorization of the health problems and disabilities on this list is fairly broad.
46 For example, heart and blood pressure problems includes people with high blood
47 pressure and patients with severe cardiovascular diseases. A more detailed
48 classification of health problems and disabilities would, however, have required a
49 much larger sample size in order to obtain sufficiently large cell sizes.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4. Estimation results

In this section we discuss the changes of mortality and morbidity over the period 1991-1998 for men and women. We also present the results of the ordered probit estimates of subjective health. These probit estimates are used to calculate gender and age group specific QALY weights.

Life expectancy

Table 1 contains the life expectancy – at birth and conditional on attaining a certain age - for men and women in 1991 and 1998. For men life expectancy at birth increased by 1.5 years from 73.2 years in 1991 to 74.7 years in 1998. For women it increased by 1 year, from 78.7 to 79.7 years. If we look at the increases in life expectancy for different age groups, we see that at all age levels the conditional life expectancy increased. The largest increase in life expectancy occurred for men at age 20 and 30: for these age groups the conditional life expectancy increased by 1.4 years. Among women we find that for all ages between 5 and 60 the conditional life expectancy increased by 0.7 to 0.9 years.

Table 1 around here

Self-assessed quality of health

The figures on life expectancy show a notable increase. However, if we look at the quality of health a somewhat different picture emerges. In table 2 and 3 the frequency distribution of the self-assessed health status for men and women in 1991

1
2
3 and 1998 are presented. In order to make the figures on self-assessed health as
4 comparable as possible with the figures on life expectancy, we present figures by five
5 age groups.
6
7
8
9

10 If we look at the distribution of health for all age groups combined, we find that
11 for both men and women self-assessed health has deteriorated between 1991 and
12 1998. In 1991 nearly 32% of the men in the sample evaluated their health as
13 'excellent', while another 44.5% rated it as 'good'. Less than 7% of the men in 1991
14 rated their health as '(very) poor'. By 1998 the share of men in excellent or good
15 health had declined and the number of men in (very) poor health had gone up. In
16 1998 less than 25% of the men rated their health as excellent and 46.6% said to be
17 in good health. The share of men in (very) poor health had increased to 9.7%. A
18 similar trend can be observed among women. The percentage of women in excellent
19 health declined from 25.7% in 1991 to 19.0% in 1998, while the percentage of
20 women in (very) poor health increased from 9.6% to 11.7%.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Tables 2 and 3 around here

One potential explanation for the deterioration of health is the increase in life expectancy. If this increase is mainly caused by an increase in life years spent in less than perfect health, we may expect the subjective evaluation to deteriorate over time. We would then expect that the evaluation of health status within age groups to remain constant. This is not what the figures in table 2 and 3 show, however. Both among men and among women we find that in all of the six age groups distinguished the share of people in excellent health declined between 1991 and 1998, while the share of people in (very) poor health increased.

1
2
3
4
5
6 An alternative explanation for the deterioration of the self-assessment of health is that
7
8 people have become more pessimistic about their own health. I.e. they evaluate the
9
10 same objective health state more negatively in 1998 than in 1991. Whether this
11
12 explanation holds can be seen if we compare the self-assessments with the
13
14 prevalence of health problems and disabilities in 1991 and 1998.
15
16
17
18
19

20 *The prevalence of health problems and disabilities*

21
22 Table 4 contains the prevalence of health problems and disabilities among men in
23
24 1991 and 1998. Similar figures for women are found in table 5. The trends in the
25
26 prevalence of these health impairments are remarkably similar for men and women.
27
28 For both men and women we find an increase in the prevalence of problems with
29
30 arms, legs, etc, difficulty in hearing, skin conditions and allergies, heart and blood
31
32 pressure circulation problems, stomach, liver and kidney problems, diabetes, nerves
33
34 and anxiety problems and depression. One example is the increase in the prevalence
35
36 of diabetes among men. The prevalence of diabetes among men increased from
37
38 1.9% to 2.9% in 1998. Also in all age groups the prevalence increased. Among men
39
40 aged 25-40, for example, it doubled from 0.6% to 1.2%.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Tables 4 and 5 around here

Only difficulty in seeing is less frequently reported in 1998 than in 1991. On a few
health impairments the trends differ between men and women. Among men the
prevalence of chest and breathing problems declined, while this increased among
women. Alcohol and drug use increased slightly among men, but remained constant

1
2
3 among women. Epilepsy increased somewhat among women but remained constant
4
5 among men. Finally, migraine and chronic headaches declined among men but
6
7 increased among women. The overall picture that emerges is that both among men
8
9 and among women the prevalence of health problems and disabilities has increased
10
11 between 1991 and 1998. This contradicts the idea that the deterioration of the self-
12
13 assessed health status in table 2 and 3 is merely because people have become more
14
15 pessimistic and have changed the interpretation they attach to notions like 'excellent'
16
17 and 'poor' health. It suggests that the negative change in self-assessed quality of
18
19 health reflects a deterioration of the true health status.
20
21
22
23

24
25 As expected, the prevalence of health problems and disabilities is higher
26
27 among older age groups than among the younger ones. However, if we look within
28
29 age groups, we see similar trends as for the sample as a whole. For most age groups
30
31 health problems and disabilities the prevalence increased between 1991 and 1998.
32
33 Only for a few age groups the prevalence decreased over the period 1991-1998.
34
35
36
37

38 39 *Ordered probit estimates of self-assessed quality of health*

40
41 The ordered probit estimates are used to calculate Quality of Life weights. The
42
43 estimation results of the probit equations on self-assessed health status for men and
44
45 women are found in table 6 and 7, respectively. Health problems and disabilities
46
47 generally lower the self-reported health status. Especially, problems connected with
48
49 arms, legs, hands, feet, back, or neck, chest and breathing problems such as
50
51 asthma and bronchitis, heart problems and blood pressure or blood circulation
52
53 problems, stomach, liver, kidneys or digestive problems, diabetes, problems caused
54
55 by anxiety, depression or bad nerves and epileptic problems have strong negative
56
57 effects on the self-assessment of the health status.
58
59
60

Tables 6 and 7 around here

We further find that years of education generally has a positive, and among men in particular, a statistically significant effect on self-assessed health. In most of the equations age has a positive effect on health as well. This is surprising as one might expect health to decline with age. Two explanations can be given for this unexpected finding. First, the age effect is conditional on the prevalence of health problems and handicaps. Secondly, the subjective health state question explicitly asks respondents about their health “compared to people of your own age”. This introduces a source of age norming in the respondents’ answers which causes the reverse sign of the age effect on health in the estimations (see Groot 2000).

QALY weights

The probit estimates are used to calculate QALY weights. Table 8 contains the average QALY weights by age group for men and women. Three conclusions can be drawn from the results in this table. First, we find – as expected - that the QALY weights are lower for older age groups than for younger ones. For example, in 1991 the average QALY weight for men aged 25 or younger is 0.889, while for men aged 75 and older it is 0.663. For both men and women we find for both years that the average QALY weight of an older age group is always lower than that of a younger one.

Table 8 around here

1
2
3 Secondly, we find that the average QALY weights for women are always less than
4 the corresponding average QALY weights for men. This reflects the lower health
5 status and the higher prevalence of health problems and disabilities among women.
6
7

8
9
10 Finally, we find that for both men and women and for all age groups the
11 average QALY weight in 1998 is lower than the average QALY weight in 1991. This
12 corresponds to the lower self-rating of health and the higher prevalence of health
13 problems and disabilities in 1998 compared to 1991.
14
15
16
17
18

21 22 *HALE*

23
24 Finally, we calculate the quality of health adjusted life expectancy (HALE). This is
25 done by multiplying the life expectancy figures in table 1 with the age group specific
26 QALY weights in table 8. An example illustrates how the HALE is calculated. The life
27 expectancy at birth of men in 1991 is 73.2 years. Of these, 25 years are spent with
28 an average QALY weight of 0.889. The next 15 years are spent with QALY weight
29 0.858, and so on. Finally, the last years of the life expectancy are spent in average
30 QALY weight of 0.670.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 The quality of health adjusted life expectancies are found in table 9. As might
42 be expected - based on the differences in self-assessed health, the prevalence of
43 health problems and disabilities and the QALY weights - the differences between
44 men and women in quality adjusted life expectancy are less than the male-female
45 differences in life expectancy that were found in table 1. We find that below the age
46 of 30, quality adjusted life expectancy of men actually exceeds the quality adjusted
47 life expectancy of women. After the age of 30 we find that women have a longer
48 quality adjusted life expectancy.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A second conclusion that can be drawn is that quality adjusted life expectancy
4 has *declined* between 1991 and 1998 rather than increased. The increase in life
5 expectancy in the 1990s has been more than off-set by a decline in quality of life.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Table 9 around here
13
14
15

16 17 **5. Conclusion** 18

19
20
21
22 In this paper we have used quality of health adjusted life expectancy (HALE) as a
23 summary measure for health. We have used the HALE to calculate the changes in
24 health of the British population in the 1990s. The most notable finding is that quality
25 of health adjusted life expectancy has declined rather than increased in the 1990s.
26
27
28
29

30
31
32 This finding contradicts some of the findings in the influential Wanless report
33 'Securing good health for the whole population' (Wanless 2003). In this report it is
34 stated that: "In the UK healthy life expectancy at birth is increasing. In 1999, the
35 number of years males could expect to live in good or fairly good health was 66.6
36 years, compared to 64.4 years in 1981. For females, the equivalent figures were 68.9
37 and 66.7 years" (Wanless 2003, p. 19). However, the Wanless report also notes that
38 the prevalence of all major disease groups – including musculoskeletal disorder,
39 heart and circulatory disease and respiratory disease – increased between 1994 and
40 1998 (Wanless 2003, p. 21-22). Also the prevalence of Type2 diabetes is increasing.
41 It is even noted that the most deprived fifth of the population have a 50 percent
42 increased risk of Type 2 diabetes (Wanless 2003, p. 22).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A major reason for the decline in HALE is that - for both men and women - the self-
4 assessed health status has declined and the prevalence of diseases and handicaps
5 has increased for all age groups distinguished. A natural question to ask is how
6 reliable these figures on self-assessed health are? Our data do not allow us to test
7 the reliability of the self-assessment of health, other than that we find that the
8 prevalence of health problems and disabilities are good predictors of the self-
9 assessment. Crossley & Kennedy (2002) analyze the reliability of self-assessed
10 health status using Australian data in which a random sub-sample of respondents
11 answer a standard self-assessed health question twice – before and after an
12 additional set of health related questions. This study finds that 28% of the
13 respondents change their response: 13.6% report a higher level of health whilst
14 14.8% report a lower level of health after a general health and well-being
15 questionnaire is answered. As about the same number of respondents change their
16 self-assessment upwards as downwards, the null-hypotheses that the means of both
17 distributions are the same can not be rejected. They do find, however, that the null
18 hypotheses that the distributions are the same is strongly rejected. We conclude from
19 this that at least the means of the distribution provide reliable information about the
20 health status of the sample as a whole. In our study we find that for all gender and
21 age groups, the means of the self-assessed health state declined between 1991 and
22 1998.

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 Another potential point of criticism concerns the fact that respondents are asked to
54 evaluate their health relative to others with the same age (“Compared to people of
55 your own age, would you say your health has on the whole been...”). It is possible
56 that because of some exogenous change – for example a dramatic improvement of
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 medical technology – the health status of the whole population increases uniformly.
4
5 By asking people to compare their own age with that of others, a uniform increase in
6
7 health status may leave the relative distribution unchanged (some people still
8
9 consider themselves being in poor health compared to other although their health
10
11 status has improved).
12
13

14
15 We consider the source of bias to be only minor. First, we compare the health
16
17 status of the people over a relatively short period of time. It is unlikely that dramatic
18
19 improvements in medical technology have occurred that have affected the health of
20
21 the entire population. Secondly, one may expect such uniform change to be in the
22
23 direction of a general health improvement, not in a deterioration of the health status.
24
25 Our findings show a decline in subjective health. Thirdly, people are asked to
26
27 compare their health with that of people their own age. One way to eliminate this
28
29 source of bias is to compare the changes in health status over time for similar age
30
31 groups. We find that in all age groups, self reported health has declined. Finally, as
32
33 has been noted before, we do not only find that the self-assessment of the health
34
35 status has deteriorated, the prevalence of diseases and handicaps has increased as
36
37 well.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Finally, we may ask why self-assessed health has deteriorated and why the
47
48 prevalence of most health problems and handicaps has increased in the 1990s?
49
50 Three possible explanations suggest itself. First, as was already noted before, the
51
52 increase in life expectancy is for a large part an increase in life expectancy in less
53
54 than perfect health. This means an increase in the prevalence of chronic diseases in
55
56 the population. A second explanation is that – because of improved medical
57
58 technology and a greater awareness of the risks of health problems among the
59
60

1
2
3 population – diseases are nowadays diagnosed sooner and better than before. A
4
5 final explanation is that the life style of the population has become less healthy – i.e.
6
7 an increase in alcohol consumption and obesity – which has led to an increase in
8
9 (chronic) diseases.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

References

- Berger, M. & J. Messer (2002), 'Public financing of health expenditures, insurance, and health outcomes', *Applied economics* 34, p. 2105-2113
- Burström, LK., M. Johannesson & F. Diderichsen (2003), 'The value of the change in health in Sweden 1980/81 to 1996/97', *Health Economics* 12, p. 637-654
- Crossley, T. & S. Kennedy (2002), 'The reliability of self-assessed health status', *Journal of Health Economics* 21, p. 643-658
- Cutler, D. & E. Richardson (1997), 'Measuring the health of the U.S. population', *Brookings Paper on Economic Activity*, p. 217-271
- Cutler, D. & E. Richardson (1998), 'The value of health: 1970-1990', *American Economic Review* 88, p. 97-100
- Fayers, P. & M. Sprangers (2002), 'Understanding self-rated health', *The Lancet* 359, p. 187-188
- Fryback, D., E. Dasbach, R. Klein, B. Klein, N. Dorn, K. Peterson & P. Martin (1993), 'The Beaver dam health outcomes study: initial catalog of health-state quality factors', *Medical Decision Making* 13, p. 89-102
- Gold, M., D. Stevenson & D. Fryback (2002), 'HALYs and QALYs and DALYs, oh my: similarities and differences in summary measures of population health', *Annual Review of Public Health* 23, p. 115-134
- Groot, W. (2000), 'Adaptation and scale of reference bias in self-assessments of quality of life', *Journal of Health Economics* 19, p. 403-420
- Grossman, M. (1972), *The Demand for Health: A Theoretical and Empirical Investigation*, Columbia University Press
- Illich, I. (1975), *Medical Nemesis: The Expropriation of Health*, Calders & Bagars, London
- McKelvey, R. & W. Zavoina (1975), 'A statistical model for the analysis of ordinal level dependent variables', *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* 4, p. 103-120
- Moore, W. (2002), 'NHS to receive an extra £40bn over next five years', *British Medical Journal* 324, p. 993
- Rivera, B. (2001), 'The effects of public health spending on self-assessed health status: an ordered probit model', *Applied Economics* 33, p. 1313-1319
- Rosenberg, M., D. Fryback & W. Lawrence (1999), 'Computing population-based estimates of health-adjusted life expectancy', *Medical Decision Making* 19, p. 90-97

1
2
3 Taylor, M. Freed (ed.), (1992), *British Household Panel Survey User Manual*,
4 Colchester, University of Essex
5

6
7 Wanless, D. (2003), 'Securing good health for the whole population: population
8 health trends', www.doh.gov.uk/wanless/index.htm
9

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

For Peer Review

Table 1 Life expectancy in years in Britain 1991-1998, by gender and age

	<i>At birth</i>	<i>At age</i>						
	5	20	30	50	60	70	80	
	<i>Men</i>							
1991	73.2	68.9	54.2	44.7	26.0	17.7	11.1	6.4
1998	74.7	70.3	55.6	46.1	27.4	18.9	11.9	6.7
	<i>Women</i>							
1991	78.7	74.3	59.5	49.7	30.6	21.9	14.3	8.2
1998	79.7	75.2	60.3	50.5	31.4	22.6	14.7	8.4

Source: National Statistics Britain

For Peer Review

Table 2 Frequency distribution subjective health status 1991-1998, men by age group

	<i>All</i>	<i>Age group</i>					
		<i>25 or younger</i>	<i>25 - 40</i>	<i>40 - 55</i>	<i>55 - 65</i>	<i>65 - 75</i>	<i>Older than 75</i>
<i>1991</i>							
Very poor	1.9%	0.5%	1.2%	1.9%	3.0%	3.6%	5.5%
Poor	5.1%	2.5%	2.5%	5.7%	8.7%	9.7%	10.2%
Fair	16.7%	15.3%	13.2%	15.4%	19.6%	28.1%	20.8%
Good	44.5%	44.5%	48.0%	44.0%	41.8%	39.3%	42.4%
Excellent	31.8%	37.2%	35.1%	33.1%	26.9%	19.2%	21.2%
#observations	4832	915	1453	1183	572	473	236
<i>1998</i>							
Very poor	2.4%	0.4%	1.0%	3.2%	3.5%	4.9%	5.2%
Poor	7.3%	4.5%	5.1%	7.6%	11.3%	9.7%	15.1%
Fair	19.0%	16.1%	16.3%	15.8%	24.6%	29.4%	27.1%
Good	46.6%	51.1%	48.2%	47.1%	41.5%	41.4%	40.9%
Excellent	24.7%	27.8%	29.4%	26.2%	19.0%	14.6%	11.7%
#observations	5050	898	1546	1244	564	507	291

Table 3 Frequency distribution subjective health status 1991-1998, women by age group

	<i>All</i>	<i>Age group</i>					
		<i>25 or younger</i>	<i>25 - 40</i>	<i>40 - 55</i>	<i>55 - 65</i>	<i>65 - 75</i>	<i>Older than 75</i>
		<i>1991</i>					
Very poor	2.3%	0.6%	1.2%	1.8%	4.1%	4.8%	5.6%
Poor	7.3%	5.1%	5.5%	8.3%	5.5%	11.1%	12.6%
Fair	19.3%	18.8%	15.0%	17.2%	22.5%	25.7%	28.6%
Good	45.4%	47.1%	47.0%	45.0%	46.5%	42.6%	39.6%
Excellent	25.7%	28.4%	31.4%	27.7%	21.5%	15.7%	13.6%
#observations	5424	887	1565	1300	641	619	412
		<i>1998</i>					
Very poor	3.0%	1.1%	2.0%	2.9%	3.3%	4.4%	8.2%
Poor	8.7%	6.3%	6.7%	8.4%	9.7%	12.2%	15.1%
Fair	22.3%	16.9%	18.4%	22.2%	26.1%	28.6%	33.0%
Good	47.0%	52.8%	49.0%	47.6%	45.2%	43.8%	34.3%
Excellent	19.0%	23.0%	23.9%	18.9%	15.6%	11.0%	9.4%
#observations	5848	944	1743	1392	639	608	522

Table 4 Prevalence of health problems and disabilities 1991-1998, men

	<i>All</i>	<i>Age</i>					
		≤ 25	25 - 40	40 - 55	55 - 65	65 - 75	75 >
		<i>1991</i>					
Problems with arms, legs, etc.	0.208	0.081	0.140	0.223	0.345	0.362	0.394
Difficulty in seeing	0.068	0.049	0.036	0.068	0.081	0.108	0.216
Difficulty in hearing	0.088	0.022	0.034	0.075	0.138	0.210	0.377
Skin conditions, allergies	0.078	0.102	0.087	0.065	0.053	0.072	0.068
Chest, breathing problems	0.105	0.109	0.089	0.065	0.117	0.197	0.170
Heart, blood	0.108	0.009	0.030	0.105	0.224	0.320	0.275
Stomach, liver, kidney	0.053	0.020	0.043	0.051	0.089	0.110	0.055
Diabetes	0.019	0.002	0.006	0.017	0.037	0.049	0.081
Nerves, anxiety, depression	0.033	0.014	0.028	0.035	0.047	0.055	0.047
Alcohol, drugs	0.005	0.006	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.002	0.013
Epilepsy	0.007	0.012	0.006	0.006	0.004	0.006	0.013
Migraine, chronic headaches	0.043	0.037	0.052	0.047	0.037	0.032	0.021
Other	0.034	0.024	0.023	0.029	0.049	0.045	0.106
		<i>1998</i>					
Problems with arms, legs, etc.	0.255	0.080	0.163	0.280	0.420	0.443	0.522
Difficulty in seeing	0.044	0.021	0.023	0.039	0.041	0.085	0.179
Difficulty in hearing	0.097	0.021	0.034	0.077	0.166	0.228	0.388
Skin conditions, allergies	0.100	0.101	0.117	0.091	0.088	0.098	0.065
Chest, breathing problems	0.131	0.109	0.106	0.097	0.164	0.224	0.241
Heart, blood	0.135	0.006	0.034	0.118	0.295	0.396	0.375
Stomach, liver, kidney	0.066	0.015	0.047	0.089	0.086	0.112	0.117
Diabetes	0.029	0.007	0.012	0.023	0.049	0.085	0.072
Nerves, anxiety, depression	0.050	0.023	0.049	0.057	0.071	0.053	0.055
Alcohol, drugs	0.007	0.007	0.008	0.006	0.007	0.006	0.000

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

Epilepsy	0.007	0.009	0.012	0.002	0.007	0.002	0.007
Migraine, chronic headaches	0.047	0.033	0.056	0.053	0.032	0.053	0.031
Other	0.042	0.021	0.023	0.046	0.062	0.079	0.093

For Peer Review

Table 5 Prevalence of health problems and disabilities 1991-1998, women

	<i>All</i>	<i>Age</i>					
		≤ 25	25 - 40	40 - 55	55 - 65	65 - 75	75 >
		<i>1991</i>					
Problems with arms, legs, etc.	0.249	0.083	0.102	0.274	0.395	0.459	0.542
Difficulty in seeing	0.078	0.046	0.035	0.062	0.080	0.137	0.264
Difficulty in hearing	0.067	0.026	0.021	0.038	0.081	0.141	0.283
Skin conditions, allergies	0.124	0.190	0.160	0.104	0.086	0.058	0.075
Chest, breathing problems	0.103	0.093	0.082	0.081	0.122	0.150	0.170
Heart, blood	0.126	0.037	0.035	0.090	0.217	0.343	0.310
Stomach, liver, kidney	0.057	0.037	0.044	0.058	0.073	0.073	0.097
Diabetes	0.016	0.003	0.004	0.012	0.038	0.029	0.046
Nerves, anxiety, depression	0.068	0.037	0.062	0.075	0.078	0.092	0.087
Alcohol, drugs	0.003	0.002	0.006	0.002	0.003	0.000	0.002
Epilepsy	0.007	0.012	0.005	0.009	0.006	0.002	0.000
Migraine, chronic headaches	0.109	0.118	0.127	0.131	0.105	0.061	0.029
Other	0.065	0.042	0.043	0.078	0.075	0.092	0.099
		<i>1998</i>					
Problems with arms, legs, etc.	0.313	0.086	0.169	0.301	0.518	0.591	0.661
Difficulty in seeing	0.055	0.015	0.024	0.028	0.075	0.095	0.232
Difficulty in hearing	0.074	0.028	0.025	0.047	0.075	0.158	0.293
Skin conditions, allergies	0.151	0.195	0.182	0.142	0.105	0.110	0.096
Chest, breathing problems	0.142	0.162	0.122	0.108	0.147	0.202	0.190
Heart, blood	0.163	0.028	0.044	0.132	0.265	0.425	0.458
Stomach, liver, kidney	0.087	0.045	0.063	0.076	0.122	0.151	0.157
Diabetes	0.026	0.009	0.009	0.019	0.041	0.074	0.061
Nerves, anxiety, depression	0.105	0.050	0.100	0.125	0.124	0.117	0.132
Alcohol, drugs	0.003	0.005	0.002	0.005	0.002	0.002	0.000

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

Epilepsy	0.009	0.013	0.010	0.011	0.003	0.007	0.000
Migraine, chronic headaches	0.131	0.143	0.149	0.152	0.106	0.099	0.056
Other	0.070	0.033	0.058	0.073	0.085	0.097	0.119

For Peer Review

Table 6 Parameter estimates health status men, 1991-1998 (standard errors in brackets)

	<i>All</i>	<i>Age</i>					
		≤ 25	25 - 40	40 - 55	55 - 65	65 - 75	75 >
<i>1991</i>							
<i>Health problems and disabilities</i>							
Problems with arms, legs, etc.	-0.691 (0.041)	-0.664 (0.135)	-0.603 (0.084)	-0.783 (0.079)	-0.690 (0.101)	-0.652 (0.111)	-0.765 (0.153)
Difficulty in seeing	-0.396 (0.064)	-0.058 (0.173)	-0.177 (0.159)	-0.366 (0.129)	-0.528 (0.170)	-0.607 (0.165)	-0.590 (0.190)
Difficulty in hearing	-0.091 (0.058)	-0.365 (0.251)	-0.226 (0.162)	-0.191 (0.123)	-0.053 (0.135)	0.158 (0.127)	-0.207 (0.155)
Skin conditions, allergies	-0.045 (0.060)	-0.065 (0.123)	0.142 (0.107)	-0.059 (0.132)	-0.222 (0.207)	-0.374 (0.200)	-0.016 (0.291)
Chest, breathing problems	-0.795 (0.052)	-0.816 (0.121)	-0.703 (0.102)	-0.857 (0.132)	-0.830 (0.150)	-1.044 (0.135)	-0.832 (0.196)
Heart, blood	-0.726 (0.054)	-1.474 (0.395)	-0.544 (0.172)	-0.904 (0.106)	-0.791 (0.115)	-0.886 (0.116)	-0.265 (0.164)
Stomach, liver, kidney	-0.689 (0.070)	-0.749 (0.267)	-0.770 (0.142)	-0.513 (0.146)	-0.853 (0.170)	-0.648 (0.166)	-1.004 (0.315)
Diabetes	-0.914 (0.114)	-0.897 (0.795)	-1.354 (0.391)	-1.011 (0.245)	-1.001 (0.250)	-1.014 (0.240)	-0.561 (0.265)
Nerves, anxiety, depression	-0.882 (0.088)	-1.002 (0.317)	-1.150 (0.177)	-0.734 (0.173)	-1.039 (0.222)	-0.568 (0.230)	-0.903 (0.338)
Alcohol, drugs	-0.364 (0.218)	1.563 (0.629)	-1.246 (0.411)	-0.707 (0.450)	-0.629 (0.644)	-	-0.019 (0.687)
Epilepsy	-0.993 (0.184)	-0.551 (0.333)	-1.370 (0.381)	-0.956 (0.405)	-1.056 (0.795)	-1.316 (0.638)	-1.455 (0.694)
Migraine, chronic headaches	-0.241 (0.078)	-0.052 (0.195)	-0.320 (0.132)	-0.240 (0.152)	-0.299 (0.247)	-0.479 (0.297)	0.342 (0.503)
Other	-0.848 (0.086)	-0.927 (0.236)	-0.731 (0.195)	-0.875 (0.189)	-0.684 (0.216)	-1.276 (0.250)	-0.916 (0.237)
<i>Other control variables</i>							
Years of education	0.039 (0.006)	0.015 (0.024)	0.032 (0.010)	0.040 (0.011)	0.035 (0.018)	0.057 (0.016)	0.074 (0.032)
Age	0.001 (0.001)	0.041 (0.015)	-0.012 (0.007)	0.011 (0.009)	0.025 (0.017)	0.007 (0.019)	0.019 (0.021)
Married	0.108 (0.040)	-0.123 (0.119)	0.091 (0.080)	0.063 (0.100)	0.513 (0.121)	0.271 (0.124)	0.031 (0.153)
Number of dependent children	-0.034 (0.020)	-0.032 (0.089)	-0.032 (0.030)	0.013 (0.039)	0.094 (0.258)	-0.099 (0.449)	-
Country of birth	-0.179 (0.081)	-0.219 (0.192)	-0.074 (0.131)	-0.185 (0.166)	-0.544 (0.251)	0.172 (0.378)	-0.502 (0.626)

Location parameters

α_1	-2.577	-2.272	-2.940	-2.030	-1.205	-2.178	-0.714
	(0.099)	(0.376)	(0.291)	(0.451)	(1.062)	(1.344)	(1.697)
α_2	-1.787	-1.377	-2.314	-1.211	-0.175	-1.296	0.010
	(0.089)	(0.332)	(0.277)	(0.443)	(1.056)	(1.339)	(1.695)
α_3	-0.779	-0.226	-1.303	-0.300	0.861	-0.021	0.866
	(0.085)	(0.324)	(0.270)	(0.441)	(1.056)	(1.337)	(1.696)
α_4	0.632	1.118	0.198	1.095	2.281	1.459	2.331
	(0.085)	(0.325)	(0.268)	(0.441)	(1.058)	(1.339)	(1.699)
Number of observations	4814	911	1448	1177	571	471	236
- Loglikelihood	4376.5	622.3	1276.1	1095.5	548.3	483.0	276.0
Pseudo R ²	0.285	0.165	0.197	0.279	0.408	0.426	0.357
			1998				
Problems with arms, legs, etc.	-0.676	-0.744	-0.782	-0.739	-0.726	-0.387	-0.644
	(0.039)	(0.136)	(0.078)	(0.073)	(0.105)	(0.103)	(0.135)
Difficulty in seeing	-0.260	0.088	-0.167	-0.604	-0.078	-0.363	-0.161
	(0.078)	(0.262)	(0.193)	(0.165)	(0.240)	(0.186)	(0.175)
Difficulty in hearing	-0.132	-0.482	-0.210	-0.288	-0.092	-0.043	-0.081
	(0.055)	(0.256)	(0.154)	(0.118)	(0.132)	(0.118)	(0.135)
Skin conditions, allergies	0.044	-0.206	0.009	0.164	-0.048	-0.016	0.223
	(0.052)	(0.125)	(0.089)	(0.113)	(0.167)	(0.168)	(0.269)
Chest, breathing problems	-0.663	-0.301	-0.758	-0.711	-0.827	-0.658	-0.839
	(0.047)	(0.120)	(0.093)	(0.110)	(0.131)	(0.122)	(0.156)
Heart, blood	-0.692	-1.114	-0.937	-0.670	-0.751	-0.667	-0.524
	(0.050)	(0.486)	(0.161)	(0.101)	(0.106)	(0.103)	(0.138)
Stomach, liver, kidney	-0.793	-1.782	-0.949	-0.715	-0.789	-0.638	-0.557
	(0.064)	(0.315)	(0.136)	(0.114)	(0.171)	(0.159)	(0.211)
Diabetes	-0.492	-0.713	-0.816	-0.549	-0.517	-0.252	-0.548
	(0.095)	(0.444)	(0.260)	(0.215)	(0.227)	(0.180)	(0.253)
Nerves, anxiety, depression	-0.812	-1.353	-0.759	-1.063	-0.575	-0.669	-0.243
	(0.074)	(0.249)	(0.137)	(0.145)	(0.195)	(0.231)	(0.288)
Alcohol, drugs	-0.652	-1.456	-1.020	-0.241	0.295	0.075	-
	(0.196)	(0.443)	(0.313)	(0.421)	(0.665)	(0.666)	
Epilepsy	-0.420	-0.179	-0.377	0.006	-0.242	-1.073	-
	(0.179)	(0.393)	(0.252)	(0.645)	(0.549)	(1.111)	
Migraine, chronic headaches	-0.301	-0.312	-0.408	-0.255	-0.293	-0.244	0.511
	(0.073)	(0.206)	(0.123)	(0.141)	(0.267)	(0.220)	(0.380)
Other	-0.946	-0.497	-1.226	-1.072	-0.911	-0.733	-0.818
	(0.077)	(0.254)	(0.190)	(0.154)	(0.192)	(0.185)	(0.222)
<i>Other control variables</i>							
Years of education	0.017	0.087	-0.001	0.017	0.022	0.021	0.005
	(0.006)	(0.039)	(0.013)	(0.011)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.023)
Age	0.002	0.032	0.009	0.026	-0.006	0.013	0.031
	(0.001)	(0.014)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Married	0.079	0.002	0.083	0.117	0.064	0.142	-0.027
	(0.038)	(0.115)	(0.076)	(0.087)	(0.129)	(0.112)	(0.141)

Number of dependent children	-0.006 (0.018)	-0.131 (0.110)	-0.037 (0.027)	0.039 (0.036)	0.072 (0.118)	-0.187 (0.481)	-
Country of birth	-0.238 (0.633)	-0.023 (1.100)	-0.130 (0.786)	-	-	-	-
<i>Location parameters</i>							
α_1	-2.815 (0.102)	-1.859 (0.541)	-3.141 (0.288)	-1.621 (0.426)	-3.380 (0.987)	-1.733 (1.215)	-0.446 (1.385)
α_2	-1.830 (0.091)	-0.519 (0.494)	-1.985 (0.259)	-0.652 (0.418)	-2.371 (0.980)	-0.949 (1.212)	0.609 (1.380)
α_3	-0.829 (0.087)	0.509 (0.491)	-0.934 (0.254)	0.235 (0.417)	-1.277 (0.977)	0.221 (1.211)	1.587 (1.381)
α_4	0.663 (0.087)	2.017 (0.494)	0.584 (0.253)	1.781 (0.419)	0.227 (0.976)	1.681 (1.213)	3.086 (1.389)
Number of observations	5043	897	1543	1242	564	506	291
- Loglikelihood	4654.1	-500.8	1350.7	1229.5	580.5	565.4	349.8
Pseudo R ²	0.327	0.178	0.283	0.367	0.412	0.338	0.333

Table 7 Parameter estimates health status women, 1991-1998 (standard errors in brackets)

	<i>All</i>		<i>Age</i>				
		≤ 25	25 - 40	40 - 55	55 - 65	65 - 75	75 >
	1991						
<i>Health problems and disabilities</i>							
Problems with arms, legs, etc.	-0.681 (0.038)	-0.545 (0.137)	-0.843 (0.093)	-0.686 (0.073)	-0.666 (0.093)	-0.744 (0.094)	-0.480 (0.112)
Difficulty in seeing	-0.227 (0.057)	-0.036 (0.180)	-0.290 (0.151)	-0.275 (0.128)	-0.250 (0.162)	-0.197 (0.129)	-0.150 (0.126)
Difficulty in hearing	-0.197 (0.062)	-0.439 (0.234)	-0.389 (0.194)	-0.321 (0.157)	-0.133 (0.161)	-0.019 (0.128)	-0.135 (0.123)
Skin conditions, allergies	-0.114 (0.046)	-0.094 (0.097)	-0.120 (0.077)	-0.050 (0.102)	-0.086 (0.158)	-0.245 (0.192)	-0.248 (0.206)
Chest, breathing problems	-0.812 (0.050)	-1.071 (0.131)	-0.641 (0.102)	-0.812 (0.114)	-1.180 (0.140)	-0.839 (0.127)	-0.503 (0.144)
Heart, blood	-0.642 (0.047)	-0.992 (0.198)	-0.528 (0.151)	-0.781 (0.107)	-0.622 (0.108)	-0.601 (0.094)	-0.517 (0.119)
Stomach, liver, kidney	-0.789 (0.064)	-0.833 (0.198)	-0.925 (0.135)	-0.951 (0.132)	-0.678 (0.170)	-0.430 (0.170)	-0.802 (0.181)
Diabetes	-0.906 (0.118)	-0.947 (0.631)	-1.704 (0.452)	-1.121 (0.273)	-0.717 (0.233)	-0.629 (0.260)	-0.983 (0.257)
Nerves, anxiety, depression	-0.829 (0.059)	-1.069 (0.199)	-1.040 (0.117)	-0.788 (0.117)	-0.575 (0.165)	-0.641 (0.154)	-0.876 (0.191)
Alcohol, drugs	-0.642 (0.262)	-0.940 (0.779)	-0.562 (0.348)	-0.321 (0.770)	-1.404 (0.773)	-	-
Epilepsy	-0.995 (0.182)	-1.346 (0.332)	-1.275 (0.379)	-0.822 (0.326)	-0.894 (0.549)	-0.240 (1.075)	-
Migraine, chronic headaches	-0.299 (0.048)	-0.421 (0.117)	-0.202 (0.084)	-0.267 (0.091)	-0.654 (0.144)	-0.206 (0.182)	-0.265 (0.313)
Other	-0.843 (0.060)	-0.831 (0.188)	-0.994 (0.136)	-0.848 (0.113)	-0.662 (0.167)	-0.897 (0.153)	-0.699 (0.180)
<i>Health problems and disabilities</i>							
Years of education	0.036 (0.006)	0.045 (0.024)	0.016 (0.009)	0.042 (0.011)	0.050 (0.018)	0.054 (0.020)	0.036 (0.024)
Age	0.003 (0.001)	0.029 (0.016)	0.017 (0.007)	-0.006 (0.008)	0.035 (0.016)	-0.011 (0.016)	0.010 (0.014)
Married	0.002 (0.032)	-0.165 (0.091)	-0.002 (0.070)	0.013 (0.080)	0.060 (0.098)	-0.095 (0.090)	-0.188 (0.136)
Number of dependent children	-0.023 (0.017)	-0.103 (0.062)	-0.039 (0.025)	-0.051 (0.046)	0.168 (0.797)	-	-
Country of birth	-0.043 (0.079)	0.357 (0.238)	0.153 (0.119)	-0.481 (0.164)	-0.703 (0.255)	0.314 (0.326)	0.882 (0.543)

Location parameters

α_1	-2.623	-2.705	-2.543	-3.180	-0.486	-3.353	-1.638
	(0.099)	(0.396)	(0.276)	(0.441)	(0.985)	(1.152)	(1.113)
α_2	-1.722	-1.338	-1.471	-2.092	0.101	-2.530	-0.846
	(0.091)	(0.344)	(0.255)	(0.430)	(0.983)	(1.149)	(1.110)
α_3	-0.741	-0.139	-0.551	-1.179	1.251	-1.520	0.148
	(0.088)	(0.337)	(0.251)	(0.427)	(0.983)	(1.146)	(1.109)
α_4	0.720	1.354	0.908	0.295	2.851	0.021	1.515
	(0.088)	(0.339)	(0.252)	(0.427)	(0.986)	(1.145)	(1.111)
Number of observations	5409	885	1558	1298	640	617	411
- Loglikelihood	5323.1	708.5	1359.5	1131.4	621.3	664.6	472.9
Pseudo R ²	0.313	0.292	0.250	0.332	0.379	0.349	0.261
			1998				
Problems with arms, legs, etc.	-0.620	-0.563	-0.589	-0.810	-0.692	-0.386	-0.606
	(0.035)	(0.131)	(0.073)	(0.069)	(0.093)	(0.096)	(0.104)
Difficulty in seeing	-0.131	-1.077	-0.173	-0.212	-0.010	-0.178	0.144
	(0.065)	(0.297)	(0.176)	(0.185)	(0.172)	(0.155)	(0.117)
Difficulty in hearing	-0.175	-0.009	-0.375	-0.162	-0.182	-0.035	-0.157
	(0.057)	(0.223)	(0.169)	(0.140)	(0.167)	(0.126)	(0.106)
Skin conditions, allergies	-0.110	-0.061	-0.172	0.060	-0.123	-0.123	-0.416
	(0.041)	(0.094)	(0.070)	(0.087)	(0.145)	(0.147)	(0.164)
Chest, breathing problems	-0.589	-0.602	-0.322	-0.713	-0.925	-0.518	-0.915
	(0.042)	(0.101)	(0.082)	(0.099)	(0.129)	(0.113)	(0.126)
Heart, blood	-0.442	-0.380	-0.534	-0.560	-0.459	-0.420	-0.391
	(0.043)	(0.222)	(0.130)	(0.090)	(0.102)	(0.093)	(0.098)
Stomach, liver, kidney	-0.622	-1.352	-0.893	-0.485	-0.361	-0.589	-0.430
	(0.052)	(0.179)	(0.112)	(0.115)	(0.136)	(0.131)	(0.136)
Diabetes	-0.545	-0.801	-0.741	-0.767	-0.555	-0.603	-0.150
	(0.091)	(0.386)	(0.278)	(0.226)	(0.228)	(0.173)	(0.198)
Nerves, anxiety, depression	-0.884	-0.756	-1.010	-0.982	-1.006	-0.865	-0.533
	(0.049)	(0.170)	(0.093)	(0.095)	(0.138)	(0.146)	(0.147)
Alcohol, drugs	-0.928	-1.178	-1.733	-0.805	-0.411	1.050	-
	(0.267)	(0.500)	(0.855)	(0.416)	(1.112)	(1.100)	
Epilepsy	-1.062	-1.185	-1.494	-0.655	-0.182	-0.949	-
	(0.155)	(0.320)	(0.262)	(0.290)	(0.768)	(0.551)	
Migraine, chronic headaches	-0.210	-0.243	-0.270	-0.198	-0.044	-0.109	-0.333
	(0.043)	(0.107)	(0.076)	(0.083)	(0.143)	(0.154)	(0.213)
Other	-0.809	-1.231	-0.966	-0.726	-0.727	-0.681	-0.726
	(0.057)	(0.203)	(0.114)	(0.114)	(0.157)	(0.152)	(0.149)
<i>Other control variables</i>							
Years of education	0.029	0.045	0.027	0.014	0.056	0.022	0.051
	(0.006)	(0.042)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.022)	(0.019)	(0.021)
Age	0.001	0.040	0.001	0.007	-0.005	-0.028	-0.024
	(0.001)	(0.015)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.011)
Married	-0.005	-0.093	0.067	-0.145	0.063	-0.119	-0.181
	(0.030)	(0.088)	(0.063)	(0.073)	(0.097)	(0.091)	(0.120)

Number of dependent children	-0.003 (0.016)	-0.021 (0.066)	-0.023 (0.023)	0.053 (0.043)	-0.254 (0.561)	-	-
Country of birth	-0.176 (0.448)	-0.318 (0.786)	0.661 (0.823)	-0.626 (0.766)	-	-	-
<i>Location parameters</i>							
α_1	-2.738 (0.099)	-2.104 (0.546)	-2.795 (0.265)	-2.827 (0.419)	-3.034 (0.985)	-4.776 (1.180)	-4.250 (0.932)
α_2	-1.801 (0.092)	-0.835 (0.525)	-1.795 (0.251)	-1.857 (0.411)	-2.088 (0.979)	-3.849 (1.175)	-3.422 (0.928)
α_3	-0.766 (0.090)	0.125 (0.523)	-0.795 (0.247)	-0.751 (0.408)	-0.929 (0.977)	-2.768 (1.171)	-2.316 (0.924)
α_4	0.800 (0.090)	1.779 (0.525)	0.765 (0.247)	0.868 (0.409)	0.707 (0.976)	-1.147 (1.168)	-0.905 (0.920)
Number of observations	5845	944	1742	1390	639	608	522
- Loglikelihood	5807.0	659.3	1705.1	1382.4	648.6	654.9	606.3
Pseudo R ²	0.342	0.268	0.309	0.377	0.387	0.331	0.338

Table 8 QALY weights by age group, 1991-1998

	<i>All</i>	<i>Age group</i>					
		<i>25 or younger</i>	<i>25 - 40</i>	<i>40 - 55</i>	<i>55 - 65</i>	<i>65 - 75</i>	<i>Older than 75</i>
		<i>Men</i>					
1991	0.818	0.889	0.858	0.825	0.760	0.670	0.663
1998	0.753	0.831	0.812	0.755	0.671	0.617	0.579
		<i>Women</i>					
1991	0.757	0.826	0.831	0.781	0.693	0.619	0.593
1998	0.691	0.775	0.755	0.694	0.650	0.587	0.514

For Peer Review

Table 9 Quality adjusted life expectancy in years by gender and age, 1991-1998

	<i>At birth</i>	<i>At age</i>					
		20	30	50	60	70	80
		<i>Men</i>					
1991	60.6	43.5	39.3	19.1	12.3	7.4	4.2
1998	57.0	40.9	37.0	18.0	11.8	7.1	3.9
		<i>Women</i>					
1991	60.1	41.8	40.1	26.5	13.8	8.6	4.9
1998	55.4	40.3	36.9	19.1	13.0	7.9	4.3

For Peer Review