LIVING ARRANGEMENTS AND THE HEALTH OF OLDER PERSONS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: EVIDENCE FROM RURAL BANGLADESH

Mohammed O. Rahman*

S

The present analysis focuses on 1,891 respondents aged 50 and above (981 males and 910 females) who answered questions on self-reported general health status and self-reported limitations in activities of daily living. There are three separate clusters of self-reported ADLs (gross mobility limitations, range of motion and personal care, which are described below).[1]

Variable measurement

All respondents to the Survey were asked to rate their general health status ("What is your current health status?") as "excellent", "good" or "poor". This three-level variable has been dichotomized for the purposes of the present analysis into poor general health status (coded as 1) and non-poor general health status (coded as 0). It is worth noting that several studies have shown reported poor general health to be a good predictor of mortality (Mossey and Shapiro, 1982; Idler and Benyamini, 1997).

A number of researchers have suggested that self-reports of limitations in activities of daily living are less subject to reporting bias than are self-reports of general health, and are good indicators of underlying functional disabilities (Rosow and Breslau, 1969; Katz and others, 1970; Nagi, 1976; Guralnik and others, 1989; Elam and others, 1991; Gijsbers van Wijk and others, 1991; Kelly-Hayes and others, 1992; Merrill and others, 1997). In the Survey, information is available on limitations in 13 separate ADL items, which (following Merrill and others, 1997) are divided for the present analysis into three different clusters: (a) limitations in personal care—four items; (b) gross mobility limitations—three items; and (c) range of motion limitations—six items. In the questionnaire, each ADL item has a three-level score: "can do on their own easily" (scored as 1); "can do on their own with difficulty" (scored as 2); and "unable to do on their own" (scored as 3). For the purposes of this analysis, the three-level score for each ADL item has been initially collapsed into a dichotomous measure: (a) can do on their own easily (scored as 1); vs. (b) can do with difficulty or unable to perform the activity (scored as 0).

Limitations in personal care are ascertained using a modified version of the Katz ADL (Katz and others, 1970) and include ability to: (a) bathe; (b) dress; (c) get up and out of bed; and (d) use the toilet. For the present analysis, the dichotomous item measures for each of the four personal care items were summed to construct an aggregate personal care limitation score ranging from 0 to 4. This aggregate score was then dichotomized into: (a) can do all four items easily (scored as 0); vs. (b) can do with difficulty or unable to do one or more items (scored as 1).

Gross mobility limitation items include ability to (a) walk one mile; (b) use a ladder to climb to a storage place at least five feet in height; and (c) sweep the floor or courtyard. These items were adapted to the local conditions of rural Bangladesh from an instrument developed by Rosow and Breslau (1969). For the present

Results

Table 1 shows some general descriptive characteristics for older adults in our study population in rural Bangladesh. There are marked gender differences in marital status, educational status and ownership of assets, with older women being much more likely than older men to be not currently married, to have no education and to own less than or equal to $20 dollars worth of assets. In this study, individual access to financial resources was measured by summing the estimated monetized value of a number of assets that were singly or jointly owned (including land, jewelry, bicycle, watch, radio etc.).

(TABLE 1 HERE)

With regard to ownership of assets (results not shown in table), among older males aged 50 and over, the non-married are more likely to have less than $20 dollars worth of assets than are their currently married peers (20 per cent or 12/60 vs. 5 per cent or 45/921). However, among older females, there is no difference in asset ownership by marital status (59 per cent or 294/500 vs. 59 per cent or 244/410). With regard to educational attainment, among older males, there is no difference by marital status (45 per cent of each marital group have no education). However, among older females, the non-married are more likely to have no education than are their currently married peers (83 per cent or 341/410 vs. 76 per cent or 378/500).

Table 2 shows differences in self-reported general health status stratified by age group and marital status for men and women aged 50 and over. For both older men and older women, non-married individuals aged 50 and over taken as a group are more likely to report poor general health relative to their married counterparts. However, once one stratifies by age, these marital status differences by and large disappear. Moreover, older women as a whole are more likely to report poor general health than are older men (42 per cent vs. 32 per cent) (results not shown in table 2).

(TABLE 2 HERE)

Table 3 shows differences in ADL limitations for men and women stratified by 10-year age intervals. As in the case of self-reported general health, older women are significantly more likely to report limitations than are their male counterparts in each ADL item and each of the three summary ADL catel9.4(TJ3(A)4.4(D)-7(e F4(a)2(e)-

(TABLE 3 HERE)

With regard to marital status differences (results not shown in table 3), for both older men and older women aged 50 and over as a group, the non-married report a higher frequency of ADL limitations than do their currently married peers. The relevant figures (non-married vs. currently married) are (a) summary range of motion limitations: males (67 per cent vs. 37 per cent); females (79 per cent vs. 67 per cent); (b) summary gross mobility limitations: males (60 per cent vs. 37 per cent); females (82 per cent vs. 71 per cent); and (c) summary personal care limitations: males (19 per cent vs. 10 per cent); females (29 per cent vs. 13 per cent). It should be noted, however, that once these figures are adjusted for the higher ages of the non-married, the marital status differences in ADL limitations disappear.

Table 4 shows results (separately for men and women) from sequential binary logistic regressions examining the impact of marital status on poor general health status, adjusting for the addition of various controls. For older women, in model 1, the results indicate that controlling for age (measured in calendar years), non-currently married women (the vast majority of whom are widowed) in this study population are significantly more likely to report poor general health than are their currently married counterparts (odds ratio of non-married vs. married = 1.5). In models 2 and 3, additional controls for education and household assets do not appreciably change the impact of marital status on poor general health (odds ratio of married vs. non-married changes from 1.5 to 1.49). Finally, in model 4, introducing further controls for number of co-resident sons does not change the impact of marital status on poor general health for older women (odds ratio of married vs. non-married remains at 1.49 (95 per cent C. I. of 1.00-2.22).

(TABLE 4 HERE)

For older men, in model 1, the results indicate that non-currently married men are no more likely to report poor general health than are their currently married peers. This lack of impact of marital status on poor general health is not affected by the addition of controls for education and household assets in models 2 and 3, respectively (odds ratio of married vs. non-married = 0.98 (95 per cent C. I. of 0.48-2.02).

Table 5 shows results (for men and women separately) from logistic regressions examining the impact of marital status on three different categories of ADL limitations (personal care limitation, gross mobility limitation, and range of motion limitation), controlling for age, education, household assets and (for women, the presence of co-residential sons). In no case is there a statistically significant impact of marital status on any of the ADLs. It should be noted that sequential models were run and no impact was found for marital status on ADL limitations once controls were added for age (results not shown in table 5).

(TABLE 5 HERE)

Discussion

The fact that older non-currently married women report worse general health status than do their married peers in rural Bangladesh mirrors the bulk of the findings on this issue from Europe and the United States. These results also fit with earlier longitudinal research in the same study population that shows that non-married older women have higher mortality than do their married peers (Rahman, Menken and Foster, 1992; Rahman, 1997, 1999b). However, these results are somewhat at odds with other longitudinal research that show that the absence of a spouse does not have any impact on mortality for older women (Rahman, 1999a). An explanation for this discrepancy may lie in the fact that cross-sectional differences in health status between married and non-married women reflect health conditions that cause distress but do not affect mortality (e.g., migraine and arthritis). A number of studies have suggested a similar explanation for the paradox of high female morbidity coupled with low female mortality relative to men (Wingard, 1984; Verbrugge and Wingard, 1987; Kandrack, Grant and Segall, 1991). The discrepancy between the self-reported general health results and the ADL results (the latter showing no impact of marital status) also suggests that the different measures of health status are tapping into different dimensions of health and that ADLs may be more reflective of mortality risks than self-reported general health.

There are a number of possible explanations that one can invoke to understand why the presence of a spouse may be associated with better health for older women, even though, as discussed above, it may not lead to better survival. These explanations fall into two conceptually different approaches to understanding the association between marital status and health. The first and most often cited approach posits a so-called "protective effect", that is having a spouse is deemed to directly cause an improvement in one's health, which is mediated through a variety of proximate factors such as increased access to financial resources, improved caregiving, emotional buffering, better diet and less risk-taking behaviour (Bowling, 1987; Ross, Mirowski, Goldstein, 1990). The second explanation posits a "selection effect", whereby one's marital status per se does not have any causative impact on one's health (Goldman, 1993; Rahman and others, 1994; Goldman, Korenman and Weinstein, 1995). Instead, the association between marital status and health status is merely a marker of some underlying process by which intrinsically healthier people, for example, may be more likely to be currently married. This distinction between "protection" and "selection" has bedevilled the interpretation of associations between marital status and heath (particularly cross-sectional comparisons) and the resolution of this debate relies at least partially on detailed longitudinal data on early health prior to marriage, which is most often not available.

From the protective effect point of view, as commented on above, one of the more obvious explanations for why non-married older women have worse health than their married peers is that the non-married have decreased access to financial resources. This is thought to be particularly true in a setting such as rural Bangladesh, where

women have limited economic mobility and are dependent on their husbands and sons primarily for economic support (Cain, 1984, 1986; Ellickson, 1988). Thus, loss of a husband may result in a decrease in the availability of financial resources. The decrease in financial resources associated with the loss of a husband may come about in two ways, directly and indirectly. The direct consequence would be from the loss of the income-generation capability of the husband. The indirect adverse consequence would be in the diminution of the receipt of resources from other earning household members, typically sons. In the social setting of rural Bangladesh, where sons often live together with parents and contribute financially to the joint household income, the death of a father usually precipitates household splitting and the resultant loss of income from the son who moves away (Aziz, 1979; Foster, 1993). Regardless of how the decrease in financial resources occurs, it is hypothesized to lead to poorer health. The potential mechanisms include decreased access and use of health-care services, worse nutrition and lifestyle and increased environmental and occupational hazards (Ross, Mirowski and Goldstein, 1990; Wyke and Ford, 1992).

In the present study, an individual woman's access to financial resources is proxied in two ways, first by household asset ownership, and second by the presence of co-residential sons. Our results show that, having less than or equal to US$20 worth of household assets is not a statistically significant predictor of poor general health (controlling for age and marital status) and, moreover, does not account for any of the marital status difference in health. The fact that asset ownership does not have a significant impact on general health status in this population may be explained by the fact that the measured assets are relatively long term and not very liquid (i.e., they cannot easily be transformed into cash to be used for health services, medication or nutritional needs) and thus do not quite capture the availability of financial resources at the individual level. Moreover, controlling for the number of sons co-resident in the household also does not account for any of the marital status differences in self-reported general health among older women. Parenthetically, it should be noted that the number of co-resident sons does not have any impact on an older woman's health status. The lack of impact of co-resident sons on marital status differences in self-reported general health and, indeed, on the health status of older women is broadly consistent with earlier longitudinal research on mortality that showed that non-co-resident sons may be just as important as co-resident sons and that proximity does not necessarily confer any particular advantage. The lack of impact of proximity is due to two possible reasons: the first is that there may be a selection effect, whereby sick mothers move in with sons and healthy mothers do not. The second reason is that if remittances of income are the mechanism by which sons improve their mother's health, distant sons (for example, living in the city where there are more income-earning opportunities) may be better able to impact their mother's health than co-resident sons in a stagnant village economy.

As discussed above, the association between marital status and health may reflect the possibility that currently married older women in this social setting are intrinsically in better health than are their non-married peers. In this traditional rural society, where near-universal marriage is the norm, and divorce is rare, the essence of this

argument is that intrinsically healthier women are less likely to become widowed and the difference in reported health status by marital status among older women reflects differences in underlying early health prior to marriage, which has nothing to do with their current marital status. To test this proposition, one should ideally have some marker for early health, that is, health prior to marriage. In the absence of such data, educational attainment (which is completed prior to marriage) may be a crude but effective proxy to the extent that higher educational attainment prior to marriage reflects better health prior to marriage. While individual educational attainment significantly reduced the risk of mortality, it did not account for any of the marital status differences in health.

Thus, the present study provides little support for either protective effects (e.g., changes in financial resources) or selective effects (early educational attainment) in understanding the mechanism by which the absence of a spouse among older women is associated with poorer general health.

As to the case of older men in the study population, the present analysis shows that, among older men, marital status does not affect self-reported general health status or ADL limitations. This result is somewhat puzzling as it is at odds with earlier longitudinal work in this population (Rahman, 1997, 1999a, 1999b) and in Europe and North America, which clearly demonstrates that older men without spouses are at a significantly increased risk of dying relative to their currently married counterparts (Bowling, 1987; Ross, Mirowski and Goldstein, 1990). It is also at odds with evidence from several studies in the developed world that have documented increased morbidity for older non-married men (particularly widowers) compared to their currently married peers (Wyke and Ford, 1992; Goldman, Korenman and Weinstein, 1995; Glaser and Grundy, 1997). One possible explanation for this disjunction in results between the cross-sectional and the longitudinal studies may be related to differential mortality selection by marital status. The thinking here is that we can only observe individuals who have survived to enter our study. Thus, if sick non-married younger men die earlier than their sick married counterparts (presumably owing to differences in caregiving), one is left with a residual pool of fairly robust non-married older men. In a cross-sectional comparison such as the one reported on in the present study, this differential mortality by marital status would artefactually decrease the morbidity differences between currently married and non-married older men (Rahman and others, 1994; Goldman, Korenman and Weinstein, 1995; Rahman, 1999a). Another possibility (though less likely) is that health conditions that would lead to higher mortality for one group may not be manifested in symptoms that would be differentially reported. Thus, for example, if the bulk of old-age mortality is from conditions that have relatively few preceding symptoms, one may not observe differences in self-reported health.

As the above discussion suggests, there appears to be a complex dynamic relationship between living arrangements and health status, with differences by gender, by the outcome measure of health (morbidity vs. mortality and different measures of morbidity), by various measures of living arrangements (i.e., spouses vs. sons) and by study design (cross-sectional vs. longitudinal). Moreover, the possible mechanisms by which living

arrangements may affect health status remain thus far unelucidated. Further progress in this line of inquiry requires more detailed information on a variety of measures of health status (both self-reported and measured), indicators of early health, the ability to track both changes in living arrangements (e.g., by the presence of various co-residential family members) and health status over time, and better measures of access to financial resources and changes in caregiving.

1

REFERENCES

_____, and J. Liu (1999). Gender differences in functioning for older adults in rural Bangladesh. The impact of differential reporting? *Journal of Gerontology: Medical Sciences* (December).

Rahman, O., J., Menken, and A. Foster (1992). Older widow mortality in rural Bangladesh. *Social Science and Medicine*, vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 89-96.

Rahman, O., and others (1994). Gender differences in adult health: an international comparison. *The Gerontologist*, vol. 34, No. 4, pp. 463-469.

_____ (1999). *The Matlab Health and Socio-economic Survey: Overview and User's Guide, 1999*. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation.

Rosow, I., and N. Breslau (1969). A Guttman health scale for the aged. *Journal of Gerontology*, vol. 21, pp. 557-560.

Ross, C. E., J., Mirowski, and K. Goldstein (1990). The impact of the family on health: the decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 52, pp. 1059-1078.

Seeman, T. E., and others (1987). Social networks and mortality among the elderly in the Alameda County study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, vol. 126, pp. 714-23.

Trovato, F., and G. Lauris (1989). Marital status and mortality in Canada, 1951-1981. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 51, No. 4, pp. 907-922.

Verbrugge, L. M., and D. L. Wingard (1987). Sex differentials in health and mortality. *Women's Health*, vol. 12, pp. 103-145.

Wingard, D. L. (1984). The sex differential in morbidity, mortality, and life style. *Annual Review of Public Health*, vol. 5, pp. 433-458.

Wyke, S., and G. Ford (1992). Competing explanations for associations between marital status and health. *Social Science and Medicine*, vol. 34, No. 5, pp. 525-532.

Age category	Male		Female	
	Currently married	Not currently married	Currently married	Not currently married
	n=407	n=4		
50-59	% in ph, 23			

TABLE 3. SELF-REPORTED ADL LIMITATIONS FOR OLDER ADULTS IN RURAL

TABLE 3. SELF-REPORTED ADL LIMITATIONS FOR OLDER ADULTS IN RURAL

TABLE 4. ODDS RATIOS OF POOR GENERAL HEALTH FOR OLDER MEN AND WOMEN IN RURAL BANGLADESH

Variables	Males			Females			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Not currently married	0.99 ns [0.48--2.01]	0.96 ns [0.47--1.96]	0.98 ns [0.48--2.02]	1.50 [a] [1.00--2.23]	1.49 [a] [1.00--2.22]	1.49 [a] [1.00--2.22]	1.49 [a] [1.00--2.22]
Age in years	1.05 [a] [1.03--1.08]	1.05 [a] [1.03--1.08]	1.05 [a] [1.03--1.08]	1.03 [a] [1.01--1.06]	1.03 [a] [1.00--1.05]	1.03 [a] [1.01--1.05]	1.03 [a] [1.01--1.05]
No education	--	1.80 [a] [1.22--2.67]	1.80 [a] [1.22--2.67]	--	1.77 [a] [1.13--2.80]	1.78 [a] [1.13--2.81]	1.78 [a] [1.13--2.83]
<= $20 dollars of assets	--	--	0.92 ns [0.42--2.04]	--	--	0.98 ns [0.67--1.43]	0.98 ns [0.67--1.43]
# co-resident sons	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	--	--	--	1.00 ns [0.85--1.18]
# parameters	2	3	4	2	3	4	5
-2 log likelihood	1 201.9	1 184.1	1 184.0	1 204.28	1 194.6	1 194.6	1 194.6
n	980	980	980	909	909	909	909

Notes:
ns = not statistically significant.
[ ] = 95% C.I.
[a] P< = 0.05.

TABLE 5. ODDS RATIOS OF ACTIVITY OF DAILY LIVING LIMITATION FOR OLDER ADULTS IN RURAL BANGLADESH

	Personal care limitation		Range of motion limitation		Gross mobility limitation	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Variables						
Not currently married	0.42 ns [0.16--1.15]	1.40 ns [0.80--2.45]	1.54 ns [0.72--3.33]	0.86 ns [0.54--1.38]	1.55 ns [0.73--3.31]	0.91 ns [0.55-1.52]
Age in years	1.12^a [1.08--1.16]	1.08 ^{a} [1.05--1.12]	1.12 ^{a} [1.09--1.15]	1.12 ^{a} [1.08--1.17]	1.12 ^{a} [1.08--1.15]	1.12 ^{a} [1.06--1.14]
No education	1.17 ns [0.63--2.17]	0.94 ns [0.44--2.01]	1.40 ns [0.94--2.07]	0.92 ns [0.54--1.58]	1.21 ns [0.81--1.82]	1.19 ns [0.68-2.07]
<= $20 dollars of assets	0.70 ns [0.27--1.82]	1.09 ns [0.63--1.89]	0.63 ns [0.29--1.37]	1.47 ns [0.93--2.31]	0.61 ns [0.27--1.40]	1.29 ns [0.80-2.10]
# of co-resident sons	not applicable	0.88 ns [0.71--1.09]	not applicable	0.84 ns [0.70--1.00]	not applicable	0.84 ns [0.70-1.01]
# parameters	4	5	4	5	4	5
-2 log likelihood	538.0	782.2	1 114.1	936.5	1 079.1	853.5
n^b	936	873	980	909	937	873

*Note*s:
ns = not statistically significant -- P>0.05.
[   ] = 95 % C. I.
^{a}P< = 0.05
$_b$