



INTEGRATING SOCIO-ECONOMIC DETERMINANTS

of Canadian Women's Health*

Bilkis Vissandjee (School of Nursing, University of Montreal); Marie DesMeules (Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, PPHB, Health Canada); Zhenyuan Cao (Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, PPHB, Health Canada); and Shelly Abdool (School of Nursing, University of Montreal)

Background

The association between socio-economic determinants and health has been amply demonstrated in Canada and elsewhere [1–7, 8–9] with the socio-economically better off generally performing better on most measures of health status, including self-reported health. Studies examining differences between women and men in the relation between socio-economic status (SES) and mortality/morbidity have directed attention to socio-economic gradients in health as one potential explanation for gender differences in health. In addition, over the past few decades, women's increased labour force participation, their access to higher education and an evolving family structure have altered social roles considerably. Therefore, the pattern of disparities in health among women and men may have also been modified in concert with these social changes. [6, 24–26] This is well outlined in the chapter of this report entitled “The Social Context of Women's Health.”

In addition to Walters, [7] Macintyre and Hunt [4] point out that in the field of socio-economic inequalities in health, there is a need to examine the specific nature of gender biases, including the way in which social classifications were developed for women and for men (e.g. assessing whether marital and parental roles were accounted for in a gender-sensitive manner). [14, 27–32] Taking a variety of socio-economic determinants into account, a number of chapters in this report demonstrate the relation between sex and gender and health outcomes, ranging from personal health practices (e.g. smoking behaviour) to depression, cardiovascular disease, fertility, medication use and mortality. These results present additional evidence for the existence of socio-economic gradients among women and men in a range of health measures and raise additional questions regarding the specific patterns of these socio-economic gradients in health.

* The views expressed in this report do not necessarily represent the views of the Canadian Population Health Initiative, the Canadian Institute for Health Information or Health Canada.



Extensive discussions of potential advantages and disadvantages of the measurement of socio-economic position in relation to health have been presented in excellent reviews by Liberatos et al, [42] Krieger et al, [13] Lynch and Kaplan [8] and Berkman and MacIntyre. [43] A number of other studies in Britain, Finland, the United States and Canada have further explored the differential contribution of socio-economic determinants in explaining differences among women and men. [7, 44–48] A key issue is whether the association between one socio-economic determinant (e.g. income) and health is entirely or partly explained by other socio-economic determinants (e.g. employment status and education). For instance, it is known that education, occupation and employment status influence both income and health, but the direction of the relation between income and health is not always clear-cut. [32–34] Both a causal and reverse relation are possible in this case, which points to the need for improved methods of data collection and analyses to address this issue. [35–38] A number of investigators have demonstrated the ill effects on health of poverty and other adverse conditions, such as income inequality, unemployment, job insecurity, lack of social support, social discrimination/exclusion and harmful personal health practices. [18–23]

With respect to the international perspective, Moss [49] highlights the priority of examining socio-economic determinants of women's and men's health. She argues that, in the decades between 1973 and 1993, there have been periods of striking growth in developed nations paralleled by increasing socio-economic disparities in health. It has been postulated that societies with high levels of inequality in the distribution of income also have larger health status differences associated with income, measured at either the individual or household level. [31–34] Even after adjustment for several socio-economic determinants, such as employment status, education, social class and housing, [36, 37, 39–41] an inverse relation has been reported between income and 1) health, [34–36] 2) mortality [37, 38] (see the chapter entitled “Mortality, Life and Health Expectancy of Canadian Women” in this report), 3) morbidity [33, 40, 46] and 4) self-perceived health status. [41, 44, 50, 51]

Krieger et al, [3, 13] as well as Macintyre and Hunt, [4, 14] employ the term “socio-economic position” to refer to the social and economic determinants that influence what position(s) women, men and groups hold within the structure of society. These determinants, which are thought to be good indicators of social location of women and men, were shown to have an influence on health and its perceptions by a specific individual. [8, 10–13] Women and men may 1) be differentially exposed to a variety of health risks, 2) be differentially vulnerable to various features of the physical and social environment and 3) have differential access to various resources and support systems. Therefore, it is important to gain a better understanding of gender-sensitive pathways (biological and social) associated with specific health outcomes.

Other mechanisms by which gender inequalities in health can occur have been outlined by Diderichsen. [73] His framework delineates four main mechanisms—social stratification, differential exposure, differential susceptibility and differential consequences. Frank suggests adding to these mechanisms a more distal mechanism by which health inequality occurs in a diverse group—that is, the differential “cultures” of symptom expression/reporting, as, for example, may well be the case for women and men’s tendencies to report outcomes such as health, pain and some chronic diseases. [74] Lastly, in order to advance the understanding of this area, it is vitally important to develop an optimized set of gender-sensitive indicators that can be practically applied to study such questions. [3, 14–17]

Perceived health incorporates a variety of physical, cultural and emotional components of health, which, taken together, comprise individual “healthiness.” [49] As a broad indicator of health-related well-being, self-assessment of health has been extensively used within epidemiological and sociological studies and is recognized as being a robust measure of health status. [16, 17, 33, 44] A simple question is often used to assess the respondent’s own health as being “excellent, very good, good, fair or poor, compared to other persons their own age.” [51–56] Although such a subjective measure cannot precisely reflect every dimension of health in every population and may not be as reliable as some other more complex indices, it is nonetheless considered an adequate and powerful measure of global health. [16, 50–52] Studies based on surveys that assessed self-reported health and chronic conditions, as well as results from a number of chapters included in this report, show that health perception varies among women and men according to a number of individual characteristics. [53–56] Moreover, a World Health Organization (WHO) report has recently recommended the use of self-perceived health measures for comparative purposes between women and men. [56]

Accordingly, this chapter investigates the association between selected socio-economic determinants of health and two specific self-reported outcomes among women and men: (a) self-perceived health and (b) self-reports of chronic conditions. These new analyses provide gender-relevant and gender-sensitive information, not previously reported, on the relation between socio-economic status and health among women and men.

Methods

Data Sources and Measures

Cross-sectional data from the Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS)—Cycle 1.1 (2000–2001) were analyzed for the purposes of this chapter. The CCHS is a repeated, cross-sectional, household-level survey that effectively replaces the cross-sectional component of the National Population Health Survey (NPHS). The total sample comprised 125,574 individuals aged 12 years and older at the time of data collection. The sample used for the purpose of this chapter included women and men aged 18 to 65 years old and over. Accounting for the complex sample design and using the CCHS integrated weighting strategies, [58] it is expected that the final results could be generalized to the entire Canadian population.



Dependent Variables

1. Self-rated health: respondents assessed their health as excellent, very good, good, fair or poor; in order to assess the profile of the more vulnerable populations, excellent, very good and good health ratings were combined into one group and fair and poor health ratings into another, which is referred to hereafter as “poor-rated health”; and
2. Self-reported chronic conditions were assessed on a dichotomous scale, as one or more, or no (yes or no) chronic conditions (see Box 1).

Independent Variables

1. *Age*—four continuous age groups were selected to reflect different periods across the lifespan and workforce participation: 18 to 34, 35 to 44, 45 to 64, 65+;
2. *Family structure*—four categories: single without child, partner without child, single with child and partner with child;
3. *Educational attainment*—four categories of the highest level of education attained by the respondent: less than secondary school, secondary school, some postsecondary school and postsecondary school;
4. *Income adequacy*—four categories: lowest income quartile, lower middle-income quartile, upper middle-income quartile, highest income quartile;
5. *Food insecurity*—a dichotomous variable asking whether the respondent had had some food insecurity in the previous 12 months;
6. *Dwelling type*—four categories of the current type of dwelling of the respondent at the time of the survey: detached house, semi-detached/townhouse, apartment and self-reported insecure dwelling (the latter variable included self-reports of living in an institution, a mobile home, or some form of collective dwelling); and
7. *Employment status*—a categorical variable based on the respondent's main activity in the previous 12 months and comprising five categories: self-employed (full and part-time), employed full-time, employed part-time, student and homemaker as well as a category named “other” for those who did not see themselves as fitting into any of the other categories.

Statistical Analysis

Frequency procedures were used to create tables and calculate the prevalence estimates for each determinant. In accordance with Statistics Canada's guidelines, estimates that were based on a sample of fewer than 30 were deemed unreliable and were suppressed. Because socio-economic position has been shown to be associated with gender disparities in health, sex-specific logistic regression models were set up for multivariate analysis to evaluate the effects of covariates on the assessment of self-perceived health and the reported presence of chronic conditions. Statistical significance is expressed as 95% confidence intervals (CI). Confidence intervals for weighted estimates were calculated using the bootstrap method.

Results

Based on the selected socio-economic determinants of health, the descriptive picture demonstrated by this CCHS dataset shows that 10% of men aged 65 and over reported low income versus 23% of women within the same age bracket. In addition, 40% of men versus only 33% of women between the ages of 45 and 64 reported high income. While it is not possible to assess whether the respondent owned the dwelling in which he/she lived at the time of the survey, of those aged 65 and over, 67% of men versus 57% of women reported living in a detached house, and 19% of men versus 30% of women reported living in an apartment. There were no significant gender differences concerning reported food insecurity: a large majority of women and men in each age bracket denied any food insecurity within the 12 months preceding the survey (Exhibits 1 to 3).

As for employment status, 73% of men in the age bracket 18 to 34 reported full-time employment, versus 59% of women within the same age category. As age increased, the proportions of women and men reporting full-time employment decreased in all age groups, but with the overall proportions in full-time employment remaining higher for men. The proportions of men reporting self-employment (full and part-time) were also higher in all age groups (e.g. 22% of men versus 11% of women aged 45 to 64). Conversely, 12% of women aged 35 to 44 and 11% of women aged 45 to 64 reported part-time employment versus 2% and 3% of men respectively. Being a homemaker also highlighted the differences among women and men (7.0% of women versus 0.1% of men aged 18 to 34; 9.0% of women versus 0.3% of men aged 35 to 44) (Exhibit 4).

Reflecting the changing nature of women's roles and the increased access to education, the proportions of women and men within various age brackets across different categories of educational attainment were fairly similar. However, 22% of women aged 45 to 64 years reported having attained secondary school versus 17% of men in the same age bracket. On the other hand, the tendency is reversed for the attainment of a postsecondary degree (26% of women aged 65 and over versus 34% of men in the same age bracket) (Exhibit 5). These results may appear surprising because of the relatively high proportion of women and men in this age group reporting attainment of a postsecondary degree. A comparison with the general Canadian population based on Census Canada data (1996) [75] revealed that the CCHS proportions are indeed higher. This may be due to a stronger educational differential in the categories of people participating in the CCHS as opposed to the census. Of note is that if the category "some postsecondary education" is combined with the category "postsecondary degree," the combined proportions from CCHS for both sexes are more comparable with Census Canada regarding attainment of some postsecondary education without the full degree.

Lastly, in terms of family structure and possibly family support, a greater proportion of women aged 65 and over reported being single (either with or without a child). Among single-headed households in the age group of 35 to 44 years old, 12% of women versus only 3% of men reported living with one or more children (Exhibit 6).

The results of the logistic regression multivariate analyses are presented as odds ratios (OR) together with their 95% confidence intervals (CI) (Exhibits 7 and 8). Logistic regression analyses are useful for describing the simultaneous relation between a group of continuous and/or categorical independent variables and a dichotomous outcome variable, namely self-rated health and reports of chronic conditions. [68] The relative odds express the amount of increase in the outcome that would be produced by one unit increase in the independent variable. [68]

In order to avoid obscuring gender differences, as can occur when combining both sexes in multivariate models or age-adjusted health outcomes, [29, 36, 44, 49, 50] the models in these analyses were set up separately for women and men. Since a large number of variables were controlled for simultaneously (age and socio-economic position, including employment status, marital status, educational attainment, income adequacy, smoking status, dwelling security and food insecurity [17, 35, 38, 42, 43, 46, 57, 60]), it was deemed important to assess the stability of the model in order to rule out biased results due to multicollinearity. Pearson correlations were also performed. Coefficients demonstrated weak to moderate associations between each two given variables, indicating a fairly stable multivariate model.

The analyses, which are adjusted for age, smoking status [60] and the above-mentioned socio-economic determinants, demonstrated that women in the lowest income quartile (OR: 1.94; CI: 1.71, 2.20) and reporting lower educational attainment (OR: 1.89; CI: 1.71, 2.09) were significantly more likely to self-rate their health as poor. A gradient by educational attainment was shown for both women and men. Furthermore, there was a consistent pattern of inequality among women, in that the likelihood of reporting poorer health increased as income decreased; a similar pattern was found among men, although the magnitude of the gradient by SES appeared slightly larger among men.

Both women and men who lived with a partner and child/children were less likely to report poor health. However, taking into account other material circumstances, women living in an apartment or semi/townhouse were more likely to report poor health than those living in a detached house (OR: 1.28; CI: 1.15, 1.42 and OR: 1.22; CI: 1.09, 1.36 respectively), and women homemakers were more likely to report poor health than women who were employed full-time (OR: 1.28; CI: 1.04, 1.58). In contrast, the type of dwelling did not produce significant differences among men.



In keeping with the pattern of the associations between income and self-rated poor health, women in the lowest income quartile were also more likely to report chronic conditions (OR: 1.18; CI: 1.05, 1.32) than those in the highest quartile. Interestingly, women who reported upper-middle income were also more likely to report chronic conditions than those in the highest quartile (OR: 1.11; CI: 1.03, 1.19), and yet no significant associations were shown for lower-middle income women in this regard. In contrast, no significant patterns of association were found between income and reports of chronic conditions for men.

These multivariate ORs are smaller than what have usually been found in other studies. This may be because of the simultaneous adjustment of independent variables. It may also be related to what is well known: self-reported chronic conditions are frequently under-reported by women and men who belong to the lower income groups as a result of underutilization of health services. There may also be increased failure by clinicians to communicate diagnoses in understandable terms or by these patients to remember the diagnoses later.

Educational attainment showed an inconsistent pattern of associations with reported chronic conditions. Women who had completed secondary education were less likely to report chronic conditions than women who hold a postsecondary degree (OR: 0.91; CI: 0.84, 0.98); a similar pattern was observed for men. Unlike self-rated health, being a homemaker was associated with a lower likelihood of reporting chronic conditions (OR: 0.86; CI: 0.76, 0.97); however, women who were self-employed (OR: 1.12; CI: 1.01, 1.24) were more likely to report chronic conditions than women who were employed full-time. As for men, those who were self-employed were less likely than full-time employed men to report chronic conditions (OR: 0.91; CI: 0.84, 0.98).

Food insecurity was associated with a lower frequency of reported chronic conditions (OR: 0.88; CI: 0.77, 0.99, and OR: 0.86; CI: 0.76, 0.96, for women and men respectively), possibly because of the observed lower prevalence of obesity among respondents reporting food insecurity (data not shown). Other factors, such as under-reporting or under-detection among participants reporting food insecurities, may also be contributing to this observed association.

Lastly, both women (OR: 0.80; CI: 0.74, 0.87) and men (OR: 0.76; CI: 0.70, 0.82) who lived with a partner and child were less likely to report chronic conditions than those who lived with a partner but without a child. Women who were single and lived with a child were also less likely to report chronic conditions than those who lived with a partner but without a child (OR: 0.88; CI: 0.78, 0.98). Men who were single, be it with (OR: 0.72; CI: 0.62, 0.83) or without (OR: 0.82; CI: 0.76, 0.89) a child, were less likely to report chronic conditions than those living with a partner but without a child.

Discussion

Using a large Canadian dataset, the authors have attempted to increase understanding of differences among Canada's women and men in selected socio-economic determinants of health. Despite some limitations acknowledged below, a number of results are consistent with a population health perspective on the social determinants of health [7, 19, 45, 63, 67, 69] (see the chapter of this report entitled "The Social Context of Women's Health").

One limitation of the analysis is that the use of cross-sectional data makes it difficult to disentangle the direction of causality and thus limits the ability to exclude the potential for reverse causation. [4, 6, 7] Nonetheless, when determinants such as age, educational attainment, employment status and other material circumstances (e.g. dwelling type, food insecurity status) were adjusted for, the association between income and self-rated health remained statistically significant for both women and men, with a gradient observed. The shape of the association is mainly linear, with the likelihood of self-rated poor health increasing with movement down the income ladder. The association between income and self-reported chronic conditions also remained significant for women after adjusting for the above-mentioned factors, whereas this was not the case for men.

The descriptive portrait showed that fewer women than men reported high income and that fewer women were employed full-time. Given major differences in labour market experience, as well as the fact that women tend to occupy particular positions in the labour market, [13, 23, 26, 42, 43] the lack of a clear gradient in the employment status associations with self-rated health and self-reported chronic conditions might reflect gender differences in the measurement of socio-economic position rather than true differences in the association between the two selected health measures and socio-economic position for women and men. These results, which show variation among women and men in specific employment status categories, such as self-employment and being a homemaker, are consistent with results demonstrating that, in general, socio-economic determinants do vary for women and men and hence there may be a different pattern of exposure and experience among women and men. [4, 6, 8]

Another finding is that when income, employment status and other material circumstances, such as dwelling type and assessment of food insecurity, were adjusted for, together with age and smoking behaviour, the association between educational attainment and self-rated health remained statistically significant for both women and men. [4, 15, 18, 23, 29, 32, 33] The shape of the association is linear, with the likelihood of self-rated poor health increasing as one moves down the educational attainment ladder. The association between educational attainment and self-reported chronic conditions was inconsistent, which may be attributable to either measurement artefacts or to differential vulnerabilities among women and men. [4, 18, 32, 33] This is an area that needs to be further explored. [32, 36, 44]

With respect to family structure, results are mixed. For women, those who lived with a partner and a child were less likely to self-rate their health as poor than those who lived with a partner but without a child, and were also less likely to report chronic conditions. As for men, being single with or without a child made them less likely to report chronic conditions. These major differences in personal experience, the fact that single, unemployed or part-time employed women are more likely to experience financial difficulties and to report lower educational attainment might again reflect gender differences in the way socio-economic position is measured. [4, 6, 8, 13] With regard to men, these results may be explained by the fact that some men, such as those without families, may be systematically under-reporting the presence of chronic conditions. This is likely since, as mentioned in the chapter of this report entitled "Health Care Utilization by Canadian Women", single men are the least frequent users of health services. These results, which need to be interpreted with caution given the number of hypotheses that are tested, still confirm the fact that conventional measures of socio-economic position, such as employment status, educational attainment and household income, need to be assessed in a more gender-sensitive manner.

Despite the fact that it would increase the already high number of variables that need to be accounted for, it appears that more refined measures are necessary to account for social determinants such as domestic conditions, working conditions outside the home, access to resources inside and outside the home, access to opportunities or lack thereof, social participation/capital and resilience.

In sum, the results of the logistic regression models calculated for women and men on two outcome variables suggest that the selected socio-economic determinants used in this analysis are important for women and men in a differential manner. These results, while supporting other findings, [18, 19, 22, 23, 31, 33, 34, 38, 39, 62, 63] illustrate the need to refine social and economic characteristics used in surveys such as the CCHS so that they become more accurate predictors of health status, given that there are personal, cultural and environmental dimensions to take into account. A number of authors recognize that social gradients are not limited to income, education and employment status. [18, 19, 26, 35, 63, 69, 70] Research is being carried out focusing on the underlying mechanisms of gender inequalities in the distribution of health by socio-economic position with a view to obtaining a better grasp of these various relational and cross-cutting social determinants. [13, 41, 47, 49, 58, 59, 66, 71, 72] Researchers concerned with the intersection of gender and socio-economic position highlight the importance of establishing the gender appropriateness of a particular measure and the need for further refinements in these measures to include women and men in the analyses. [22, 23, 30, 36] For example, there are different occupational opportunities for women and men and conditions of work are as important to women as to men, even though women have been more closely linked to the domestic sphere. [41, 47, 50]



Data Gaps and Recommendations

When determinants such as age, educational attainment, employment status and other material circumstances (dwelling type, food insecurity status, etc.) were adjusted for, the association between income and self-rated health remained statistically significant for both women and men, with a gradient observed.

Because it was shown that socio-economic determinants of health are context-sensitive and evolve over time, the authors recommend that studies be designed to examine the complex temporal interactions between a variety of social and biological determinants of health over the life course. Examples include:

1. the ways in which socio-economic resources are acquired through training and lost through failing health across the life-course;
2. the differential in the responsibilities of women and men with respect to the care provided to both the very young and the very old;
3. accounting for other types of unpaid work and being a homemaker according to the differential experiences of men and women;
4. distinguishing between individual and household income, reflecting women's ability both to access this income and to have decision-making power to use it for individual and family health and well-being;
5. redefining family structure to include recomposed families and intergenerational households;
6. the need to increase the understanding of how gender-related variability (in the way that people "come to know," remember and report health outcomes, such as chronic conditions and perceptions of one's health) is culturally bound; and
7. the need to increase the understanding of the different ways males and females interpret and answer questions of self-rated health. In addition, it is important to understand the influence of potential mediating variables, such as depression, a condition known for its gender differences, on a particular gender's view and interpretation of health. For example, it may be that one gender has a more clinical approach to health, whereas the other has a more holistic view as to what makes up health. These views may be reflected in self-rated health measures.

In addition to new approaches in study design, the authors note that there is a need for different types of studies on health, including:

- longitudinal studies to assess the differential influence of social and economic determinants on women and men, which will allow temporal changes to be examined, and
- qualitative studies to complement the understanding of the gendered impacts of these complex determinants on women's and men's health.

Box 1: List of Self-Reported Chronic Conditions

CCCA_011 = HAS FOOD ALLERGIES?
 CCCA_021 = HAS ALLERGIES OTHER THAN FOOD ALLERGIES?
 CCCA_031 = HAS ASTHMA?
 CCCA_041 = HAS FIBROMYALGIA?
 CCCA_051 = HAS ARTHRITIS/RHEUMATISM?
 CCCA_05A = ATHRITIS/RHEUMATISM: KIND
 CCCA_061 = HAS BACK PROB. EXCL. FIBROMYALGIA/ARTHRITIS?
 CCCA_071 = HAS HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE?
 CCCA_081 = HAS MIGRAINE HEADACHES?
 CCCA_91A = HAS CHRONIC BRONCHITIS?
 CCCA_91B = HAS EMPHYSEMA/CHRONIC OBSTRUCT. PULM. DIS.?
 CCCA_101 = HAS DIABETES?
 CCCA_111 = HAS EPILEPSY?
 CCCA_121 = HAS HEART DISEASE?
 CCCA_12J = HEART DISEASE: HAS ANGINA?
 CCCA_12K = HEART DISEASE: CONGESTIVE HEART FAILURE?
 CCCA_131 = HAS CANCER?
 CCCA_141 = HAS STOMACH OR INTESTINAL ULCERS?
 CCCA_151 = SUFFERS FROM THE EFFECTS OF A STROKE?
 CCCA_161 = HAS URINARY INCONTINENCE?
 CCCA_171 = HAS A BOWEL DISORDER/CROHNS/COLITIS?
 CCCA_181 = HAS ALZHEIMERS DISEASE/OTHER DEMENTIA?
 CCCA_191 = HAS CATARACTS?
 CCCA_201 = HAS GLAUCOMA?
 CCCA_211 = HAS A THYROID CONDITION?
 CCCA_231 = HAS PARKINSONS DISEASE?
 CCCA_241 = HAS MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS?
 CCCA_251 = HAS CHRONIC FATIGUE SYNDROME?
 CCCA_261 = SUFFERS FROM MULT. CHEM. SENSITIVITIES?
 CCCA_221 = HAS ANY OTHER CHRONIC CONDITION?

References

1. Cohen M. Towards a framework for women's health. *Patient Education and Counselling* 1998; 33:187–96.
2. Kawachi I et al. Women's status and the health of women and men: a view from the States. *Soc Sci Med* 1999; 48:21–32.
3. Krieger N, Zierler S. Accounting for health of women. *Current Issues in Public Health* 1995; 1:251–56.
4. Macintyre S, Hunt K. Socio-economic position, gender and health: How do they interact? *J Health Psychol* 1997; 2:315–34.
5. Wilkinson RG. The need for an interdisciplinary perspective on the social determinants of health. *Health Econ* 2000; 9:581–83.
6. Arber S, Khlat M. Introduction to “social and economic patterning of women's health in a changing world”. *Soc Sci Med* 2002; 54:643–47.
7. Walters V, McDonough P, Strohschein L. The influence of work, household structure, and social, personal and material resources on gender differences in health: an analysis of the 1994 Canadian National Population Health Survey. *Soc Sci Med* 2002; 54:677–92.
8. Lynch JW, Kaplan GA. Understanding how inequality in the distribution of income affects health. *J Health Psychol* 1997; 2:297–314.
9. Antonovsky A. Social class, life expectancy and overall mortality. *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly* 1967; 45:31–73.
10. Davey-Smith G et al. Lifetime socio-economic position and mortality: prospective observational study. *British Medical Journal* 1997; 314:547–52.
11. Krieger N et al. Racism, sexism and social class: implications for studies of health, disease and well-being? *Am J Prev Med* 1993; 9(S6):82–122.
12. Krieger N et al. Epidemiology and the web of causation: has anyone seen the spider? *Soc Sci Med* 1994; 29:887–903.
13. Krieger N et al. Measuring social class in US public health research: concepts, methodologies and guidelines. *Annu Rev Public Health* 1997; 18:341–78.
14. Hunt K, Macintyre S. Sexe et inégalités sociales en santé. In: Grandjean H (ed). *Inégalités et disparités sociales en santé*. Paris : La Découverte, 1999:363–375.
15. Kawachi I et al. Women's status and the health of women and men: a view from the States. *Soc Sci Med* 1999; 48:21–32.
16. Pampalon R, Duncan C, Subramanian V, Jones K. Geographies of health perception in Quebec: a multilevel perspective. *Soc Sci Med* 1999; 48(10):811–25.
17. Birch S, Eyles J, Newbold KB. Proxies for health care need among populations validation of alternatives: a study in Quebec. *Soc Sci Med* 1996; 29:761–68.
18. Marmot MG, Wilkinson RG. *The social determinants of health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
19. Kawachi I, Kennedy BP, Wilkinson RG (eds). *The society and population health inequality reader: Volume I; Income and Health*. New York: The New Press, 1999.
20. Fassin D et al. Comprendre et connaître les inégalités sociales de santé. In: Leclerc A. et al (eds). *Les inégalités sociales de santé*. Paris : La Découverte, 2000: 13–25.
21. Evans RG, Stoddart GL. Producing Health and Consuming Care. *Soc Sci Med* 1990; 31:1347–63.



22. Evans RG, Stoddart GL. Producing health and consuming health care. In: Evans RG, Barer ML, Marmor TR (eds). *Why are some people healthy and others not ?* Hawthorne NY: Aldyne de Gruyter, 1994: 27–64.
23. Arber S. Comparing inequalities in women's and men's health: Britain in the 1990's. In Lahelma E, Rakhonen O (eds). Special Issue on Health Inequalities in Modern Societies and Beyond. *Soc Sci Med* 1997; 44:773–87.
24. Strobino D, Grason H, Minkovitz C. Charting a course for the future of women's health in the United States: concepts, findings and recommendations. *Soc Sci Med* 2002; 54:839–48.
25. Walby S. *Gender Transformation*. London: Routledge, 1997.
26. Annandale E, Hunt K. Gender inequalities in health: Research at the cross roads. In: Annandale E, Hunt K (eds). *Gender inequalities in health*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 2000:363–375.
27. Doyal L. *What makes women sick? Gender and the political economy of health*. London: Macmillan, 1995.
28. Clarke JN. Sexism, feminism and medicalism: a decade review of the literature on gender and illness. *Social Health Illness* 1983; 5:62–82.
29. Macintyre S. Inequalities in health: Is research gender blind? In Leon D, Walt G (eds). *Poverty, inequality and health: an international perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001: 283–93.
30. Macintyre S, Hunt K, Sweeting H. Gender differences in health: Are things really as simple as they seem? *Soc Sci Med* 1996; 42:617–24.
31. Aiach P. Femmes et hommes face à la mort et à la maladie, des différences paradoxales. In: Aiach P et al (ed). *Femmes et hommes dans le champ de la santé ; approches sociologiques*. Paris : Editions ENSP, 2001: 117–147.
32. Rakhonen O, Arber S, Lahelma I, Martikainen P, Silventoinen K. Understanding income inequalities in health among men and women in Britain and Finland. *Int J Health Serv* 2000; 30:27–45.
33. Stronks K et al. The interrelationship between income, health and employment status. *Intl J Epidemiol* 1997; 26:592–600.
34. McDonough P et al. Income dynamics and adult mortality in the United States, 1972 through 1989. *Am J Public Health* 1997; 87:1476–83.
35. Marmot MG et al. Contribution of psychosocial factors to socio-economic differences in health. *Milbank Quarterly* 1998; 76:403–48.
36. Arber S. Comparing inequalities in women and men's health: Britain in the 1990's. *Soc Sci Med* 1997; 44:773–87.
37. van Doorslaer E et al. Income related inequalities in health: some international comparisons. *J Health Econ* 1997; 16:93–112.
38. Lahelma E, Arber S. Health inequalities among men and women in contrasting welfare states: Britain and three Nordic countries compared. *Eur J Pubc Health* 1994; 4:227–40.
39. Leclerc A, Fassin D, Grandjean H, Kaminski M, Lang T. *Les inégalités sociales de santé*. Paris : La Découverte, 2000.
40. Kunst A et al. Inégalités sociales de mortalité prématurée: La France comparée aux autres pays européens. In: Leclerc A et al (eds). *Les inégalités sociales de santé*. Paris : La Découverte, 2000: 53–68.

41. Kennedy BP et al. Income distribution, socio-economic status and self-rated health in the United States: Multilevel analysis. *British Medical Journal* 1998; 317:917–21.
42. Liberatos P et al. The measurement of social class in epidemiology. *Epidemiol Rev* 1998; 10(87):87–121.
43. Berkman LF, Macintyre S. The measurement of social class in health studies: old measures and new formulations. In: Kogevinas M et al (eds). *Social Inequalities and Cancer*. Lyon, France: International Agency for Research on Cancer, 1998:51–64.
44. Matthews S, Manor O, Power C. Social inequalities in health: are there gender differences? *Soc Sci Med* 1999; 48:49–60.
45. Macintyre S. The Black Report and beyond: what are the issues? *Soc Sci Med* 1997; 44(6):723–45.
46. Macintyre S. Social inequalities and health in the contemporary world: a comparative overview. In Srtickland S, Shetty P (eds). *Human Biology and Social Inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998: 232–253.
47. Denton M, Walters V. Gender differences in structural and behavioural determinants of health: An analysis of the social production of health. *Soc Sci Med* 1999; 48:1221–35.
48. Hou F, Chen J. Neighbourhood low income, income inequality and health in Toronto. *Health Rep* 2003; 14(2):21–34.
49. Moss N. Gender equity and socio-economic inequality: A framework for the patterning of women's health. *Soc Sci Med* 2002; 54:649–61.
50. Rakhonen O, Arber S, Lahelma I, Martikainen P, Silventoinen K. Understanding income inequalities in health among men and women in Britain and Finland. *Int J Health Serv* 2000; 30:27–45.
51. Manderbacka K. Examining what self-rated health question is understood to mean by respondents. *Scand J Soc Med* 1998; 26: 145–53.
52. Idler IL, Benyamini Y. Self-rated health and mortality: A review of twenty-seven community studies. *J Health Soc Behav* 1997; 38: 21–37.
53. Jylha M et al. Is self-rated health comparable across cultures and gender. *J of Gerontol Soc Sci* 1998; 53B:S144–S152.
54. Shadbolt B. Some correlates of self-rated health for Australian women. *Am J Public Health* 1997; 87(6):951–56.
55. Goldstein MS, Siegel MJ, Boyer R. Predicting changes in self-perceived health status. *Am J Public Health* 1984; 74:611–14.
56. Suchman EA, Phillips BS, Streib GF. An analysis of the validity of health questionnaires. *Social Forces* 1958; 36: 223–32.
57. Bruin A, de Pichavet HSJ, Nossikov A. *Health Interview Surveys: Towards international harmonisation of methods and instruments*. Copenhagen: WHO regional publications, 1996.
58. Segovia J, Bartlett RF, Edwards AC. An empirical analysis of the dimensions of health measures. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1989; 50:564–69.
59. Beland Y. Canadian Community Health Survey—Methodological overview. *Health Rep* 2002; 13(3):9–14.
60. Chen J. Age at diagnosis of smoking-related disease. *Health Rep* 2003; 14(2):9–19.
61. No authors cited. The health divide-how the sexes differ. *Health Rep* 2001; 12(3):1–82.



62. Krieger N, MS, Siegel MJ, Boyer R. Predicting changes in self-perceived health status. *Am J Public Health* 1984; 74:611–14.
63. Marmot M et al. Social inequalities in health: next questions and converging evidence. *Soc Sci Med* 1997; 44(6):901–10.
64. No authors cited. Income inequality and mortality among working-age people in Canada and the US. *Health Rep* 1999; 11(3):77–82
65. Furher R, Stansfeld SA. How gender affects patterns of social relations and their impact on health: a comparison of one or more multiple sources of support from close persons. *Soc Sci Med* 2002; 54:811–25.
66. Arber S. Class, paid employment and family roles: making sense of structural disadvantage, gender and health status. *Soc Sci Med* 1991; 32:425–36.
67. Macintyre S. The effect of family position and status on health. *Soc Sci Med* 1992; 23:393–415.
68. Hosmer DW, Lemeshow S. *Applied Logistic Regression*. New York: Wiley-Interscience Publication, 1989.
69. Frank JW. Why population health? *Can J Public Health* 1995; 86(3):162–64.
70. Dunn JR, Dyck I. Social determinants of health in Canada's immigrant population: results from the National Population Health Survey. *Soc Sci Med* 2000; 51:1573–93.
71. Frank JW, Mustard JF. The determinants of health from a historical perspective. *Deadalus* 1994; 123(4):1–20.
72. Wilkinson R. Comment: Income, inequality and social cohesion. *Am J Public Health* 1997; 87(9):1504–06.
73. Diderichsen F, Evans T, Whitehead M. The Social Basis of Disparities in Health. In: Evans T, Whitehead M, Diderichsen F, Bhuiya A, Wirth M (eds). *Challenging inequities in health: from ethics to action*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001: 49–67.
74. Frank JW, Cohen R, Yen I, Balfour J, Smith M. Socioeconomic gradients in health status over 29 years of follow-up after midlife: the Alameda county study. *Soc Sci Med* 2003; 57(12):2305–23.
75. Statistics Canada. Census Canada. 1996.

Exhibit 1: Proportion of Women's and Men's Income Adequacy by Age Groups

Women	Income Quartile			
	Highest Quartile	Upper Middle	Lower Middle	Lowest Quartile
Age Group				
18-34	27.60	36.41	22.26	13.73
35-44	32.67	36.03	20.33	10.97
45-64	33.09	36.62	19.27	11.01
65+	10.75	27.58	39.00	22.67

Men	Income Quartile			
	Highest Quartile	Upper Middle	Lower Middle	Lowest Quartile
Age Group				
18-34	33.80	36.41	20.11	9.68
35-44	36.49	37.63	18.04	7.84
45-64	40.27	35.68	15.41	8.64
65+	16.88	35.83	37.21	10.09

Source: CCHS, 2000-2001

Exhibit 2: Proportion of Women's and Men's Type of Dwelling by Age Groups

Women	Detached House	Townhouse/Semi	Apartment	Insecure Dwelling
Age Group				
18-34	55.47	17.18	25.30	1.56
35-44	66.93	14.85	16.43	1.27
45-64	69.12	12.48	16.34	1.41
65+	56.63	10.75	30.18	1.59

Men	Detached House	Townhouse/Semi	Apartment	Insecure Dwelling
Age Group				
18-34	56.98	15.27	25.49	1.68
35-44	66.55	13.78	17.4	1.67
45-64	72.52	10.76	14.51	1.61
65+	67.27	10.67	19.19	1.96

Source: CCHS, 2000-2001



Exhibit 3: Proportion of Women's and Men's Reported Food Insecurity by Age Groups

Women	None Reported	Insecurity Reported
Age Group		
18-34	91.44	8.56
35-44	94.64	5.36
45-64	96.23	3.77
65+	98.91	1.09

Men	None Reported	Insecurity Reported
Age Group		
18-34	88.31	11.69
35-44	92.14	7.86
45-64	93.40	6.60
65+	98.90	1.10

Source: CCHS, 2000-2001

Exhibit 4: Proportion of Women's and Men's Employment Status by Age Groups

Women	Employed Full-Time	Employed Part-Time	Self-Employed	Student	Homemaker	Other
Age Group						
18-34	59.38	18.94	6.18	4.00	7.38	3.52
35-44	58.31	12.44	11.49	1.71	8.88	4.91
45-64	45.42	10.85	10.59	0.78	5.29	17.54
65+	1.60	1.72	1.67	0.35	0.74	86.44

Men	Employed Full-Time	Employed Part-Time	Self-Employed	Student	Homemaker	Other
Age Group						
18-34	73.43	10.47	9.15	3.31	0.09	4.11
35-44	72.83	1.79	19.63	0.54	0.25	7.12
45-64	57.12	2.53	22.15	0.38	0.23	27.0
65+	3.79	1.83	7.63	0.23	0.04	93.90

Source: CCHS, 2000-2001

Exhibit 5: Proportion of Women's and Men's Educational Attainment by Age Groups

Women	Less Than Secondary School	Secondary School; No Post-Secondary	Some Post- Secondary	Post-Secondary Degree
Age Group				
18–34	11.38	21.58	14.84	52.20
35–44	12.86	23.17	7.62	56.36
45–64	23.95	22.34	6.59	47.12
65+	51.44	17.77	5.17	25.61

Men	Less Than Secondary School	Secondary School; No Post-Secondary	Some Post- Secondary	Post-Secondary Degree
Age Group				
18–34	15.56	23.63	14.47	46.34
35–44	14.74	20.86	6.21	58.19
45–64	24.44	16.54	6.10	52.92
65+	47.72	13.77	4.96	33.55

Source: CCHS, 2000–2001

Exhibit 6: Proportion of Women's and Men's Family Structure by Age Groups

Women	Single Without Child	Single With Child	Partner Without Child	Partner With Child
Age Group				
18–34	15.97	10.93	19.39	51.45
35–44	9.94	12.23	13.66	61.02
45–64	19.44	6.10	43.67	28.96
65+	49.39	0.55	44.35	4.16

Men	Single Without Child	Single With Child	Partner Without Child	Partner With Child
Age Group				
18–34	22.93	6.80	20.60	47.64
35–44	17.39	3.30	14.73	62.29
45–64	16.17	2.46	39.53	39.95
65+	20.47	0.19	73.39	4.32

Source: CCHS, 2000–2001



Exhibit 7: Adjusted Odds Ratios: Self-Rated Poor Health

Selected Determinants		Odds Ratios		95% Confidence Interval	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
Age	18–34	1.00	1.00	-	-
	35–44	1.66*	1.59*	1.43, 1.94	1.40, 1.81
	45–64	2.72*	2.14*	2.37, 3.13	1.87, 2.44
	65+	2.13*	1.76*	1.80, 2.52	1.49, 2.08
Smoking Status	Never Smoked	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Former Smoker	1.28*	0.93	1.13, 1.45	0.85, 1.02
	Current Smoker	1.74*	1.40*	1.54, 1.96	1.27, 1.55
Income Adequacy	Highest Quartile	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Upper Middle	1.14*	1.13*	1.02, 1.27	1.02, 1.26
	Lower Middle	1.68*	1.47*	1.50, 1.88	1.32, 1.65
	Lowest Quartile	2.17*	1.94*	1.89, 2.49	1.71, 2.20
Dwelling Type	Detached House	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Semi/Townhouse	0.97	1.22*	0.83, 1.13	1.09, 1.36
	Apartment	1.04	1.28*	0.92, 1.17	1.15, 1.42
	Insecure Dwelling	1.08	1.21	0.89, 1.31	1.00, 1.46
Food Insecurity	None Reported	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Insecurity Reported	0.99	1.21	0.80, 1.21	0.96, 1.52
Educational Attainment	Post Secondary Degree	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Some Post Sec.	1.23*	1.20*	1.04, 1.44	1.04, 1.38
	Secondary School	1.34*	1.21*	1.18, 1.51	1.09, 1.34
	Less Than Sec. School	1.94*	1.89*	1.75, 2.15	1.71, 2.09
Employment Status	Employed Full-Time	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Employed Part-Time	1.28*	1.17	1.01, 1.61	0.99, 1.37
	Self-Employed	0.98	0.93	0.86, 1.12	0.77, 1.13
	Student	1.73*	1.24	1.16, 2.60	0.80, 1.92
	Homemaker	1.16	1.28*	0.42, 3.19	1.04, 1.58
Family Structure	Partner With No Child	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Single With No Child	1.08	1.01	0.97, 1.20	0.91, 1.12
	Single With Child	1.06	1.21*	0.79, 1.43	1.04, 1.41
	Partner With Child	0.86*	0.85*	0.75, 0.99	0.75, 0.97

– Reference group

*Significance level: $p < 0.05$

Source: CCHS, 2000–2001

Exhibit 8 : Adjusted Odds Ratios: Self-Reports of Chronic Conditions

Selected Determinants		Odds Ratios		95% Confidence Interval	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
Age	18–34	1.00	1.00	-	-
	35–44	1.44*	1.20*	1.33, 1.55	1.12, 1.29
	45–64	1.92*	1.72*	1.77, 2.08	1.59, 1.87
	65+	2.69*	2.95*	2.33, 3.11	2.55, 3.42
Smoking Status	Never Smoked	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Former Smoker	1.22*	1.28*	1.14, 1.31	1.20, 1.37
	Current Smoker	1.17*	1.26*	1.08, 1.27	1.17, 1.35
Income Adequacy	Highest Quartile	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Upper Middle	0.98	1.11*	0.91, 1.05	1.03, 1.19
	Lower Middle	1.02	1.04	0.94, 1.11	0.96, 1.14
	Lowest Quartile	1.03	1.18*	0.92, 1.16	1.05, 1.32
Dwelling Type	Detached House	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Semi/Townhouse	1.07	1.19*	0.96, 1.18	1.08, 1.31
	Apartment	0.92	0.93	0.85, 1.00	0.84, 1.02
	Insecure Dwelling	1.15	1.13	1.00, 1.32	0.96, 1.34
Food Insecurity	None Reported	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Insecurity Reported	0.86*	0.88*	0.76, 0.96	0.77, 0.99
Educational Attainment	Post Secondary Degree	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Some Post Sec.	1.23*	0.97	1.11, 1.37	0.88, 1.08
	Secondary School	0.92*	0.91*	0.86, 0.99	0.84, 0.98
	Less Than Sec. School	1.01	1.02	0.93, 1.09	0.94, 1.11
Employment Status	Employed Full-Time	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Employed Part-Time	1.10	1.08	0.97, 1.25	0.99, 1.18
	Self-Employed	0.91*	1.12*	0.84, 0.98	1.01, 1.24
	Student	1.21	0.9	0.92, 1.60	0.72, 1.13
	Homemaker	1.26	0.86*	0.69, 2.30	0.76, 0.97
Family Structure	Partner With No Child	1.00	1.00	-	-
	Single With No Child	0.82*	1.06	0.76, 0.89	0.97, 1.15
	Single With Child	0.72*	0.88*	0.62, 0.83	0.78, 0.98
	Partner With Child	0.76*	0.80*	0.70, 0.82	0.74, 0.87

– Reference group

*Significance level: $p < 0.05$

Source: CCHS, 2000–2001