THE UNIVERSITY of York



Discussion Papers in Economics

No. 2008/21

Ill-Health as a Household Norm: Evidence from Other People's Health Problems

By

Nattavudh Powdthavee, University of York

Department of Economics and Related Studies
University of York
Heslington
York, YO10 5DD

Ill-Health as a Household Norm:

Evidence from Other People's Health Problems

Nattavudh Powdthavee[1]

Department of Economics and Related Studies, University of York

June, 2008

Abstract

This paper presents evidence that an individual's self-assessed health (SAH) does not only suffer from systematic reporting bias and adaptation bias but is also biased owing to confounding social norm effects. Using 13 waves of the British Household Panel Survey, I am able to show that, while there is a negative and statistically significant correlation between SAH and individuals' own health problem index, this negative effect varies significantly with the average number of health problems per (other) family member. Consistent with Akerlof's (1980) social norm theory, the gap in SAH between individuals with and without health problems reduces as the average number of health problems for other household members increases. Under the assumption that SAH is endogenous, this finding suggests that the objective health of other household members could be a good instrument for self-assessed levels of health.

Keywords: Self-assessed health; subjective health; relative; norm; comparison effects; chronic illness; BHPS

[1].Department of Economics and Related Studies, University of York, Heslington, York, UK. Email: n_powdthavee@hotmail.com. I thank Paul Dolan, Robert Metcalfe, Mathew White, Sabine Pahl, and Andrew Clark for their valuable comments.

1. Introduction

Perhaps one of the most widely used measures of personal health in empirical research, self-assessed health (SAH) is often shown to be correlated with actual health (e.g. Cutler & Richardson, 1997; Kaplan & Baron-Epel, 2003; Groot et al, 2004). It is also shown to be a powerful predictor of mortality (Idler & Kasl, 1995; Idler & Benyamini et al, 1999; van Doorslaer & Gerdtham, 2003), subsequent disability (Kaplan et al, 1993; Idler & Kasl, 1995), morbidity (Ferraro et al, 1997) and subsequent use of medical care (Angel & Gronfein, 1988; van Door et al, 2004). Yet because it is subjective in nature, its validity continues to be questioned in the literature. Do people say what they mean when prompted to answer a subjective health question such as "Please think back over the last 12 months – how would you say your health has on the whole been?" More specifically, if SAH is a valid measure of true health, why do we continue to observe a differential reporting of health across individuals or groups of individuals with the same objective health status?

A popular explanation for this observation is that SAH suffers from systematic reporting bias. Individuals from different population sub-groups (e.g. categorized by, among other things, age, gender, education, language and income) are thought to interpret the SAH question within their own specific context and therefore use different reference points when asked to respond to the same question (see, e.g., Lindeboom & van Doorslaer, 2004; Hernandez-Quevedo et al, 2005). In short, SAH does not have a natural reference point; rather, it is determined by individual specific situations and characteristics. Another potential explanation for this observation could be that individuals have an incredible ability to adapt to ill health (see, e.g., Groot, 2000; Oswald & Powdthavee, 2008). In this case, people who have been ill for a long period of time may report levels of health that are much higher than those of individuals struck down with the same illness for the first time, thus leading to the differential reporting of SAH among those with an objective health status.

This paper extends from the previous literature by arguing that measures of SAH do not only suffer from systematic reporting bias and adaptation bias but may also be biased owing to confounding social norm effects. This means that individuals with the same level of objective health not only differ in their interpretation of their health, but their interpretation is also a function of their social environment. To test this idea, this paper asks what happens to the gap in the reported SAH levels between the healthy and the unhealthy as the health problem index of other household members increases? Using British micro-data, I am able to show that, while there is a negative and statistically significant correlation between SAH and individuals' own health problem index, this negative effect varies significantly with the average number of health problems per (other) family member. Consistent with the social norm theory, the gap in SAH between individuals with and without health problems reduces as the average number of health problems for other household members increases. Under the assumption that SAH is endogenous, this finding suggests that the objective health of other household members could be a good instrument for self-assessed levels of health.

2. Literature review

Previous research on SAH suggests that the respondent's rating of his or her health status expresses subjective as well as objective aspects: information and knowledge that the respondent has, together with body sensations and such subjective elements as perceptions, evaluations and judgemental attitudes (Liang, 1986; Kaplan & Baron-Epel, 2003). With respect to the subjective dimension of SAH, Krause and Jay (1994) found that people of different age groups tend to think about different aspects of their health when making evaluations. Using data on 158 in-depth interviews, they showed that older respondents were more likely to use specific health problems as a reference point for their health, while the younger cohorts were more likely to focus on their own physical functioning. This means that people with the same 'true health' may end up reporting different levels of SAH depending on their age. The differential reporting of SAH among people with the same objective health is not limited to only those of different age groups. For example, Baron-Epel and Kaplan (2001) showed that people with more years of education tend to assess their health in an optimistic way, even when they proportion other characteristics such as language, culture, nationality and religion. Using Swedish micro-data, Gerdtham and Johannesson (2001) found SAH to be higher among women, those with a high income, the highly educated, the employed and the married. The differential mapping of true health when reporting SAH by respondent characteristics has been termed 'state-dependent reporting bias' (Kerkhofs & Lindeboom, 1995), 'scale of reference bias' (Groot, 2000) and 'response category cut-point shift' (Lindeboom & van Doorslaer, 2004; Hernandez-Quevedo et al, 2005). For a comprehensive review on the evidence of non-random measurement error in SAH, see Currie and Madrian (1999).

Another issue related to the evaluation of SAH concerns the individual's comparison process when making health assessments. Reference group theory suggests that, when asked to evaluate their perceived health, people may compare themselves against their own previous health conditions (e.g. Groot, 2000; Oswald & Powdthavee, 2008) or others of the same age (e.g. Cockerham et al, 1983; Fienberg et al, 1985). For example, Singer (1974, 1977) found that people with Parkinson's disease tend to select others of their own age rather than those with the same illness as their reference group. When confronted by illness, old people tend to make themselves feel better about their health by adjusting their perception to match that of their age peers (Levkoff et al, 1987) or the health of stereotypical others of the same age (Fienberg et al, 1985; Suls et al, 1991). The comparison sets used by respondents may also vary by the level of subjective health they report. Using the subjective health information of 383 Israeli residents, Kaplan and Baron-Epel (2003) found that young people who report sub-optimal health (e.g. less than satisfied with health) tend not to compare themselves to people their own age, whereas a high percentage of old people do. Among those with excellent health, the young rather than the old tend to compare themselves to others their age. With respect to the comparison with one's own previous health, Oswald and Powdthavee (2008) found that individuals are able to recover around 30% of their loss of well-being after three years of serious disability. More generally, these results seem to suggest that people tend to find ways to evaluate their health in a more positive or more negative light.

While the above findings appear to suggest that we are inclined to compare our health with that of stereotypical others with the same characteristics, much less attention has been paid to whether the health of those in close proximity to us has any influence on our health perceptions. Recent studies have shown that the actions of our relevant others (i.e. friends, family, neighbours) can influence not only our objective behaviours but also our subjective well-being (see, e.g., Luttmer, 2005; Vera-Toscano & Ateca-Amestoy, 2008). Kulik et al (1996) found that patients fare better in terms of mental well-being and future recovery time while awaiting a coronary bypass operation when they proportion a room with another cardiac patient than with a non-cardiac patient or do not proportion a room at all. One reason for this may be that it is psychologically beneficial for patients to live with someone who also proportions the same burden. More recent evidence for this is shown by Clark and Etilé (2008), who found that obesity (a BMI of over 30) has a strong negative effect on psychological well-being. However, this effect is smaller if the individual lives in a household where there is at least one other obese person.

3. A framework

To fix ideas, I follow Akerlof's (1980) theory of social norm and assume that every individual in a society has social codes to follow, one of which is to live healthily. Under this assumption, higher psychological rewards are given in the form of a higher perception of health to those who can maintain healthy living in a society where the norm to be objectively healthy is strong compared to a society where this norm is weak, simply because health is valued much more highly in the former than in the latter. For the same reason, the negative effect of acquiring a health problem on the perception of health is also likely to be greater in societies where the cost of being unhealthy is high. Assuming that social norm is a function of other people's health circumstances, this negative effect is thought to be smaller as the proportion of other members in the society who have health problems increases and the norm to be healthy (or the cost of being unhealthy) reduces in strength.

Let health perception be

$$H(.) = H(A, X) \tag{1}$$

where $H(.)$ represents the health perception function, A is objective health, and X denotes other personal characteristics. Normally, A is assumed to be absolute, i.e. it has an independent effect on the perception of health. However, this article assumes that A can be written as a function of social environment as follows:

$$A = (-P(1-\overline{P}), -\overline{P}(1-P)), \qquad (2)$$

where P is a dummy variable representing whether the individual has health problems, and $\overline{P}$ is the proportion of other members in the society who have health problems. Assume, as a first stage, that the societal code is for everyone to live healthily (i.e. $\overline{P} = 0$). If the health code is followed by the individual (i.e. $P = 0$), the first term disappears and the impact of obeying the code on health perception will be inversely related to how 'weak' the health norm is in that society – as indicated by an increase in $\overline{P}$. On the other hand, if the code is not followed (i.e. $P = 1$), the second term disappears and the individual's health problems decrease the perception of health through the first term. However, the negative effect from not following the code reduces as the proportion of other members in that society who have health problems, $\overline{P}$, increases. Substituting A into H produces the following health perception function:

$$H(.) = H(-P(1-\overline{P}), -\overline{P}(1-P), X). \qquad (3)$$

What the above framework suggests is that the weaker the norm to be objectively healthy (as represented by an increase in the proportion of unhealthy people in the society), the smaller the gap in the average level of health perception between the healthy and the unhealthy. The same idea has also been applied successfully to explain the effect of social norm on well-being outcomes from unemployment (Clark, 2003; Stutzer & Lalive, 2004; Powdthavee, 2007) and on becoming a victim of crime (Powdthavee, 2005). The literature is coy, however, about who constitutes the society in question. Given that we tend to compare our health with that of stereotypical others of the same characteristics as us, an average health of all within the same age band or of the same gender as the respondent may be a good guess. However, it may also be that the relevant group for the health norm is much more narrowly defined than this. Individuals may also (subconsciously) compare themselves with those living in close proximity to them, such as other family members in their household (see Clark & Etilé, 2008).

4. Implementing a test

4.1 Data

The data set comes from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS). The BHPS is nationally representative of British households, contains over 10,000 adult individuals and has been conducted between September and Christmas of each year since 1991. The study interviews separately all adult members of the household with respect to their income, employment status, marital status, health and attitudes. The question on health perception, which is available in every wave of the BHPS, asks individuals:

> "Please think back over the last 12 months about how your health has been. Compared to people of your own age, would you say your health has on the whole been excellent, good, fair, poor, very poor?"

For simplicity, the data is recoded such that responses regarding SAH increase in value, running from very poor health to excellent health. By definition, the SAH version of the BHPS is thought to capture the respondent's health perception relative to the individual's concept for the norm of their age group (or as age-related self-assessed health as described in Baron-Epel and Kaplan, 2001).

This paper draws on two survey questions on health problems in the BHPS. The first asks each individual in every wave of the BHPS to state which (but not limited to one) of the following 13 illnesses or disabilities he or she has, excluding temporary conditions:

1. Arms, legs, hands, feet or neck (including arthritis and rheumatism)
2. Difficulty in seeing (other than needing glasses to read normal-size print)
3. Difficulty in hearing
4. Skin conditions/allergies
5. Chest/breathing problems, asthma, bronchitis
6. Heart/blood pressure or blood circulation problems
7. Stomach/liver/kidneys or digestion problems
8. Diabetes
9. Anxiety, depression or bad nerves
10. Alcohol or drug-related problems
11. Epilepsy
12. Migraine or frequent headaches
13. Other health problems not on the list

This checklist of illnesses has been shown to correlate well with GP reports (Kriegsman et al, 1996) and the use of health and welfare services (Sacker et al, 2003), with people more likely to under-report their true health conditions in the absence of a list. There is also evidence that the inclusion of a checklist of conditions in the survey encourages reporting of illnesses by the genuinely ill and not by those who are less severely affected by their disease (Knight et al, 2001). For an application of the checklist in the health literature, see Groot et al (2004).

The second question asks individuals about their physical functioning: “Does your health in any way limit your daily activities compared to most people your age?” The daily activities in question include housework, climbing stairs, dressing oneself and walking for at least 10 minutes. This variable appears in every wave of the BHPS, except for Waves 9 and 14.

This paper analyses Waves 1–15 of the BHPS, leaving out Waves 9 and 14. I restrict the sample to contain only those observations with information on both health perception and objective health problems. I also restrict the sample to contain only those individuals who do not live alone. This yields a sample of an unbalanced panel of 127,699 observations (or 21,941 individuals). Around 30% of individuals reported to have one of the listed health problems, and approximately 27% reported to have two or more. Roughly 17% of the sample said that health has limited them from doing day-to-day activities. Approximately 37% of the sample stayed in all 15 waves of the BHPS. Descriptive statistics of the variables are reported in Table 1.

Is the SAH gap between the healthy and the unhealthy smaller in unhealthy households? To test this hypothesis, I first calculated the average SAH score between individuals with no illness and those who listed one illness out of the 13 listed conditions. Figure 1 summarises the difference between the two for (i) households where no other members have an illness and (ii) households where the average of illnesses per member is one. Consistent with the social norm model, Figure 1 reveals a smaller SAH gap between individuals with no illness and those with one illness in unhealthier households. The average SAH gaps are 0.453 and 0.444 in households where no other members have an illness and in households where the average of illnesses per member is one, respectively. Figure 2 repeats the analysis for the variable 'health limits daily activities'. Here, we can see that the SAH gap is noticeably smaller in households where the proportion of other household members whose health limits daily activities is 1 (SAH gap = 1.314) than in households where the proportion is 0 (SAH gap = 1.362). Thus, the results provide some of the first raw data evidence that the health problems of other household members affect the SAH of the healthy negatively but have a positive impact on the SAH of those with health problems.

4.2 Empirical strategy and results

Table 2 moves to econometric evidence. The first set of specifications, which is an empirical counterpart to equation (3), can be written as:

$$H_{iht} = P_{iht}^{'}\beta_1 + (1 - P_{iht}^{'})\frac{1}{N_{hm}}\sum_{j}^{N_{hm}} HM_j\beta_2 + (P_{iht}^{'} \times \frac{1}{N_{hm}}\sum_{j}^{N_{hm}} HM_j)\beta_3 + X_{iht}^{'}\gamma + u_i + \varepsilon_{iht}, \qquad (4)$$

where H_{it} is the SAH level of an individual *i* in a household *h* at a time *t*, $P_{iht}^{'}$ is a vector of the respondent's health problems, N_{hm} is the number of other household members and HM_j denotes the health problems of other household members. The variable X_{iht} represents a vector of personal and household characteristics that are assumed to be important in influencing SAH and are typically included in the estimation of SAH. This includes dummy variables for gender, marital status, education, employment status, region and year, as well as age, age-squared, log of real household income per capita, number of people in the household and number of children aged under 16. The parameters u_i and ε_{iht} are the individual random effects and the error term, respectively. For simplicity in the regression, an illness index is created by summing the individual illnesses for the 13 types of health conditions. The dummy variable representing the individual's ability to perform daily activities is kept the same. Only the same types of health problems between the individual and other household members are interacted, i.e. the individual's own illness index is interacted with the average illness index of other household members, while the individual's own ability to function is interacted with the average ability to function of other household members. The prevalence of other members with health problems is reported against the individual's own health status for each of the SAH categories in the Appendix.

Equation (4) allows us to test the hypotheses that, *ceteris paribus*, people with health problems will report a lower SAH than average (or $\beta_1 < 0$) and that other members' health problems will lower the SAH for those people without a health problem (or $\beta_2 < 0$). However, the negative correlation between having health problems and the corresponding SAH will be smaller in households where the average health problems of other household members are high (or $\beta_3 > 0$).

The first column of Table 2 estimates the random effects ordered probit model using the unbalanced panel. The literature suggests that ordered probit or ordered logit models can be used when considering an ordered categorical variable such as SAH (McElvey & Zavoina, 1975).

The coefficients on an individual's own illness index and his/her 'health limits daily activities' variable, in the first column of Table 2, are −0.439 and −1.134, respectively. This implies that health perception is, other things being equal, associated negatively with an individual's own illnesses and restricted ability to carry out daily activities. The standard errors on the coefficients are 0.005 for the illness index and 0.015 for 'health limits daily activities', so that the null of zero can be rejected at the 1% level.

The remainder of the health problem variables in the first column of Table 2 are for the average illness index and the proportion of limited abilities to undertake daily activities through health of other members in the household. This is to capture the extent of social norm in health, if any.

The average illness index of others has a coefficient of −0.070, while the proportion of others with restricted abilities to perform daily tasks has a coefficient of −0.065. Both are statistically significant at the 1% level, suggesting that others' health problems lower the SAH for those who do not have health problems on average. There is, however, an offsetting factor for those with health problems. As could be seen from the table, an interaction term for *own illness index × average illness index of other household members* has a coefficient of 0.032, with a standard error of 0.003. In addition to this, an interaction term for *own health limits daily activities × proportion of other household members with restricted abilities* is also positive and significant: the estimation coefficient is 0.073, with a statistically significant standard error of 0.027. These variables and their coefficients suggest that the SAH gap between individuals with no health problems and those with health problems is smaller in households where health problems are more prevalent among other household members, which is consistent with the social norm theory. It is also consistent with the findings on relative obesity by Clark and Etilé (2008) and reminiscent of Clark (2003) and Powdthavee (2007), who found that it is psychologically preferable to be unemployed in an area where there are many jobless people.

4.3 Robustness checks

According to Contoyannis et al (2004), the attrition rates in the BHPS are inversely related to SAH, and in particular, attrition is highest among those who start the survey in very poor health. To be sure that the results are not being driven by individuals who are in the panel only briefly, I redid the estimation, in the second column of Table 2, on a smaller balanced panel (i.e. recorded over 15 years in the BHPS). Despite some notable increases in the standard errors, there is little change in the size of the estimated coefficients on own and others' health problems. This result is consistent with the findings of Contoyannis et al that, although there is a health-related attrition in the BHPS, it does not hugely distort the estimates of the socio-economic gradient in health.

To what extent are the results being driven by systematic reporting bias? The random effects ordered probit models of Table 2 assumed that the explanatory variables have the same impact on the odds of all the ordered scores and that there is a single index that describes 'true health'. However, as described earlier in the literature review, there is evidence that people of different sub-groups in a population tend to interpret the SAH question within their own specific context and therefore use different reference points when they are answering the same question, despite having the same level of true health. To be sure that the results are not driven by the restrictive assumptions of the random effects ordered probit model, the first panel of Table 3 reports estimates from a random effects generalised ordered probit specification (see, e.g., van Doorslaer & Jones, 2003; Boes & Winkelmann, 2006) in which the β values are allowed to vary across the reported category of SAH (β_j , j=1…5) using the balanced panel. With the exception of the 'health limits daily activities' variable, the coefficients on the interaction terms between own and others' health problems continue to be positive and statistically significant at conventional confidence levels in all categories of SAH. The estimated parameters are also similar in size. For example, the interaction term for *own illness index* × *average illness index of other household members* has a coefficient of 0.017 in the equation that determines the choice between the category *very poor* and the combined categories *poor*, *fair*, *good* and *very good* (i.e. equation j=1). The same variable has a coefficient of 0.021 in the equation that determines the choice between the combined categories *very poor*, *poor*, *fair* and *good* and the category *very good* (i.e. equation j=4). It can therefore be concluded that the effect of health norm on SAH is robust to systematic reporting bias.

To what extent are the estimates being driven by the unobserved heterogeneity in the SAH data? Some people are born with persistent personality traits that make them rate their subjective well-being in a more optimistic way than others. These predispositions, noted by Headey (2006), are also likely to determine the type of life events the person will experience in his/her lifetime. For example, subjective well-being scores, including SAH, tend to be higher among extroverts. However, extroverts are also more likely to engage in risky behaviours and, as a result, are more prone to chronic health problems and disabilities than less extrovert individuals. This positive correlation between SAH and the incidence of disabilities can therefore result in an overestimation of the true impact of health problems on SAH in general.

One way of dealing with the unobserved heterogeneity bias is to allow for correlation between unobserved time-invariant factors and the observed variables of interest. The solution, originally proposed by Mundlak (1978), involves a process that decomposes the individual random effects in equation (4) into a time-variable and time-constant component.

This can be done by decomposing the observable explanatory variables of interests – the individual's own and others' health problems in our case – into their mean average over the observation period and the deviation of that mean and including them both in the SAH equation. The inclusion of these average variables (the so-called Mundlak transformation) is interpreted as picking up the correlation between unobserved time-invariant factors and the explanatory variables. In effect, the coefficients on the current level of own and others' health problems can now be interpreted as the *shock* effects that are independent from their mean (or permanent) effects on SAH (see Ferrer-i-Carbonell & van Praag, 2002), which are also in the process free from adaptation bias generated by the respondent's prior experiences of health problems.

The generalised ordered probit estimates that incorporate the Mundlak transformation are reported in the second panel of Table 3. Despite the decrease in the size of estimated parameters for some of the health problem variables, nearly all of the interaction terms for *own illness index* × *average illness index of other household members* in the second panel of Table 3 continue to be positive and statistically significant at conventional confidence levels. The results thus suggest that the effect of health norm on SAH is also robust to controls for unobserved time-invariant factors.

Finally, an alternative explanation of the positive externality of others' health problems on SAH may not be psychological at all but in fact reflect a real phenomenon. For example, if I suddenly find it difficult to walk in a household with similarly disabled people, it is likely that the accommodation will be equipped with rails, stair lifts and so on. To test whether the results are being driven by certain types of physical illness that could potentially benefit from others' disabilities of the same type such as problems with walking or difficulty in hearing,

Table 4 unpacks the own illness indexes and interacts them separately with the average illness index of other household members in a random effects generalised ordered probit specification with the Mundlak transformation. While the coefficient on the interaction between own and others' illness indexes is positive and statistically significant in all categories of SAH for physical illnesses, such as *arms, legs, hands, feet or neck*, there is evidence that people with illnesses such as heart pressure, diabetes and anxiety – none of which show how the individual could use them to gain from others' health problems – also benefit in terms of their SAH from an increase in the average illness index of other household members, which is consistent with the psychological explanation of health norm on health perception. Here, 8 out of the 13 health problems 'work' in the expected directions, i.e. the coefficient on own health problem is negative, but the coefficient on own health problem interacted with others' health problem is positive.

5. Conclusion

The objective of this paper was to present evidence that self-assessed health does not only suffer from systematic reporting bias and adaptation bias (see, e.g., Groot, 2000; van Doorslaer & Jones, 2003) but is also biased owing to the confounding social norm effects. Using 13 waves of the BHPS, I have shown that, consistent with Akerlof's (1980) theory of social norm, the gap in self-assessed health between people with health problems and those without health problems is significantly smaller in households where the average number of health problems per other family member (and/or the proportion of other members whose health restricts their ability to perform daily activities) is high.

There is one important implication of this finding. Under the assumption that health is endogenous, it may be possible, in some cases, to use others' objective health as an instrument for health levels in studies where health perception is used as an independent variable in the regression. This may include studies that view self-assessed health as an endogenous variable in the wage equation (see, e.g., Contoyannis & Rice, 2001) or even in the retirement decision equation (see, e.g., Dwyer & Mitchell, 1999).

Reference

Akerlof, G. A theory of social custom, of which unemployment may be one consequence. Quarterly Journal of Economics 94, 749-775.

Angel, R., Gronfein, W. 1988. The use of subjective information in statistical models. American Sociological Review 53, 464-473.

Baron-Epel, O., Kaplan, G. 2001. General subjective health status or age-related subjective health status: Does it make a difference? Social Science & Medicine 53, 1373-1381.

Benyamini, Y., Leventhal, E.A., Leventhal, H. 1999. Self-assessment of health: What do people know that predicts their mortality? Research on Aging 21, 477-500.

Boes, S., Winkelmann, R. 2006. The effect of income on positive and negative subjective well-being, University of Zurich: Socio-economic Institute, manuscript.

Clark, A.E. 2003. Unemployment as a social norm: Psychological evidence from panel data. Journal of Labor Economics 21(2), 289-322.

Clark, A.E., Etilé, F. 2008. Happy house: Spousal weight and individual well-being. Paris School of Economics and IZA, manuscript.

Cockerham, W.C., Sharp, K., Wilcox, J.A. 1983. Aging and perceived health status. Journal of Clinical Psychology 38, 349-355.

Contoyannis, P., Jones, A.M., Rice, N. 2004. The dynamics of health in the British Household Panel Survey. Journal of Applied Econometrics 19, 473-504.

Contoyannis, P., Rice, N. 2001. The impact of health on wages: evidence from the British Household Panel Survey. Empirical Economics 26, 599-622.

Cutler, D., Richardson, E. 1997. Measuring the health of the U.S. population. Brooking Papers: Microeconomics 1997, 217-282.

Currie, J., Madrian, B.C. 1999. Health, health insurance and the labour market. In Handbook of Labour Economics, Vol. 3, Ashenfelter, O., Card D. (eds.). Elsevier: Amsterdam.

Dwyer, D.S., Mitchell, O.S. 1999. Health problems as determinants of retirement: are self-rated measures endogenous? Journal of Health Economics 18, 173-193.

Ferraro, K.F., Farmer, M.M., Wybraniec, J.A. 1997. Health trajectories: Long-term dynamics among black and white adults. Journal of Health and Social Behavior 38, 38-54.

Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A., van Praag, B.M.S. 2002. The subjective costs of health loss due to chronic diseases: An alternative model for monetary appraisal. Health Economics 11(8), 7009-722.

Fienberg, S.E., Loftus, E.F., Tanur, J.M. 1985. Cognitive aspects of health survey methodology: An overview. Milbank Quarterly 63, 547-564.

Gerdtham, U-G., Johannesson, M. 2001. The relationship between happiness, health, and socio-economic factors: Results based on Swedish microdata. Journal of Socio-Economics 30, 553-557.

Groot, W. 2000. Adaptation and scale of reference bias in self-assessments of quality of life. Journal of Health Economics 19, 403-420.

Groot, W., van den Brink, H.T.M., Plug, E. 2004. Money for health: the equivalent variation of cardiovascular diseases. Health Economics 13, 859-872.

Headey, B. 2006. Happiness: Revising set point theory and dynamic equilibrium theory to account for long term change. DIW Berlin Discussion Paper No. 607.

Hernandez-Quevedo, C., Jones, A.M., Rice, N. 2005. Reporting bias and heterogeneity in self-assessed health. Evidence from the British Household Panel Survey. The University of York: HEDG working paper 05/04.

Idler, E.L., Benyamini, Y. 1997. Self-rated health and mortality: A review of twenty-seven community studies. Journal of Health and Social Behavior 38, 21-37.

Idler, E.L., Kasl, S. 1995. Self-rating of health: Do they also predict change in functional ability? Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences, 50B, S334-S353.

Kaplan, G., Strawbridge, W.J., Camacho, T., Cohen, R.D. 1993. Factors associated with change in physical functioning in the elderly: A six-year prospective study. Journal of Aging and Health 5, 40-53.

Kaplan, G., Baron-Epel, O. 2003. What lies behind the subjective evaluation of health status? Social Science & Medicine 56, 1669-1676.

Kerkhofs, M., Lindeboom, M. 1995. Subjective health measures and state dependent reporting error. Health Economics 4, 221-235.

Knight, M., Stewart-Brown, S., Fletcher, L. 2001. Estimating health needs: The impact of a checklist of conditions and quality of life measurement on health information derived from community surveys. Journal of Public Health Medicine 23(3), 179-186.

Krause, N.M., Jay, G.M. 1994. What do global self-rated health items measure? Medical care 32(9), 930-942.

Kriegsman, D.M., Penninx, B.W., van Eijk, J.T., Boeke, A.J., Deeg, D.J. 1996. Self-reports and general practitioner information on the presence of chronic diseases in community dwelling elderly. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology 49(12), 1407-1417.

Kulik, J.A., Mahler, H.I.M., Moore, P.J. 1996. Social comparison and affiliation under threat: Effects on recovery from major surgery. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 71, 967-979.

Levkoff, S.E., Cleary, P.D., Wetle, T. 1987. Differences in the appraisal of health between aged and middle-aged adults. Journal of Gerontology 42, 114-120.

Liang, J. 1986. Self-reported physical health among aged adults. Journal of Gerontology 41, 248-260.

Lindeboom, M., van Doorslaer, E. 2004. Cut-point shift and index shift in self-reported health. Journal of Health Economics 23, 1083-1099.

Luttmer, E.F.P. 2005. Neighbours as negatives: relative earnings and well-being. Quarterly Journal of Economics 120, 963-1002.

McElvey, R.D., Zavoina, W. 1975. A statistical model for the analysis of ordinal level dependent variable. Journal of Mathematical Sociology 4, 103-120.

Moulton, B.R. 1990. An illustration of a pitfall in estimating the effects of aggregate variables on micro units. Review of Economics and Statistics 72, 334-338.

Mundlak, Y. 1978. On the pooling of time series and cross section data. Econometrica 46, 69-85.

Oswald, A.J., Powdthavee, N. 2008. Does happiness adapt? A longitudinal study of disability with implications for economists and judges. Journal of Public Economics 92, 1061-1077.

Powdthavee, N. 2005. Unhappiness and crime: Evidence from South Africa. Economica 72, 531-547.

Powdthavee, N. 2007. Are there geographical variations in the psychological costs of unemployment in South Africa? Social Indicators Research 80(3), 629-652.

Sacker, A., Wiggins, R.D., Clarke, P., Bartley, M. 2003. Making sense of symptom checklists: A latent class approach to the first 9 years of the British Household Panel Survey. Journal of Public Health Medicine 25(3), 215-222.

Singer, E. 1974. Premature social aging: The social psychological consequences of a chronic disease. Social Science & Medicine 8, 143-151.

Singer, E. 1977. Subjective evaluation as indicators of change. Journal of Health and Social Behavior 18, 84-90.

Stutzer, A., Lalive, R. 2004. The role of social work norms in job searching and subjective well-being. Journal of European Economic Association 2, 696-719.

Suls, J., Marco, C.A., Tobin, S. 1991. The role of temporal comparison, social comparison and appraisal in the elderly's self-evaluation of health. Journal of Applied Social Psychology 21, 1125.

van Doorslaer, E., Jones, A.M. 2003. Inequalities in self-reported health: validation of a new approach to measurement. Journal of Health Economics 22, 61-87.

van Doorslaer, E., Gerdtham, U-G. 2003. Does inequality in self-assessed health predict inequality in survival by income? Evidence from Swedish data. Social Science & Medicine 57, 1621-1629.

van Doorslaer, E., Jones, A.M., Koolman, X. 2004. Explaining income-related inequalities in doctor utilization in Europe. Health Economics 13, 629-647.

Vera-Toscano, E., Ateca-Amestoy, V. 2008. The relevance of social interactions on housing satisfaction. Social Indicators Research 86, 257-274.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics (BHPS, Waves 1-8, 10-13, & 15)

Variables	**M**	**SD**
i) Health related variables		
Self-assessed health (SAH)	3.858	0.930
Own illness index	1.108	1.237
Own health limits ability to do daily activities	0.147	0.354
Others' illness index	1.108	1.147
Others' health limits ability to do daily activities	0.147	0.326
ii) Personal and household characteristics		
Male	0.495	0.499
Age	42.632	17.330
Age-squared/100	21.178	16.286
Log of real household income per capita	8.254	2.471
Marital status: cohabiting	0.116	0.321
Marital status: widowed	0.019	0.137
Marital status: divorced	0.020	0.141
Marital status: separated	0.006	0.078
Marital status: single	0.184	0.388
Employment status: unemployed	0.040	0.198
Employment status: self-employed	0.075	0.264
Employment status: retired	0.148	0.355
Employment status: disabled	0.036	0.188
Employment status: not active in labour market	0.160	0.366
Education: completed first degree	0.084	0.278
Education: completed higher degree	0.020	0.140
Household size	3.216	1.256
Number of dependent children (age < 16)	0.575	0.976
N = 127699		

Figure 1: The SAH gap between individuals with no illness and those with one illness ($SAH_{P=0}$-$SAH_{P=1}$) and other household members' health problems



Note: Average $SAH_{P=0}$ = 4.278 with no other ill household members (N=27,552), average $SAH_{P=1}$ = 3.825 with no other ill household members (N=12,979), average $SAH_{P=0}$ = 4.248 with the average of one illness per member (N=16,350); average $SAH_{P=1}$ = 3.801 with the average of one illness per member (N=12,201).

Figure 2: The SAH gap between 'those whose health does not limit daily activities' and 'those whose health limits daily activities' ($SAH_{P=0}$-$SAH_{P=1}$) and other household members' ability to physically function



Note: Average $SAH_{P=0}$ = 4.082 with no other 'not able to do daily activities' household members (N=91,256), average $SAH_{P=1}$ = 2.719 with no other 'not able to do daily activities' household members (N=10,289), average $SAH_{P=0}$ = 3.915 with health limits daily activities for all other household members (N=10,214); average $SAH_{P=1}$ = 2.601 with health limits daily activities for all other household members (N=4,141).

Table 2: Random effects ordered probit SAH regressions with health problems as independent variables

Dependent variable: SAH - 5 point-scale	Unbalanced panel	Balanced panel
Own illness index	-0.439	-0.420
	[0.005]**	[0.008]**
Average illness index of other household members	-0.070	-0.063
	[0.006]**	[0.009]**
Own illness index × Average illness index of other members	0.032	0.029
	[0.002]**	[0.004]**
Own health limits ability to do daily activities	-1.134	-1.044
	[0.015]**	[0.022]**
Proportion of members whose health limits the ability to do daily activities	-0.065	-0.029
	[0.016]**	[0.023]
Own health limits ability × Proportion of members whose health limits ability	0.073	0.035
	[0.027]**	[0.045]
Male	0.081	0.129
	[0.014]**	[0.024]**
Age	0.004	0.004
	[0.002]*	[0.004]
Age-squared/100	-0.007	-0.002
	[0.002]**	[0.004]
Log of real household income per capita	0.013	0.028
	[0.004]**	[0.008]**
Marital status: cohabiting	-0.059	-0.070
	[0.017]**	[0.027]*
Marital status: widowed	-0.053	-0.015
	[0.040]	[0.073]
Marital status: divorced	-0.053	0.005
	[0.034]	[0.052]
Marital status: separated	-0.149	-0.152
	[0.052]**	[0.084]+
Marital status: single	0.049	0.028
	[0.021]*	[0.034]
Employment status: unemployed	-0.185	-0.128
	[0.020]**	[0.032]**
Employment status: self-employed	0.069	0.067
	[0.019]**	[0.027]*
Employment status: retired	-0.069	-0.023
	[0.019]**	[0.028]
Employment status: disabled	-0.697	-0.559
	[0.025]**	[0.041]**
Employment status: not active in labour market	-0.100	-0.030
	[0.013]**	[0.020]
Education: completed first degree	0.209	0.178
	[0.021]**	[0.034]**
Education: completed higher degree	0.275	0.245
	[0.042]**	[0.068]**
Household size	-0.008	-0.010
	[0.005]	[0.008]
Number of dependent children (age < 16)	-0.006	0.008

	[0.007]	[0.011]
Cut_1	-4.347	-1.530
	[0.056]**	[0.087]**
Cut_2	-3.001	-2.962
	[0.055]**	[0.088]**
Cut_3	-1.565	-4.274
	[0.054]**	[0.087]**
Cut_4	0.406	0.393
	[0.054]**	[0.091]**
Rho	0.410	0.500
	[0.004]**	[0.006]**
Regional dummies	Yes	Yes
Year dummies	Yes	Yes
Observations	127699	58132
Log likelihood	-126604.22	-55090.92

Note: + 10%, * 5%, ** 1%. Standard errors are in parentheses. Self-assessed health (SAH) is measured using a 5-point scale, ranging from 1.very poor health to 5.excellent health. Reference groups are: female, marital status: married, employment status: in full-time employment, education: no formal education. All equations are robust to clustering by personal identification.

Table 3: Random effects generalized ordered probit SAH regressions (balanced panel)

	Random effects generalized ordered probit				Random effects generalized ordered probit with Mundlak transformation			
Dependent variable: SAH - 5 point-scale	**j=1**	**j=2**	**j=3**	**j=4**	**j=1**	**j=2**	**j=3**	**j=4**
Own illness index	-0.260	-0.368	-0.472	-0.439	-0.223	-0.426	-0.377	-0.333
	[0.021]**	[0.014]**	[0.011]**	[0.014]**	[0.025]**	[0.016]**	[0.012]**	[0.016]**
Average illness index of other household members	-0.078	-0.067	-0.075	-0.036	-0.058	-0.032	-0.062	-0.070
	[0.033]*	[0.018]**	[0.012]**	[0.011]**	[0.020]**	[0.038]	[0.012]**	[0.013]**
Own illness index × Average illness index of other members	0.017	0.022	0.031	0.021	0.033	0.015	0.022	0.022
	[0.010]+	[0.006]**	[0.006]**	[0.008]**	[0.006]**	[0.008]**	[0.006]**	[0.010]
Own health limits ability to do daily activities	-0.929	-1.159	-1.064	-0.736	-0.223	-0.726	-1.066	-0.973
	[0.055]**	[0.031]**	[0.028]**	[0.051]**	[0.025]**	[0.030]**	[0.062]**	[0.054]**
Proportion of members whose health limits the ability to do daily activities	0.157	-0.026	-0.056	-0.014	-0.058	0.016	0.161	-0.055
	[0.126]	[0.051]	[0.030]+	[0.031]	[0.020]**	[0.057]	[0.034]	[0.035]
Own health limits ability × Proportion of members whose health limits ability	-0.104	0.079	-0.030	-0.206	0.033	-0.072	0.098	-0.017
	[0.137]	[0.067]	[0.062]	[0.142]	[0.006]**	[0.141]	[0.067]	[0.137]
Mean over the observation period								
Illness index					-0.158	-0.134	-0.141	-0.200
					[0.034]**	[0.024]**	[0.021]**	[0.023]**
Average illness index of other household members					0.002	0.021	0.007	0.013
					[0.045]	[0.028]	[0.022]	[0.022]
Health limits ability to do daily activities					-0.479	-0.916	-1.232	-0.641
					[0.114]**	[0.081]**	[0.074]**	[0.091]**
Proportion of members whose health limits the ability to do daily activities					-0.129	-0.033	-0.244	-0.133
					[0.156]	[0.101]	[0.080]**	[0.082]
Rho	0.394 [0.006]**				-0.227 [0.107]**			
Observation	58132				58132			
Log likelihood	-54681.368				-54331.970			

Note: + 10%, * 5%, ** 1%. SAH categories: j=1 (very poor), j=2 (poor), j=3 (fair), j=4 (good). Standard errors are in parentheses. Other controls are as in Table 2.

Table 4: Random effects generalized ordered probit SAH regression with unpacked illness index and Mundlak transformation (balanced panel)

Dependent variable: SAH - 5 point-scale	j=1	j=2	j=3	j=4
Arms, legs, hands, feet, or neck	-0.056	-0.335	-0.418	-0.459
	[0.078]	[0.042]**	[0.029]**	[0.033]**
Average illness index of other household members	-0.065	-0.078	-0.062	-0.035
	[0.040]	[0.021]**	[0.013]**	[0.012]**
Arms, legs, hands, etc. × Average illness index	0.060	0.060	0.019	0.038
	[0.034]+	[0.019]**	[0.015]	[0.018]*
Difficulty in seeing	-0.107	-0.114	-0.203	-0.004
	[0.116]	[0.074]	[0.060]**	[0.073]
Difficulty in seeing × Average illness index	-0.013	0.005	0.071	-0.051
	[0.047]	[0.031]	[0.029]*	[0.039]
Difficulty in hearing	0.258	0.144	-0.068	-0.172
	[0.143]+	[0.080]+	[0.054]	[0.060]**
Difficulty in hearing × Average illness index	-0.024	-0.036	-0.005	0.034
	[0.050]	[0.031]	[0.024]	[0.029]
Skin conditions/allergies	0.037	0.024	-0.137	-0.114
	[0.101]	[0.056]	[0.039]**	[0.042]**
Skin conditions/allergies × Average illness index	0.003	-0.010	0.003	0.008
	[0.044]	[0.026]	[0.020]	[0.025]
Chest/breathing problems, asthma, bronchitis	-0.132	-0.312	-0.487	-0.403
	[0.087]	[0.053]**	[0.042]**	[0.055]**
Chest/breathing problems × Average illness index	-0.038	-0.034	0.017	-0.030
	[0.035]	[0.023]	[0.019]	[0.029]
Heart/blood pressure or blood circulation problems	-0.225	-0.447	-0.551	-0.591
	[0.088]*	[0.052]**	[0.039]**	[0.051]**
Heart/blood pressure × Average illness index	-0.046	0.023	0.050	0.057
	[0.034]	[0.022]	[0.018]**	[0.025]*
Stomach/liver/kidneys or digestion problems	-0.671	-0.636	-0.716	-0.681
	[0.084]**	[0.054]**	[0.046]**	[0.074]**
Stomach or digestion problems × Average illness index	0.141	0.091	0.075	0.018
	[0.037]**	[0.025]**	[0.023]**	[0.043]
Diabetes	-0.014	-0.348	-0.725	-0.598
	[0.173]	[0.114]**	[0.101]**	[0.155]**
Diabetes × Average illness index	-0.028	0.031	0.060	0.068
	[0.060]	[0.044]	[0.041]	[0.064]
Anxiety, depression or bad nerves	-0.446	-0.711	-0.747	-0.659
	[0.083]**	[0.054]**	[0.048]**	[0.080]**
Anxiety, depression or bad nerves × Average illness index	0.000	0.060	0.084	0.094
	[0.037]	[0.025]*	[0.025]**	[0.047]*
Alcohol or drugs related problems	0.088	-0.549	-0.046	-0.071
	[0.420]	[0.254]*	[0.229]	[0.396]
Alcohol or drugs related problems × Average illness index	-0.144	0.167	-0.299	-0.177
	[0.154]	[0.143]	[0.145]*	[0.343]
Epilepsy	-0.552	-0.052	-0.763	-0.339
	[0.275]*	[0.226]	[0.198]**	[0.240]
Epilepsy × Average illness index	0.124	0.063	0.129	0.016
	[0.117]	[0.084]	[0.072]+	[0.096]
Migraine or frequent headaches	-0.061	-0.141	-0.285	-0.307
	[0.098]	[0.057]*	[0.043]**	[0.050]**
Migraine or frequent headaches × Average illness index	0.025	0.007	0.020	0.030
	[0.043]	[0.027]	[0.023]	[0.030]

Other health problems	-0.642	-0.604	-0.738	-0.526
	[0.087]**	[0.058]**	[0.050]**	[0.073]**
Other health problems × Average illness index	0.041	0.012	0.070	0.006
	[0.042]	[0.029]	[0.029]*	[0.048]
Health limits ability to do daily activities	-0.964	-1.044	-0.840	-0.694
	[0.064]**	[0.035]**	[0.030]**	[0.055]**
Proportion of members whose health limits the ability to do daily activities	0.171	-0.060	0.013	0.007
	[0.137]	[0.057]	[0.035]	[0.035]
Health limits ability × Proportion of members whose health limits ability	-0.037	0.116	-0.011	-0.200
	[0.141]	[0.068]+	[0.063]	[0.143]
Rho	0.361 [0.006]**			
Observation	58132			
Log likelihood	-53761.647			

Note: + 10%, * 5%, ** 1%. Standard errors are in parentheses. Other controls are as in Table 2.

Appendix: The prevalence of others' health problems for each category of SAH

Own status: no health problems	Others' illness index	Others' health limits daily activities
Very poor	1.008 (1.209)	0.198 (0.374)
Poor	0.832 (0.956)	0.178 (0.355)
Fair	0.883 (1.025)	0.162 (0.340)
Good	0.786 (0.959)	0.124 (0.302)
Excellent	0.741 (0.922)	0.104 (0.277)
Mean	**0.778 (0.952)**	**0.126 (0.304)**
Own status: with at least one illness/health limits daily activities		
Very poor	1.223 (1.307)	0.299 (0.428)
Poor	1.124 (1.222)	0.282 (0.419)
Fair	1.065 (1.176)	0.267 (0.413)
Good	1.014 (1.101)	0.226 (0.390)
Excellent	0.943 (1.068)	0.253 (0.402)
Mean	**1.020 (1.122)**	**0.268 (0.413)**