



EUROPE

Socioeconomic differences in health, health behaviour and access to health care

in Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation and Ukraine



Marc Suhrcke, Sarah Walters, Stefano Mazzuco,
Joceline Pomerleau, Martin McKee and Christian W. Haerpfer



EUROPE

Socioeconomic differences in health, health behaviour and access to health care

in Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan,
Kyrgyzstan, the Republic of Moldova,
the Russian Federation and Ukraine

Marc Suhrcke, Sarah Walters, Stefano Mazzuco,
Joceline Pomerleau, Martin McKee and Christian W. Haerpfer

Abstract

This publication presents tables summarizing the distribution of health, health behaviour, health care access and social capital by socioeconomic status, gender and residence (urban and rural). The data come from the Living Conditions, Lifestyles and Health (LLH) Project, which conducted representative surveys in eight countries of the former Soviet Union: Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation and Ukraine in October and November 2001. The statistics are descriptive and do not necessarily reflect causal relationships between socioeconomic status and health.

Keywords

SOCIOECONOMIC FACTORS	BELARUS
HEALTH SERVICES ACCESSIBILITY	GEORGIA
HEALTH BEHAVIOR	KAZAKHSTAN
HEALTH STATUS INDICATORS	KYRGYZSTAN
HEALTH SURVEYS	REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA
STATISTICS	RUSSIAN FEDERATION
ARMENIA	UKRAINE

ISBN 978 92 890 4286 4

Address requests about publications of the WHO Regional Office for Europe to:
Publications
WHO Regional Office for Europe,
Scherfigsvej 8, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark
Alternatively, complete an online request form for documentation, health information, or for permission to quote or translate, on the Regional Office web site (<http://www.euro.who.int/pubrequest>).

©World Health Organization 2008

All rights reserved. The Regional Office for Europe of the World Health Organization welcomes requests for permission to reproduce or translate its publications, in part or in full.

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the World Health Organization concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Dotted lines on maps represent approximate border lines for which there may not yet be full agreement.

The mention of specific companies or of certain manufacturers' products does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by the World Health Organization in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. Errors and omissions excepted, the names of proprietary products are distinguished by initial capital letters.

All reasonable precautions have been taken by the World Health Organization to verify the information contained in this publication. However, the published material is being distributed without warranty of any kind, either express or implied. The responsibility for the interpretation and use of the material lies with the reader. In no event shall the World Health Organization be liable for damages arising from its use. The views expressed by authors, editors, or expert groups do not necessarily represent the decisions or the stated policy of the World Health Organization.

Contents

Abbreviations.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Technical notes.....	2
Sampling methods.....	6
Armenia	12
Belarus	17
Georgia.....	22
Kazakhstan	26
Kyrgyzstan	32
Republic of Moldova.....	37
Russian Federation.....	42
Ukraine	47
References.....	52

Abbreviations

BMI	body mass index
DHS	Demographic and Health Surveys
ECHP	European Community Household Panel
FSU	the former Soviet Union
LLH	Living Conditions, Lifestyles and Health
SEUA	State Engineering University of Armenia

Acknowledgements

The production of these country reports benefited from the input and comments of a number of people. We particularly acknowledge the contribution of our copy-editor, Elizabeth Goodrich. Dave Gwatkin (World Bank) provided very useful comments, and our country reports follow to a large extent his example. We also thank our colleagues in WHO country offices for their support. Active support was also received from our colleagues at the WHO European Office for Investment for Health and Development, WHO Regional Office for Europe, particularly from Antonella Biasotto and Sandra Micheluz.

We are grateful to all members of the LLH study teams who participated in the coordination and organization of data collection. In particular, we wish to thank Dr Alexander Chvorostov (Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna) who managed the project, Professor Richard Rose (University of Aberdeen) who contributed to questionnaire design, and the national team leaders: Professor Sergei Tumanov (Centre for Sociological Studies, Moscow State University), Professor David Rotman (Centre for Sociological and Political Research, Belarusian State University), Professor Valeriy Nikolaevskiy (East Ukrainian Foundation for Social Research), Professor Tudor Danii (Opinia, Independent Sociological and Information Service, Republic of Moldova), Dr Baurzhan Zhusupov (Centre for Study of Public Opinion, Almaty, Kazakhstan), Professor Kusein Isaev (International Centre of Sociological, Politological, Social-Psychological Research, Kyrgyzstan), Dr Edik Kyureghyan (Department of Social-Political Science and Macroeconomics, State Engineering University of Armenia), and Professor Tamara Berekashvili (Centre for Social Studies, Tbilisi, Georgia). The LLH Project was funded by the European Union (EU) under the FP5 horizontal programme "Confirming the International Role of Community Research" (INCO2-Copernicus; Contract No: ICA2-2000-10031, Project No: ICA2-1999-10074). The EU project officer was Dr Michel Pletschette, who provided excellent support, but the European Union cannot accept any responsibility for any information provided or views expressed.

Marc Suhrcke, Sarah Walters, Stefano Mazzuco, Joceline Pomerleau,
Martin McKee and Christian W. Haerperfer

Introduction

This publication presents tables summarizing the distribution of health, health behaviour, health care access and social capital by socioeconomic status, gender and residence (urban and rural) in eight countries of the former Soviet Union (FSU) – Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation and Ukraine – from October to December 2001. The data come from the Living Conditions, Lifestyles and Health (LLH) Project, which conducted representative surveys in these countries (Institute for Advanced Studies, 2004). The statistics are descriptive and do not reflect causal relationships between socioeconomic status and health.

This report is intended as a reference tool and to widen access to the data collected through the LLH Project, the first to implement cross-country, comparable health outcome and behaviour surveys in the FSU. The format of the data representation is inspired by and follows the model provided by Gwatkin et al. (2007), but differs in a number of respects:

- the data source used (Gwatkin et al. used data from the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) Program);
- the countries covered (the DHS include very few FSU countries);
- many of the variables considered; and
- the proxy of socioeconomic status.

To represent socioeconomic status, we constructed a deprivation index based on the prevalence of various household characteristics, such as the quality of the immediate environment and the presence of certain consumer goods. On the basis of the index, we divided the population into “asset” quintiles (five subgroups, all having the same number of people), ranging from the most to least deprived. The socioeconomic status represented in these tables is a multidimensional measure of poverty that takes account not just of monetary wealth but also of the relative level of deprivation.

The tabulations of the country data are available for all eight LLH Project countries and can be obtained from the web site of the WHO Regional Office for Europe (WHO European Office for Investment for Health and Development, 2008) or by contacting the WHO European Office for Investment for Health and Development by e-mail (info@ihd.euro.who.int).

This publication presents technical notes defining the indicators used, describing the LLH Project and its sampling methods and explaining how deprivation was measured and the deprivation index applied. The publication then presents information on each country in three tables by total population, gender and residence (urban or rural). An appendix for each country presents information from the exercise measuring deprivation, on cut-off points for wealth quintiles and on sample sizes.

Technical notes

The technical notes comprise information on the definitions of the various indicators used, as well as background information on the data and methodology. Pomerleau et al. (2003) give a more comprehensive description of methods and indicator definitions in the LLH surveys.

Indicator definitions

Place of residence: rural/urban

The regional representative conducting the survey was asked to record, prior to the interview, the administrative classification of the interview site as:

1. the capital of the state;
2. the regional capital;
3. a city, not the capital or the regional capital;
4. a small town; or
5. a village.

For the purpose of the tables, "rural" was defined as 4 and 5 (small town/village) and "urban" as 1, 2 and 3 (the state or regional capital or a city).

Health indicators

Perceived health status

Self-rated health "good" or "quite good"

Respondents were asked to rate their health on a scale of "good", "quite good", "rather bad", "bad" or "don't know". The figures presented are the percentage of people in each quintile who rated their health as either "good" or "quite good".

"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health

Respondents were asked how satisfied they were with their health: "satisfied", "quite satisfied", "rather dissatisfied" or "don't know". The figures present the percentage in each quintile who said they were either "satisfied" or "quite satisfied".

Presence of health problems/chronic diseases

This is the percentage of people in each quintile who answered "yes" to the question: "Do you have any health problems, chronic diseases that limit your activities?".

Diseases

Has or has had heart-related disease

This is the percentage of people in each quintile who stated that they have or have had one of the following conditions: heart attack, heart operation, stenocardia, other heart problems, stroke and persistent high blood pressure.

Has angina

The presence of angina was determined using the Rose Angina Questionnaire (Pomerleau et al., 2003; Rose, 1962).

Has had diabetes

This is the percentage of each quintile reporting having had diabetes. No information on the prevalence of different types of diabetes was collected.

Has had tuberculosis

This is the percentage of people in each quintile stating that they have ever had tuberculosis.

Health behaviour indicators

Alcohol intake

The LLH surveys included questions on the frequency of consumption of beer, wine and spirits. The categories of consumption were "daily", "4–5 times a week", "2–3 times a week", "once a week", "once every 2–3 weeks", "once a month", "once every 2–3 months", "less often" and "never". Those drinking at least once every 2–3 weeks were asked how much they typically consumed in each episode of drinking.

Lacking information on the usual amounts of alcohol drunk per occasion in respondents who reported consuming alcohol less than once every 2–3 weeks, we assumed that these respondents had a weekly intake of 0 g. For those drinking once or more every 2–3 weeks, the reported millilitres or litres of beer/wine/spirits typically consumed were converted into grams of alcohol: assuming 40 g alcohol per litre of beer, 90 g per 750-ml bottle of wine and 215 g per 500-ml bottle of vodka or other strong spirits. Those reporting consumption of more than 2 litres of beer, 1 litre of wine or 0.5 litre of spirits were assumed to drink 2.5 litres of beer, 1 litre of wine and 600 g of strong spirits, respectively.

We then defined two measures of high alcohol intake based on recognized classification of risky drinking (see definition below), and the figures in the tables present the percentage of each quintile falling into each of these two groups (Pomerleau & McKee, in press).

Total alcohol intake per week

Based on the above-discussed calculations, the tables present the mean grams of alcohol consumed per week for each quintile.

High alcohol intake

This was defined as weekly alcohol consumption of more than 210 g of alcohol by males or 140 g by females (Rehn, Room & Edwards, 2001).

High-risk alcohol intake

This was defined as weekly consumption of more than 420 g by males or 280 g by females (WHO, 2000).

Smoking

Does not smoke and has never smoked

In response to the question "Have you ever smoked?" respondents fell into three categories.

1. Yes, I smoked and I smoke at the present moment.
2. Yes, I smoked but I stopped.
3. No, I don't smoke and I never have.

The percentage of each quintile falling into the first category is presented here.

Smokes at least one cigarette per day

Those who were smokers at the time of the survey were asked how many cigarettes they smoked per day, and answers fell into four categories: "one or two per day", "up to 10", "between 10 and 20" and "more than 20". The percentages presented after this heading represent those reporting smoking at least one cigarette per day in each quintile.

Smokes more than 10 per day

The percentages reporting smoking either “between 10 and 20” cigarettes per day or “more than 20” are presented here as a percentage of each asset quintile.

Nutrition

Body mass index

We calculated body mass index (BMI) using reported weight and height (weight in kg/height in m²) and categorized the results according to categories devised by WHO (1998): underweight (< 18.5 kg/m²); overweight (25.0–29.9 kg/m²); obese (≥ 30.0 kg/m²). The figures in the tables show the percentage in each asset quintile falling into each of these BMI categories.

Health care access indicators

Has visited a doctor in last 12 months

Respondents were asked if they had visited a doctor or feldsher (medical attendant) in the previous 12 months. The figures are the percentage of the total sample in each asset quintile that reported such a visit.

Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money

Respondents who had not visited a doctor in the last 12 months were asked why, and the answers fell into seven categories:

1. “not that seriously ill”;
2. “visiting a doctor takes too much time”;
3. “treated myself with home remedies”;
4. “bought medicine from a pharmacist”;
5. “didn’t have the money to pay for treatment”;
6. “I do not trust the qualification of the doctor (or feldsher)”;
7. other (specify).

Those who answered that they were not seriously ill were excluded from the denominator. Among those who did not visit a doctor for reasons other than “not that seriously ill”, the percentage not seeking care because they lacked money to pay for treatment (answer 5) was calculated and is presented here as a percentage.

Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies

Again, excluding those who were “not that seriously ill” from the sample, the percentage not seeking care from a doctor/feldsher is presented as a percentage of each quintile.

Lives more than 10 km from the nearest hospital

The interviewer recorded the distance in kilometres to the nearest hospital before starting the survey, and the percentage in each quintile residing over 10 km from the nearest hospital is presented here.

“Definitely dissatisfied” with health system

Respondents were asked how satisfied they were with the health system in their country and asked to respond “definitely satisfied”, “quite satisfied”, “rather dissatisfied” or “definitely dissatisfied”. The percentage of each quintile responding “definitely dissatisfied” is reported here.

Social capital indicators

In light of the importance of social capital for development outcomes in general and health in particular, the LLH survey asked several questions relating to social capital. We selected two to represent the distribution of social capital by asset quintile.

Support: can count on someone to help when in crisis

This is the percentage of people who responded “yes” as opposed to “no” or “not sure” to the question: “Is there anyone who you can really count on to help you out in a crisis?”

Control: has “a great deal” of control over life

People were asked to respond to the following statement:

Some people feel they have completely free choice and control over their lives, while other people feel that what they do has no real effect on what happens to them. Please use this scale where 1 means “none at all” and 5 means “a great deal” to indicate how much freedom of choice and control you feel you have over the way your life turns out.

The percentage of each quintile answering “a great deal” (5) is presented.

Data and methodology**The LLH Project**

The LLH Project, a multilevel study investigating health behaviours and outcomes in eight FSU countries, was funded by the European Community (through a horizontal programme, Confirming the International Role of Community Research, in its fifth framework programme) and coordinated by the Institute for Advanced Study, Vienna, Austria. The Project had three stages:

1. the collection of aggregate national statistics;
2. a representative sample survey of each country in the region; and
3. a special study of Chernobyl and its immediate neighbourhood.

The results presented in this report are from the sample survey.

For the cross-sectional surveys, 18 428 respondents were interviewed across the FSU with approximately 2000 in each country, except the Russian Federation and Ukraine, where, to reflect the size and diversity of the adult population, 4000 and 2500 were interviewed, respectively. It was expected that the sample size of 2000 would give reliable estimates, with a precision level of 0.75%, of proportions representing 3% or more of the population at the national level. Table 1 shows the sample sizes and response rates for each country surveyed, and the rest of this subsection describes the sampling methods used.

Table 1. Sample size and response rates for eight countries surveyed in the LLH Project

Country	Final sample size	Overall response rate (%)	No contact with selected respondent after three visits (%)	Refusal after contact with interviewer (%)
Armenia	2000	88	8	4
Belarus	2000	73	10	17
Georgia	2000	88	5	7
Kazakhstan	2000	82	–	–
Kyrgyzstan	2000	71	15	14
Republic of Moldova	2000	81	7	12
Russian Federation	4006	73	11	16
Ukraine	2400	76	9	15

Sampling methods

Armenia

The Armenia survey was conducted by the State Engineering University of Armenia (SEUA) between 10 November and 5 December 2001, after a pilot study of 40 questionnaires and 10 interviews.

The LLH Project selected the sample using multi-stage random sampling with stratification by region and area (settlement type). The Project identified 200 primary sampling units and used systematic random sampling to select households from a household list. Within households individuals were sampled on the basis of the nearest birthday.

No groups were over- or underrepresented in the sample, but certain groups were excluded, including prisoners, people with mental disabilities, anyone under the influence of heavy alcoholic intoxication and military personnel living in the territories of their units. No region of the country was excluded from the sample. No prespecified quota controls were used in Armenia, but the Project applied a sampling repair procedure by settlement type, gender, age and education after fieldwork.

If no one was at home after three visits on different days and at different times, the next apartment on the route was selected. Substitution was permitted if the apartment was not used for residence or was ruined (in a disaster zone), if no one was at home after three visits or if the resident was not in the country. Interviews were conducted in Armenian (78%) and Russian (22%). Quality control of interviewers and supervisors was ensured through internal control by regional supervisors (10% of the sample) and external control by SEUA supervisors (10% of sample and supervisors' work).

Belarus

The Belarus Survey was conducted by the Centre for Sociological and Political Research at the Belarusian State University between 26 October and 20 November 2001 after pretesting the questionnaire on 100 people.

The LLH Project selected the sample using multi-stage random sampling with stratification by region and area (rural/urban). The Project identified 61 primary sampling units and households using standardized random route procedures. Within households individuals were sampled on the basis of the nearest birthday.

No groups were over- or underrepresented in the sample, but certain groups were excluded, including those fully supported by the state (prisoners, those in institutions for invalids), foreigners and military personnel and families living on military territories. No region of the country was excluded from the sample. Prespecified quota controls were used on the basis of gender, age and education.

Substitution was permitted if the individual was not at home for three visits, in which case the next household on the route was selected. All interviews were conducted in Russian. Quality control of interviewers and supervisors was ensured through internal and external control, using follow-up visits or telephone interviews for 10% of the sample.

Georgia

The Georgia survey was conducted by the Centre for Social Studies between 5 and 25 November 2001 after pretesting the questionnaire on nine people.

The LLH Project selected the sample using multi-stage random sampling with stratification by region and area (rural/urban). The Project identified 53 primary sampling units and households

using standardized random route procedures. No prespecified quota controls were used, but the Project applied a sampling repair procedure by settlement type, gender, age and education after fieldwork. Within households individuals were sampled on the basis of the nearest birthday.

No groups were over- or underrepresented in the sample, but certain groups were excluded, including prisoners, people with mental disabilities, anyone under the influence of heavy alcoholic intoxication and military personnel living in the territories of their units. Data were not available from Abkhazia and Ossetia.

If no one was at home after three visits on different days and at different times, the next apartment on the route was selected. Substitution was permitted if the apartment was not used for residence or was ruined (in a disaster zone), if no one was at home after three visits or if the resident was not in the country. Interviews were conducted in Georgian (75%) and Russian (25%). Quality control of interviewers and supervisors was ensured through internal control by regional supervisors (12% of sample) and by external control by the Centre for Sociological Studies (Moscow) of selected regional supervisors and interviewers.

Kazakhstan

The Kazakhstan survey was conducted by Centre for the Study of Public Opinion between 26 October and 23 November 2001 after pretesting the questionnaire on 40 people.

The LLH Project selected the sample using multi-stage random sampling with stratification by region and area (rural/urban). The Project identified 54 primary sampling units and households using standardized random route procedures. Prespecified quota controls were used on the basis of gender and age. Within households individuals were sampled on the basis of the nearest birthday.

No groups were over- or underrepresented in the sample, but the military and prisoners were excluded. No region of the country was excluded.

If no one was at home after three visits on different days and at different times, the next household on the route was selected. Substitution was permitted if the apartment was not used for residence or was ruined (in a disaster zone), if no one was at home after three visits or if the resident was not in the country. Interviews were conducted in Russian (90%) and Kazakh (10%). Quality control was ensured internally using repeat personal interviews (30% of sample) and externally through interviews with supervisors (5% of sample).

Kyrgyzstan

The Kyrgyzstan survey was conducted by International Centre of Sociological, Political and Social–Psychological Research between 20 October and 31 November 2001 after pretesting the questionnaire on 20 people.

The LLH Project selected the sample using multi-stage random sampling with stratification by region and area (rural/urban). The Project identified 200 primary sampling units and households using standardized random route procedures. Prespecified quota controls were used (100 in the north and 100 in the south). Within households individuals were sampled on the basis of the nearest birthday.

No groups were over- or underrepresented in the sampling design, but the military, prisoners and other institutionalized people were excluded from the sample. No region of the country was excluded.

If the individual was not at home after three visits at different days and times, the next apartment on the route was selected. Substitution was not permitted during sampling or fieldwork.

Interviews were conducted in Kyrgyz (60%) and Russian (40%). Quality control was ensured using internal monitoring by regional supervisors and external control by the Centre for Sociological Studies (Moscow) through second visits or telephone interviews (10% of the sample).

Republic of Moldova

The Republic of Moldova survey was conducted by the Independent Sociological and Information Service between 26 October and 11 November 2001.

The LLH Project selected the sample using multi-stage random sampling with stratification by region and area (rural/urban and size of localities). The Project identified 64 primary sampling units and households using standardized random route procedures. Prespecified quota controls were used on the basis of gender and age. Within households individuals were sampled on the basis of the nearest birthday.

No groups were over- or underrepresented in the sampling design, but the military, prisoners and other institutionalized people (in hospitals, student hostels, centres for elderly people) were excluded from the sample. Data were not available from the Trans-Dniester region and the municipality of Bender (approximately 15% of the population).

If the individual was not at home after three visits at different days and times, the next apartment on the route was selected. Substitution was not permitted during sampling or fieldwork. Interviews were conducted in Romanian (68%) and Russian (32%). Internal control was by random checking of the fieldwork documents and quality (of fieldworkers, documents and internal control reports) was controlled externally by the Belarus coordination team.

Russian Federation

The Russian Federation survey was conducted by the Centre for Sociological Studies, Moscow State University between 26 October and 25 November 2001 after pretesting the questionnaire on 115 people.

The LLH Project selected the sample using multi-stage random sampling with stratification by region and area (settlement type). The Project identified 208 primary sampling units and households using standardized random route procedures. No pre-specified quota controls were used in the Federation, but a sampling repair procedure by settlement type, age, gender and education was employed after fieldwork. Within households individuals were sampled on the basis of the nearest birthday.

No groups were over- or underrepresented in the sampling design, but the military living with the units of their territories, prisoners, mentally disabled and people heavily intoxicated with alcohol were excluded from the sample. Data were not available from the Chechen and Ingush republics, and the autonomous districts in the far north.

Substitution was permitted during sampling or fieldwork if the apartment was not used for residence or if the person was not home after three visits. If the individual was not at home after three visits at different days and times, the next apartment on the route was selected. All interviews were conducted in Russian. Quality control was ensured using internal monitoring by regional supervisors (12% of the sample) and external control by the Centre for Sociological Studies (Moscow) of selected interviews and regional supervisors.

Ukraine

The Ukraine survey was conducted by the East Ukrainian Foundation for Social Research between 3 and 27 November 2001.

The LLH Project selected the sample using multi-stage random sampling with stratification by

region and area (rural and urban with four categories). The Project identified 136 primary sampling units and households using standardized random route procedures. Prespecified quota controls were used in Ukraine on the basis of region, area, age and gender. Within households individuals were sampled on the basis of the nearest birthday.

No groups were over- or underrepresented in the sampling design, but the military, prisoners, and hospitalized and homeless people were excluded from the sample.

Substitution was permitted if the person was not home after three visits, or the respondent was drunk or aggressive or away for more than three weeks. If the individual was not at home after three visits on different days and times, the next apartment on the route was selected. Interviews were conducted in Ukrainian (42%) and Russian (58%). Regional control was ensured using verification of sampling methods and interview duration and content (10% of sample) and control by telephone interview (5% of sample).

Measurement of socioeconomic status: the asset approach

The tables show the distribution of health by socioeconomic quintile defined on the basis of assets and household characteristics, rather than income or consumption. This approach is partly a pragmatic response to the lack of income or consumption information in the LLH surveys and the desire to make use of the detailed information on household characteristics. At the same time, the decision to use a deprivation index based on the analysis of assets and characteristics reflects current thinking about the measurement of socioeconomic status. That thinking suggests both that asset ownership is a good proxy for consumption and that, because it is not based only on monetary information, it is a powerful way to capture the multidimensional aspects of poverty and reflect relative levels of deprivation (Filmer and Pritchett, 1998; Gwatkin et al., 2007; Montgomery, et al. 1997; Wagstaff et al., 1991; Rutstein, 1999).

Approaches to formulating indices of deprivation

Considerable research was undertaken to develop multidimensional measures of economic well-being, which generally depend on a range of household characteristics (see Miceli, 1998; Qizilbash, 2002). The main problem that these authors tackled was how to represent various characteristics by constructing a single index. The technical approach is based on "fuzzy" systems (described by Betti & Verma, 1999; Cerioli & Zani, 1990; Cheli & Lemmi, 1995) and was officially recognized and adopted by EUROSTAT (2002). This approach identifies a range of "items" believed to be important for individuals' perception of well-being. The presence of these items might be determined in surveys by yes-no dichotomies or ordered scales. Some items relate to the possession of consumer goods. In these cases, lack of a particular consumer good does not necessarily reflect deprivation and might simply reflect individual preference. To account for this, the item is selected only if a household specifically indicates that the reason for lacking it is an inability to afford it. Other indicators might be subjective in nature, so individuals are asked to express their perception of their economic situation or any other relevant dimension of their current situation.

The full set of indicators is "summarized" into a composite index, ranging from 0 (no deprivation) to 1 (maximum deprivation). Breakpoints are then identified to split the population into quintiles (five groups of equal size), running from least to most deprived.

An appropriate weighting scheme usually determines the extent to which variables represent deprivation. A general principle in the construction of weights is that deprivation items that affect only small portions of a population, which means only a small portion of the population does **not** have it, should be considered more critical and consequently given a larger weight.

Applying this kind of approach to poverty analysis of countries in the WHO European Region

is becoming more common. By applying a factor analysis based on 25 variables in the European Community Household Panel (ECHP) survey, Whelan et al. (2001) identified five groups of assets, which they used to construct deprivation indices. In a similar approach, but using a more complex weighting scheme, Aassve, Mazzucco & Mencarini (2005) considered the impact of childbearing events on a similar set of deprivation indices. Their analysis complements the more standard approach of using a poor/non-poor dichotomy based on income/consumption, and, for certain applications, the use of deprivation indices provides qualitatively similar results to those obtained with traditional measures.

LLH deprivation index

We followed an approach similar to that of Whelan et al. (2001) and ran a factor analysis on household characteristics recorded in the LLH survey in order to identify the groups of variables with which to construct the deprivation index. The first table in each appendix has the asset variables we used. The assets were the same across countries, although the factor scores for any given asset varied between countries. We found that the assets fell broadly into five groups of factors. These factors were slightly different from those identified by Whelan et al. on the basis of ECHP variables. This is because the LLH used a different set of variables and the ECHP involved western European countries where deprivation is on average lower than in the LLH Project countries. For instance, most households have cold water on tap in ECHP countries, whereas many in the LLH countries do not.

Results of the factor analysis

Of the five groups of factors identified, the first is concerned with the availability of heat and good water. The second consists of non-essential items such as a television, telephone, video recorder, dishwasher, computer, car, bicycle and so on. The third group relates to housing conditions, for example, the presence of a toilet, bathroom and kitchen. The fourth is concerned with the ability of households to satisfy their basic needs (to obtain basic foodstuffs, heating, necessary clothes, electricity, medical services, household repairs, hot and cold water, etc.). The last is related to satisfaction with the household's immediate environment (such as water and air quality) and provision of local services (such as public transport and electricity).

Constructing the deprivation index

For each country a single asset index was developed on the basis of data from the entire country sample (separate asset indicators were not prepared for gender- or rural-and-urban-specific samples). The final deprivation index is the weighted sum of the deprivation indices relative to every item in each country:

$$f(x_i) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^J g(x_{ij}) \cdot w_j}{\sum_{j=1}^J w_j}$$

where $g(x_{ij})$ is the deprivation of household i (ranging from 0 to 1) with respect to the item j , and w_j is a set of weights proportional to the coefficient of variation¹ of $g(x_{ij})$ with respect to j . That is, the fewer households that are deprived of item j in a country, the higher its deprivation weight for that country.

¹ The coefficient of variation is the ratio between the average and the standard error.

The definition of $g(x_{ij})$ depends on the nature of variable x . Most items are simple yes/no dichotomies, so that $g(x_{ij})$ is assigned the value 1 if household i is deprived of item j , 0 otherwise. The ordered categories involving more than 0/1 values, are converted to an ordered polytomy that ranges between 0 and 1:

$$g(x_{ij}) = (M-m)/(M-1)$$

That is, individual j is ranked m on M -ordered categories, with $m = 1$ the most deprived and $m = M$ the least deprived. $g(x_{ij})$ is then weighted with the coefficient of variation of item j , giving a higher weight to items that deprivation affects in only a small part of the population. We can draw an example by looking at the descriptive statistic in the first table in the appendix for Armenia: because almost no household in the LLH sample has a dishwasher, those who do not have one will not feel additionally deprived by the lack, so the deprivation of this item is given a small weight. Conversely, many households declared having heating, so this deprivation is given a large weight.

Advantages and disadvantages of the deprivation index approach

The main advantage of the deprivation index approach is that it overcomes the poor/non-poor dichotomy in traditional poverty status measures, which are based solely on income and consumption and fail to present the multidimensional nature of economic well-being. A single deprivation index based on numerous variables reflecting well-being encapsulates this multidimensional nature. Constructing a single deprivation index from the factor analysis also has an advantage compared to using factors extracted from a simple factor analysis. As we have seen, each factor captures only one dimension of well-being (such as being able to afford basic needs, having particular household characteristics or possessing durables). Thus, using simple factor analysis poses the dilemma of either using a single index, thereby limiting the analysis to just one dimension of well-being, or using more indices, thereby complicating the interpretation of results.

The limitation of our approach is that it is not suitable for the comparison of absolute levels of deprivation, since not possessing an item is considered a more substantial deprivation in a country where a higher proportion of the population owns one. Ferguson et al. (2003) propose a more complex method to estimate a measure of permanent income that is comparable among countries. Nonetheless, with a deprivation index we have, at least, a comparable measure of relative well-being, which is important in comparative analysis of social inequality and social exclusion.

Sampling errors and sample sizes

The tables (by total, gender or residence) do not report standard errors of the quintile-specific rates. In no case was the sample size of any subgroup unacceptably small (below 100 individuals).

Measurement of inequality: the poor/rich ratio

In addition to the rates by quintile, the poor/rich ratio for each variable is presented in the first table in each chapter as a measure of inequality in the distribution of that indicator. This is the ratio of the rate in the poorest population quintile to the rate in the richest quintile. A poor/rich ratio of "3" would indicate that the rate in the poorest quintile is three times as high as in the richest. Although no information is presented about the distribution across the middle three quintiles, this crude measure is intended to provide a quick indicator of the level of inequality in the distribution of health indicators.

Armenia

Tables 2–4 describe health, health behaviour and access to health care by asset quintile.

Table 2. Asset quintiles by total population, Armenia

Indicator	Quintiles					Population average	Poor/rich ratio
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest		
HEALTH INDICATORS							
Perceived health status							
Self-rated health “good” or “quite good” (%)	39.3	47.7	59.0	67.7	78.6	58.5	0.5
“Satisfied” or “quite satisfied” with own health (%)	38.0	50.0	61.3	65.3	76.5	58.2	0.5
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	40.3	30.3	29.0	24.0	20.0	28.7	2.0
Diseases							
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	33.5	31.3	29.0	26.8	23.3	28.8	1.4
Has angina (%)	16.0	15.3	18.0	15.5	13.0	15.6	1.2
Has had diabetes (%)	1.8	2.0	2.8	1.5	2.3	2.1	0.8
Has had tuberculosis (%)	0.8	0.8	1.0	0.3	1.3	0.8	0.6
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS							
Alcohol intake							
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	27.8	31.6	41.6	49.9	46.7	39.5	0.6
High alcohol intake (%)	4.0	5.8	6.0	7.3	6.5	5.9	0.6
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	1.3	1.5	2.8	2.8	3.3	2.3	0.4
Smoking							
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	68.0	65.0	69.3	63.8	70.8	67.4	1.0
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	25.3	29.8	23.3	28.0	25.3	26.3	1.0
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	20.8	25.8	16.0	20.8	18.5	20.4	1.1
Nutrition							
BMI (kg/m ²)	24.0	24.2	24.4	24.4	24.8	24.4	1.0
Underweight (%)	2.5	3.3	4.3	5.3	2.8	3.6	0.9
Overweight (%)	21.0	24.8	24.8	25.0	29.3	25.0	0.7
Obese (%)	18.5	18.3	20.3	19.5	20.0	19.3	0.9
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS							
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	34.0	37.3	36.3	39.5	40.5	37.5	0.8
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	92.6	81.5	77.7	66.7	36.6	71.0	2.5
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	14.8	18.5	30.9	30.8	43.9	27.8	0.3
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	12.8	13.3	13.5	12.0	9.0	12.1	1.4
“Definitely dissatisfied” with health system (%)	27.0	33.0	28.8	28.3	29.5	29.3	0.9
SOCIAL CAPITAL							
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	74.8	84.3	84.5	88.5	85.3	83.5	0.9
Has “a great deal” of control over life (%)	23.3	28.0	37.0	28.0	33.8	30.0	0.7

Table 3. Asset quintiles by gender, Armenia

Indicator	Quintiles: male					Quintiles: female				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	41.6	52.5	62.5	68.9	84.5	37.7	44.5	56.6	66.8	74.7
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	39.1	57.8	65.8	65.9	84.0	37.2	44.8	58.2	64.8	71.7
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	37.9	31.1	23.6	24.0	22.4	41.8	29.7	32.6	24.0	18.4
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	29.2	26.7	23.0	24.6	20.5	36.4	34.3	33.1	28.3	25.0
Has angina (%)	14.3	14.3	19.3	12.0	10.3	17.2	15.9	17.2	18.0	14.8
Has had diabetes (%)	0.6	1.2	0.6	0.6	1.3	2.5	2.5	4.2	2.1	2.9
Has had tuberculosis (%)	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.4	1.3	1.7	0.0	1.6
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	68.0	77.7	99.8	105.5	107.9	0.7	0.6	2.3	10.0	7.6
High alcohol intake (%)	9.9	14.3	14.3	13.8	13.5	0.0	0.0	0.4	2.6	2.0
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	3.1	3.7	6.8	4.8	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.4
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	23.0	16.1	30.4	19.2	28.2	98.3	97.9	95.4	95.7	98.0
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	62.1	70.8	52.2	61.7	62.2	0.4	2.1	3.8	3.9	1.6
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	50.9	62.7	37.3	47.9	46.8	0.4	0.8	1.7	1.3	0.4
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	23.8	24.1	24.6	24.8	25.4	24.2	24.3	24.2	24.2	24.4
Underweight (%)	1.2	0.6	2.5	1.8	1.9	3.3	5.0	5.4	7.7	3.3
Overweight (%)	19.3	24.2	24.2	28.7	39.1	22.2	25.1	25.1	22.3	23.0
Obese (%)	13.7	11.2	19.3	16.8	17.3	21.8	23.0	20.9	21.5	21.7
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	36.0	31.1	35.4	34.1	35.9	32.6	41.4	36.8	43.3	43.4
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	31.1	28.6	14.3	13.8	3.2	37.7	31.4	28.5	15.9	5.3
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	9.3	11.8	11.8	10.8	7.7	10.0	8.8	16.7	11.2	10.2
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	13.7	16.1	18.0	16.8	8.3	12.1	11.3	10.5	8.6	9.4
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	27.3	28.0	33.5	29.9	30.8	26.8	36.4	25.5	27.0	28.7
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	72.0	84.5	90.1	82.6	85.3	76.6	84.1	80.8	92.7	85.2
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	26.7	33.5	42.9	31.1	46.2	20.9	24.3	33.1	25.8	25.8

Table 4. Asset quintiles by place of residence (urban/rural), Armenia

Indicator	Quintiles: urban					Quintiles: rural				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	40.2	51.4	60.1	73.0	79.4	38.4	43.4	57.5	57.3	76.5
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	39.8	52.3	62.5	69.2	77.2	36.2	47.3	59.5	57.5	74.8
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	39.8	30.6	31.0	22.2	18.9	40.7	29.9	26.2	27.6	22.6
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	34.8	31.0	31.5	24.8	22.8	32.2	31.5	25.6	30.6	24.3
Has angina (%)	19.4	17.6	16.8	15.4	13.0	12.6	12.5	19.6	15.7	13.0
Has had diabetes (%)	2.5	1.9	3.4	1.9	2.5	1.0	2.2	1.8	0.7	1.7
Has had tuberculosis (%)	1.0	1.4	1.3	0.4	1.8	0.5	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	16.7	22.8	33.1	45.9	29.7	39.0	41.9	53.2	57.8	88.8
High alcohol intake (%)	3.5	4.2	3.4	6.0	4.6	4.5	7.6	9.5	9.7	11.3
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	0.5	1.4	2.6	3.0	2.1	2.0	1.6	3.0	2.2	6.1
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	73.6	70.8	74.6	66.2	71.9	62.3	58.2	61.9	59.0	67.8
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	20.4	23.6	19.4	26.3	24.9	30.2	37.0	28.6	31.3	26.1
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	14.9	19.4	12.1	16.2	17.5	26.6	33.2	21.4	29.9	20.9
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	24.6	24.3	23.9	24.4	24.5	23.4	24.1	25.0	24.6	25.5
Underweight (%)	2.5	5.1	6.9	6.4	3.2	2.5	1.1	0.6	3.0	1.7
Overweight (%)	24.9	25.9	24.6	24.8	28.4	17.1	23.4	25.0	25.4	31.3
Obese (%)	18.4	18.5	17.7	17.3	17.9	18.6	17.9	23.8	23.9	25.2
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	36.8	42.6	38.8	42.9	40.0	31.2	31.0	32.7	32.8	41.7
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	33.3	31.5	25.9	13.5	4.9	36.7	28.8	18.5	17.9	3.5
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	10.4	11.1	18.1	12.4	10.5	9.0	8.7	10.1	8.2	6.1
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	25.6	28.8	31.5	35.8	31.3
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	26.4	34.3	30.2	30.5	29.1	27.6	31.5	26.8	23.9	30.4
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	78.1	83.8	85.3	90.6	85.3	71.4	84.8	83.3	84.3	85.2
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	25.9	25.9	33.6	28.6	29.1	20.6	30.4	41.7	26.9	45.2

Appendix

Table A. LLH: assets and asset weights used to construct the deprivation index for Armenia

Assets	Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
Availability of heat and good water						
No heating	0.11	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.06
Bad quality water	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Possession of durables						
Television	0.64	0.44	0.33	0.21	0.07	0.34
Telephone	0.51	0.46	0.36	0.27	0.22	0.36
Video recorder	0.97	0.93	0.83	0.70	0.43	0.77
Washing machine	0.69	0.55	0.43	0.33	0.21	0.44
Dishwasher	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00
Video camera	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.90	0.98
Personal computer	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.88	0.98
Car	0.97	0.93	0.84	0.74	0.55	0.80
Motorcycle	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00
Bicycle	1.00	0.99	0.98	0.96	0.83	0.95
Not having the following in the household						
Cold water on tap	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.03
Hot water on tap	0.96	0.95	0.91	0.87	0.71	0.88
Water closet/toilet	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
Bathroom	0.33	0.28	0.20	0.13	0.05	0.20
Kitchen	0.08	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.04
Having had, in the past 12 months, constantly to do without the following						
Food of first level of needs (bread, sugar, milk)	0.77	0.49	0.31	0.15	0.04	0.35
Heating	0.75	0.53	0.36	0.23	0.09	0.39
Clothes	0.95	0.78	0.60	0.39	0.16	0.58
Electricity	0.78	0.57	0.43	0.28	0.12	0.44
Water indoors	0.46	0.30	0.24	0.16	0.07	0.25
Fuel for car	0.98	0.98	0.93	0.87	0.65	0.88
Medical service	0.84	0.70	0.50	0.33	0.16	0.51
Drugs	0.79	0.54	0.36	0.22	0.09	0.40
Household repairs	0.74	0.68	0.62	0.48	0.32	0.57
Definitely dissatisfied with the following						
Housing	0.24	0.16	0.11	0.10	0.06	0.13
Water quality	0.14	0.11	0.08	0.05	0.06	0.09
Air purity	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.06
Climate	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.06
Electricity support	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02
Security level	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03
Public transport	0.14	0.17	0.13	0.12	0.10	0.13
Work/job/main study	0.34	0.31	0.21	0.21	0.13	0.24

Table B. LLH: cut-off points for wealth quintiles in Armenia

Wealth quintile	Deprivation index value	
	Highest	Lowest
Poorest	0.9475	0.8693
Second	0.8693	0.8399
Middle	0.8398	0.8137
Fourth	0.8137	0.7713
Richest	0.7713	0.4028

Table C. LLH: sample sizes by quintile in Armenia

Group	Quintile					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
All	400	400	400	400	400	2000
Urban	201	216	232	266	285	1200
Rural	199	184	168	134	115	800
Female	239	239	239	233	244	1194
Male	161	161	161	167	156	806

Belarus

Tables 5–7 describe health, health behaviour and access to health care by asset quintile.

Table 5. Asset quintiles by total population, Belarus

Indicator	Quintiles					Population average	Poor/rich ratio
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest		
HEALTH INDICATORS							
Perceived health status							
Self-rated health “good” or “quite good” (%)	46.1	49.5	58.1	67.9	75.8	59.5	0.6
“Satisfied” or “quite satisfied” with own health (%)	43.5	50.3	56.0	66.8	73.3	58.0	0.6
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	47.0	43.0	44.0	35.5	31.5	40.2	1.5
Diseases							
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	39.8	37.0	30.0	27.8	19.8	30.9	2.0
Has angina (%)	18.8	18.0	16.0	14.5	10.8	15.6	1.7
Has had diabetes (%)	3.3	1.3	3.0	2.5	2.3	2.5	1.4
Has had tuberculosis (%)	3.3	3.5	3.3	2.5	3.8	3.3	0.9
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS							
Alcohol intake							
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	53.4	51.6	61.5	75.3	76.0	63.6	0.7
High alcohol intake (%)	7.6	8.6	9.8	10.9	11.3	9.6	0.7
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	4.0	2.3	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.4	1.3
Smoking							
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	63.3	61.0	62.8	56.3	52.8	59.2	1.2
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	29.3	32.5	28.3	31.8	35.8	31.5	0.8
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	15.3	19.3	16.3	18.3	19.8	17.8	0.8
Nutrition							
BMI (kg/m ²)	25.4	25.3	25.2	25.4	25.1	25.3	1.0
Underweight (%)	2.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	2.3	1.6	1.1
Overweight (%)	31.0	30.0	31.3	29.8	32.8	31.0	0.9
Obese (%)	29.3	28.3	27.3	24.5	19.3	25.7	1.5
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS							
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	70.3	71.0	70.8	70.3	73.3	71.1	1.0
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	33.3	63.3	48.3	52.4	44.4	48.4	0.8
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	13.8	15.0	13.8	11.0	12.0	13.1	1.1
“Definitely dissatisfied” with health system (%)	24.3	17.5	20.0	15.0	15.3	18.4	1.6
SOCIAL CAPITAL							
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	74.3	80.3	88.8	91.0	91.3	85.1	0.8
Has “a great deal” of control over life (%)	14.0	20.3	20.3	23.8	29.8	21.6	0.5

Table 6. Asset quintiles by gender, Belarus

Indicator	Quintiles: male					Quintiles: female				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	58.7	62.4	65.9	76.6	82.4	39.7	40.9	52.1	59.9	67.8
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	55.1	62.7	63.8	75.8	79.9	37.4	41.8	50.0	58.6	65.2
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	34.8	30.4	35.1	26.3	26.5	53.4	51.5	50.9	43.8	37.6
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	35.5	27.3	22.4	20.5	16.0	42.0	43.5	35.8	34.3	24.3
Has angina (%)	14.5	11.8	10.9	8.4	5.9	21.0	22.2	19.9	20.0	16.6
Has had diabetes (%)	3.6	0.6	1.1	1.6	1.8	3.1	1.7	4.4	3.3	2.8
Has had tuberculosis (%)	2.9	4.3	2.3	1.6	3.2	3.4	2.9	4.0	3.3	4.4
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	112.9	111.9	129.8	143.8	129.3	22.7	10.5	9.5	13.4	10.7
High alcohol intake (%)	16.3	18.6	20.3	21.3	19.2	3.1	1.7	1.8	1.4	1.7
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	7.4	5.0	8.1	8.5	5.0	2.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.6
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	28.3	29.8	32.2	28.9	29.2	81.7	82.0	86.3	81.0	81.2
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	61.6	60.2	52.9	53.7	54.3	12.2	13.8	9.3	11.9	13.3
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	34.8	43.5	35.6	35.8	32.0	5.0	2.9	1.3	2.4	5.0
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	25.9	25.4	25.2	25.5	25.1	25.2	25.3	25.3	25.3	25.2
Underweight (%)	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	2.7	2.5	1.8	1.0	4.4
Overweight (%)	37.0	36.0	37.4	35.3	36.5	27.9	25.9	26.5	24.8	28.2
Obese (%)	26.1	26.1	20.7	21.6	16.0	30.9	29.7	32.3	27.1	23.2
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	66.7	57.8	62.1	60.0	68.0	72.1	79.9	77.4	79.5	79.6
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	1.4	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	5.1	7.5	7.5	5.8	6.4	8.0	6.3	7.1	5.7	5.0
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	10.9	14.3	16.7	12.6	13.2	15.3	15.5	11.5	9.5	10.5
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	14.6	16.1	17.8	13.7	14.2	24.0	18.4	21.7	16.2	16.6
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	73.9	83.2	86.8	88.9	89.5	74.4	78.2	90.3	92.9	93.4
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	14.5	22.4	25.3	27.4	34.2	13.7	18.8	16.4	20.5	24.3

Table 7. Asset quintiles by place of residence (urban/rural), Belarus

Indicator	Quintiles: urban					Quintiles: rural				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	52.6	56.4	60.1	71.3	78.5	33.1	37.7	54.5	61.9	71.2
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	48.9	54.8	58.6	69.1	75.6	33.1	42.7	51.1	62.5	69.3
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	45.1	39.2	43.3	34.8	29.6	50.7	49.3	45.3	36.8	34.7
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	42.8	37.2	30.7	29.3	17.6	33.8	36.7	28.8	25.0	23.3
Has angina (%)	20.8	15.2	17.6	16.4	8.8	14.7	22.7	12.9	11.1	14.0
Has had diabetes (%)	4.2	1.2	3.8	3.1	2.0	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.4	2.7
Has had tuberculosis (%)	3.4	4.0	3.1	3.1	4.8	2.9	2.7	3.6	1.4	2.0
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	53.2	53.9	46.4	66.2	77.9	53.9	47.8	90.0	91.4	72.7
High alcohol intake (%)	6.5	7.3	7.3	9.5	10.4	9.6	10.7	14.5	13.3	12.8
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	3.4	2.0	1.5	2.8	3.2	5.2	2.7	7.2	6.3	2.7
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	56.4	56.4	62.5	55.5	47.6	76.5	68.7	63.3	57.6	61.3
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	34.1	34.8	27.2	31.3	39.2	19.9	28.7	30.2	32.6	30.0
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	17.4	19.2	15.3	15.6	21.2	11.0	19.3	18.0	22.9	17.3
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	25.6	25.1	25.1	25.0	24.6	25.2	25.7	25.4	26.0	26.0
Underweight (%)	3.4	2.4	0.8	0.4	3.2	0.7	0.0	1.4	0.7	0.7
Overweight (%)	31.8	34.0	32.2	28.1	27.2	29.4	23.3	29.5	32.6	42.0
Obese (%)	27.7	22.0	26.1	21.1	18.0	32.4	38.7	29.5	30.6	21.3
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	72.0	74.0	73.6	72.7	73.2	66.9	66.0	65.5	66.0	73.3
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	1.1	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	6.8	6.0	6.5	7.0	7.6	7.4	8.0	8.6	3.5	2.7
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	40.4	40.0	39.6	29.9	31.3
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	29.5	20.8	22.6	18.4	16.4	14.0	12.0	15.1	9.0	13.3
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	79.2	86.8	90.0	92.6	91.6	64.7	69.3	86.3	88.2	90.7
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	12.5	17.2	16.9	21.1	24.4	16.9	25.3	26.6	28.5	38.7

Appendix

Table A. LLH: assets and asset weights used to construct the deprivation index for Belarus

Assets	Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
Availability of heat and good water						
No heating	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bad quality water	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Possession of durables						
Television	0.22	0.15	0.13	0.09	0.02	0.12
Telephone	0.51	0.43	0.39	0.31	0.18	0.36
Video recorder	0.96	0.84	0.72	0.61	0.44	0.71
Washing machine	0.56	0.43	0.32	0.29	0.15	0.35
Dishwasher	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00
Video camera	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.93	0.99
Personal computer	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.82	0.96
Car	0.96	0.90	0.78	0.74	0.44	0.74
Motorcycle	1.00	0.97	0.94	0.87	0.72	0.90
Bicycle	0.72	0.29	0.49	0.45	0.31	0.51
Not having the following in the household						
Cold water on tap	0.17	0.16	0.12	0.15	0.11	0.14
Hot water on tap	0.41	0.38	0.35	0.32	0.28	0.35
Water closet/toilet	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bathroom	0.43	0.39	0.35	0.31	0.26	0.35
Kitchen	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Having had, in the past 12 months, constantly to do without the following						
Food of first level of needs (bread, sugar, milk)	0.19	0.10	0.08	0.04	0.02	0.08
Heating	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.03
Clothes	0.37	0.17	0.19	0.11	0.05	0.18
Electricity	0.08	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03
Water indoors	0.22	0.17	0.14	0.15	0.09	0.15
Fuel for car	0.87	0.86	0.79	0.67	0.48	0.73
Medical service	0.16	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.07
Drugs	0.26	0.10	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.11
Household repairs	0.48	0.26	0.23	0.13	0.07	0.23
Definitely dissatisfied with the following						
Housing	0.24	0.16	0.11	0.08	0.05	0.13
Water quality	0.26	0.20	0.16	0.12	0.12	0.17
Air purity	0.25	0.18	0.18	0.09	0.10	0.16
Climate	0.11	0.06	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.05
Electricity support	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02
Security level	0.14	0.11	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.08
Public transport	0.32	0.24	0.21	0.15	0.17	0.22
Work/job/main study	0.11	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.07

Table B. LLH: cut-off points for wealth quintiles in Belarus

Wealth quintile	Deprivation index value	
	Highest	Lowest
Poorest	0.9406	0.8138
Second	0.8136	0.7849
Middle	0.7848	0.7538
Fourth	0.7537	0.7112
Richest	0.7711	0.3123

Table C. LLH: sample sizes by quintile in Belarus

Group	Quintile					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
All	400	400	400	400	400	2000
Urban	264	250	261	256	250	1281
Rural	136	150	139	144	150	719
Female	262	239	226	210	181	1118
Male	138	161	174	190	219	882

Georgia

Tables 8–10 describe health, health behaviour and access to health care by asset quintile.

Table 8. Asset quintiles by total population, Georgia

Indicator	Quintiles					Population average	Poor/rich ratio
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest		
HEALTH INDICATORS							
Perceived health status							
Self-rated health “good” or “quite good” (%)	59.0	68.7	69.2	71.5	82.8	70.2	0.7
“Satisfied” or “quite satisfied” with own health (%)	52.6	60.9	62.0	67.1	79.7	64.4	0.7
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	29.6	23.0	24.0	21.0	14.1	22.3	2.1
Diseases							
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	23.5	15.8	22.5	19.1	13.6	18.9	1.7
Has angina (%)	15.8	15.8	13.1	11.4	11.4	13.5	1.4
Has had diabetes (%)	3.0	3.2	3.0	1.7	0.7	2.3	4.0
Has had tuberculosis (%)	0.7	0.5	0.7	1.5	1.2	0.9	0.6
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS							
Alcohol intake							
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	35.8	38.8	47.2	48.5	81.9	50.5	0.4
High alcohol intake (%)	6.0	6.3	8.3	7.8	11.9	8.1	0.5
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	2.5	2.3	3.0	3.3	6.3	3.5	0.4
Smoking							
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	72.6	65.6	70.4	69.6	61.1	67.9	1.2
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	23.5	30.7	25.7	25.0	33.7	27.7	0.7
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	21.0	24.8	21.2	19.1	25.5	22.3	0.8
Nutrition							
BMI (kg/m ²)	24.9	25.0	25.5	25.1	25.3	25.2	1.0
Underweight (%)	1.2	2.2	2.2	1.7	3.0	2.1	0.4
Overweight (%)	37.5	38.6	41.7	33.4	36.1	37.3	1.0
Obese (%)	17.8	14.9	15.3	17.3	15.8	16.2	1.1
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS							
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	22.0	16.6	26.7	30.4	36.1	26.4	0.6
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	78.9	72.7	69.6	68.4	38.1	65.6	2.1
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	4.5	11.6	9.8	11.8	23.8	12.3	0.2
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	20.5	12.4	8.4	6.7	4.0	10.4	5.2
“Definitely dissatisfied” with health system (%)	72.8	75.0	67.2	60.4	50.2	65.1	1.4
SOCIAL CAPITAL							
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	76.0	83.9	84.7	88.1	93.8	22.3	0.3
Has “a great deal” of control over life (%)	10.1	14.1	19.0	29.5	38.9	22.3	0.3

Table 9. Asset quintiles by gender, Georgia

Indicator	Quintiles: male					Quintiles: female				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	75.3	79.1	80.3	82.9	86.9	46.4	57.6	59.9	63.4	78.8
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	65.3	71.7	74.6	78.6	81.1	43.1	49.7	51.8	58.9	78.4
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	20.2	14.1	14.4	15.5	12.8	36.6	32.2	31.7	25.0	15.4
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	12.5	11.7	13.3	11.3	13.3	31.5	20.1	29.9	24.6	13.9
Has angina (%)	6.9	10.7	7.1	7.7	10.1	22.4	21.1	27.9	14.0	12.5
Has had diabetes (%)	3.3	2.9	0.6	1.8	1.5	3.4	3.5	4.9	1.7	0.0
Has had tuberculosis (%)	0.6	0.5	1.1	1.8	2.0	0.9	0.5	0.4	1.3	0.5
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	83.1	74.2	100.8	105.0	150.6	1.2	2.4	5.1	8.2	17.8
High alcohol intake (%)	13.6	11.9	17.6	15.8	21.5	0.4	0.5	0.9	2.2	2.9
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	5.9	4.5	6.8	7.3	11.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	2.0
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	41.6	41.5	42.5	36.9	32.7	95.7	90.5	92.9	92.8	88.0
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	49.1	53.7	30.3	32.4	59.7	4.3	7.0	5.8	5.3	9.1
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	44.5	44.4	46.4	41.1	46.4	3.4	4.5	0.9	3.4	5.0
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	25.5	25.1	25.8	25.5	25.8	24.3	24.9	25.2	24.8	25.0
Underweight (%)	0.6	1.5	0.0	0.6	1.0	1.7	3.0	4.0	2.5	4.8
Overweight (%)	50.9	44.4	50.8	40.5	37.8	27.6	32.7	34.4	28.4	34.6
Obese (%)	12.1	12.2	11.0	14.9	15.8	22.0	17.6	18.8	19.1	25.9
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	17.3	13.7	17.1	22.6	33.2	25.4	19.6	34.4	3.0	38.9
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	15.0	12.2	8.3	11.3	2.6	35.8	34.7	27.2	16.9	7.2
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	2.9	3.9	2.8	4.2	5.6	1.7	3.5	2.2	3.0	1.4
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	28.3	14.6	10.5	8.9	6.1	14.7	10.1	6.7	5.2	1.9
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	73.4	81.0	70.8	62.5	51.5	72.4	68.8	64.3	38.9	49.0
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	83.2	90.7	86.7	86.9	94.4	70.7	76.9	83.0	89.0	93.3
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	8.1	13.2	15.5	34.5	44.9	11.6	15.1	32.9	35.8	33.2

Table 10. Asset quintiles by place of residence (urban/rural), Georgia

Indicator	Quintiles: urban					Quintiles: rural				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	57.8	65.1	66.5	67.3	78.4	60.0	72.2	72.5	77.4	89.2
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	52.6	55.8	55.4	63.6	75.6	52.6	65.9	70.2	72.2	85.5
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	29.1	25.6	28.1	27.3	18.5	30.0	20.5	18.8	11.7	7.8
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	25.1	19.1	25.9	22.3	16.4	22.2	12.7	18.2	14.2	9.6
Has angina (%)	17.1	17.1	15.2	12.8	10.5	14.8	14.6	10.5	9.3	12.7
Has had diabetes (%)	3.4	3.5	4.5	2.5	1.3	2.6	2.9	1.1	0.6	0.0
Has had tuberculosis (%)	0.6	1.0	0.9	1.7	0.8	0.9	0.0	0.6	1.2	1.8
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	33.0	27.2	45.8	39.2	43.4	38.0	50.1	49.1	62.7	136.9
High alcohol intake (%)	5.7	5.6	7.6	7.6	8.6	6.2	7.0	9.0	8.2	16.6
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	2.9	1.0	2.2	2.5	2.1	2.2	3.5	4.0	4.4	12.3
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	81.1	65.8	73.2	71.1	65.5	66.1	65.4	66.9	67.3	54.8
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	14.3	29.6	23.2	21.5	28.6	30.4	31.7	28.7	30.2	41.0
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	10.3	21.1	17.0	15.3	19.7	29.1	28.3	26.5	24.7	33.7
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	24.4	24.9	15.5	25.1	25.6	25.4	25.1	25.4	25.1	24.9
Underweight (%)	2.3	4.0	3.6	2.1	4.2	0.4	0.5	0.6	1.2	1.2
Overweight (%)	29.1	35.2	38.8	33.5	36.6	45.9	42.0	45.3	33.3	35.5
Obese (%)	14.9	13.1	15.6	18.2	18.1	20.0	16.6	14.9	16.0	12.7
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	24.0	18.1	29.5	33.5	41.2	20.4	15.1	23.2	25.9	28.9
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	36.0	30.2	22.8	16.9	7.6	20.0	16.6	13.8	21.1	1.2
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	2.9	4.0	2.7	4.1	2.1	1.7	3.4	2.2	1.5	5.4
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.1	24.4	1.8	16.7	9.6
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	69.7	68.8	64.7	65.7	50.4	75.2	81.0	70.2	52.3	50.0
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	69.1	82.4	83.0	88.8	94.5	81.3	85.4	86.7	87.0	92.8
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	12.0	19.1	25.9	31.0	43.3	8.7	9.3	10.5	27.2	32.5

Appendix

Table A. LLH: assets and asset weights used to construct the deprivation index for Georgia

Assets	Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
Availability of heat and good water						
No heating	0.20	0.19	0.17	0.16	0.09	0.16
Bad quality water	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Possession of durables						
Television	0.72	0.41	0.33	0.18	0.09	0.35
Telephone	0.85	0.74	0.60	0.45	0.39	0.61
Video recorder	1.00	0.95	0.89	0.79	0.42	0.81
Washing machine	0.80	0.61	0.53	0.41	0.26	0.52
Dishwasher	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.97	0.99
Video camera	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.92	0.98
Personal computer	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.89	0.98
Car	0.99	0.95	0.83	0.75	0.58	0.82
Motorcycle	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.97	0.99
Bicycle	1.00	0.95	0.92	0.95	0.84	0.93
Not having the following in the household						
Cold water on tap	0.16	0.13	0.10	0.06	0.02	0.09
Hot water on tap	0.95	0.85	0.81	0.71	0.54	0.77
Water closet/toilet	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bathroom	0.56	0.46	0.34	0.23	0.17	0.35
Kitchen	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
Having had, in the past 12 months, constantly to do without the following						
Food of first level of needs (bread, sugar, milk)	0.17	0.10	0.10	0.05	0.02	0.09
Heating	0.23	0.15	0.15	0.09	0.04	0.13
Clothes	0.29	0.19	0.19	0.11	0.04	0.16
Electricity	0.18	0.15	0.17	0.13	0.05	0.13
Water indoors	0.33	0.23	0.16	0.13	0.06	0.18
Fuel for car	0.91	0.87	0.79	0.69	0.51	0.76
Medical service	0.29	0.20	0.23	0.20	0.19	0.22
Drugs	0.20	0.14	0.16	0.15	0.17	0.16
Household repairs	0.36	0.33	0.35	0.30	0.22	0.31
Definitely dissatisfied with the following						
Housing	0.18	0.13	0.09	0.07	0.06	0.11
Water quality	0.14	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.04	0.08
Air purity	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.08	0.07	0.06
Climate	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.02
Electricity support	0.53	0.49	0.47	0.33	0.28	0.42
Security level	0.30	0.30	0.24	0.19	0.19	0.24
Public transport	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.03
Work/job/main study	0.28	0.23	0.28	0.30	0.20	0.26

Table B. LLH: cut-off points for wealth quintiles in Georgia

Wealth quintile	Deprivation index value	
	Highest	Lowest
Poorest	0.9438	0.8532
Second	0.8532	0.8206
Middle	0.8205	0.7844
Fourth	0.7843	0.7299
Richest	0.7297	0.2260

Table C. LLH: sample sizes by quintile in Georgia

Group	Quintile					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
All	405	404	405	404	404	2022
Urban	175	199	224	242	238	1078
Rural	230	205	181	162	166	944
Female	232	199	224	236	208	1099
Male	173	205	181	168	196	923

Kazakhstan

Tables 11–13 describe health, health behaviour and access to health care by asset quintile.

Table 11. Asset quintiles by total population, Kazakhstan

Indicator	Quintiles					Population average	Poor/rich ratio
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest		
HEALTH INDICATORS							
Perceived health status							
Self-rated health “good” or “quite good” (%)	57.6	64.1	77.2	82.3	89.7	74.2	0.6
“Satisfied” or “quite satisfied” with own health (%)	55.5	59.0	75.5	78.3	85.5	70.8	0.6
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	46.3	44.3	31.0	26.8	22.5	34.2	2.1
Diseases							
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	33.8	25.8	22.0	18.3	13.5	22.7	2.5
Has angina (%)	15.3	16.0	15.3	8.8	10.8	13.2	1.4
Has had diabetes (%)	3.0	2.5	1.3	1.8	1.8	2.1	1.7
Has had tuberculosis (%)	6.5	5.0	6.0	4.8	5.3	5.5	1.2
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS							
Alcohol intake							
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	31.6	40.9	41.8	48.0	56.4	43.7	0.6
High alcohol intake (%)	5.3	6.3	5.5	7.5	7.8	6.5	0.7
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.8	1.8	2.4	1.4
Smoking							
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	64.3	60.8	60.5	54.5	47.8	57.6	1.3
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	30.3	32.0	31.3	35.8	41.3	34.1	0.7
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	15.3	19.3	18.8	22.5	24.8	20.1	0.6
Nutrition							
BMI (kg/m ²)	24.6	24.6	24.7	24.5	24.5	24.6	1.0
Underweight (%)	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.5	2.5	3.0	1.2
Overweight (%)	28.0	27.8	30.8	29.3	32.5	29.7	0.9
Obese (%)	21.0	22.8	17.8	17.8	9.8	17.8	2.2
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS							
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	55.5	54.8	57.3	52.3	49.5	53.9	1.1
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	63.0	34.8	18.4	15.4	10.3	28.4	6.1
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	43.2	40.9	51.0	46.2	37.9	43.8	1.1
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	25.3	25.8	23.0	23.8	20.5	23.7	1.2
“Definitely dissatisfied” with health system (%)	35.0	27.0	25.8	22.0	19.5	25.9	1.8
SOCIAL CAPITAL							
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	73.3	81.5	86.8	89.3	91.5	84.5	0.8
Has “a great deal” of control over life (%)	14.0	13.5	21.3	22.5	34.0	21.1	0.4

Table 12. Asset quintiles by gender, Kazakhstan

Indicator	Quintiles: male					Quintiles: female				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	67.1	70.6	86.4	86.9	90.7	52.2	59.6	71.8	77.6	88.4
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	69.0	65.6	86.5	84.2	88.2	47.8	54.4	69.0	72.1	82.0
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	40.7	36.8	23.0	24.6	20.6	49.4	49.4	35.7	28.9	25.0
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	19.3	17.8	12.2	9.4	10.1	42.0	31.2	27.8	27.4	18.0
Has angina (%)	9.0	14.1	10.8	5.4	9.2	18.8	17.3	17.9	12.2	12.8
Has had diabetes (%)	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.0	0.9	4.7	3.4	2.0	2.5	2.9
Has had tuberculosis (%)	6.2	4.9	6.1	4.4	3.9	6.7	5.1	6.0	5.1	7.0
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	75.3	93.0	92.4	78.7	90.5	6.7	5.0	12.0	16.3	11.2
High alcohol intake (%)	12.4	14.1	12.2	11.8	13.2	1.2	0.8	1.6	3.0	0.6
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	5.5	6.1	5.4	4.4	3.1	0.8	0.0	0.8	1.0	0.0
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	21.4	20.9	20.9	20.7	22.4	88.6	88.2	83.7	89.3	81.4
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	66.9	66.9	66.2	64.0	63.6	9.4	8.0	10.7	6.6	11.6
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	37.2	43.6	44.6	43.3	41.7	2.7	2.5	3.6	1.0	2.3
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	23.7	24.4	24.3	24.7	24.6	25.1	24.8	24.9	24.3	24.5
Underweight (%)	4.1	0.6	1.4	2.0	1.8	2.4	5.5	3.2	5.1	3.5
Overweight (%)	25.5	29.4	29.7	34.0	34.6	29.4	26.6	31.3	24.4	29.7
Obese (%)	13.1	17.8	17.6	13.8	7.0	25.5	26.2	17.9	21.8	13.4
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	44.8	44.8	39.2	43.8	38.2	61.6	61.6	67.9	60.9	64.5
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	13.8	4.3	4.7	3.4	0.9	14.5	8.9	2.4	1.5	1.2
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	19.3	17.2	16.9	16.3	12.3	14.5	11.4	13.5	12.2	11.6
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	24.1	30.7	23.0	26.1	19.3	25.9	22.4	23.0	21.3	22.1
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	29.0	26.4	23.0	23.2	21.1	38.4	27.4	27.4	20.8	17.4
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	71.7	76.7	85.8	90.6	89.5	74.1	84.8	87.3	87.8	94.2
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	13.8	17.2	21.6	25.1	32.9	14.1	11.0	21.0	19.8	35.5

Table 13. Asset quintiles by place of residence (urban/rural), Kazakhstan

Indicator	Quintiles: urban					Quintiles: rural				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	56.6	66.3	77.7	82.9	86.2	59.0	61.1	76.9	81.9	94.0
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	54.7	59.1	78.4	78.1	81.6	58.2	56.8	72.6	77.1	89.8
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	47.8	40.4	31.2	23.7	24.0	42.9	50.3	31.4	30.2	21.6
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	36.9	25.1	24.1	18.3	13.8	28.8	27.8	19.4	17.7	13.8
Has angina (%)	20.7	18.7	18.1	9.5	11.2	8.5	14.2	10.9	8.3	7.2
Has had diabetes (%)	3.0	2.5	1.0	1.8	2.0	3.4	3.0	1.7	1.0	1.8
Has had tuberculosis (%)	6.9	4.4	4.5	6.5	5.1	6.2	5.3	8.6	4.2	4.2
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	23.5	28.8	46.9	57.2	60.5	42.5	60.0	41.0	45.9	56.3
High alcohol intake (%)	3.4	4.9	6.0	9.5	8.2	7.3	8.3	5.7	6.8	7.2
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.4	3.6	2.3	3.1	1.8
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	65.0	60.6	58.8	50.9	48.0	63.8	61.5	62.9	56.8	47.3
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	30.5	33.0	32.7	38.5	41.3	29.4	31.4	30.3	34.4	42.5
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	14.8	17.2	21.6	20.7	27.6	14.7	21.9	17.1	25.0	24.6
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	24.7	24.3	24.5	24.2	24.4	24.3	24.9	24.7	24.8	24.8
Underweight (%)	3.4	5.4	3.5	4.7	3.1	2.3	0.6	1.1	2.1	2.4
Overweight (%)	28.1	27.6	27.6	18.9	33.2	27.7	26.6	34.9	37.0	34.1
Obese (%)	20.7	18.7	17.6	20.1	7.7	20.9	28.4	16.0	17.2	12.6
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	54.2	53.7	58.3	58.6	52.0	57.6	56.8	56.6	47.4	46.7
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	13.8	7.4	5.0	0.6	0.5	13.0	5.9	1.1	2.6	1.8
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	17.7	12.3	12.6	14.8	10.7	15.3	14.8	17.1	15.1	15.6
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	1.5	3.0	4.0	3.6	3.6	53.7	55.0	46.9	42.7	42.5
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	41.4	27.1	23.1	24.9	19.9	24.9	24.9	26.3	19.3	19.2
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	76.8	78.8	85.9	88.2	90.3	68.4	82.2	86.3	88.5	91.6
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	14.3	14.3	21.1	21.9	33.2	15.3	14.8	22.3	25.0	36.5

Appendix

Table A. LLH: assets and asset weights used to construct the deprivation index for Kazakhstan

Assets	Quintile					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
Availability of heat and good water						
No heating	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bad quality water	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Possession of durables						
Television	0.32	0.19	0.13	0.07	0.04	0.15
Telephone	0.82	0.70	0.65	0.57	0.44	0.63
Video recorder	0.95	0.86	0.70	0.52	0.26	0.66
Washing machine	0.34	0.21	0.14	0.11	0.09	0.18
Dishwasher	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	1.00
Video camera	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.87	0.97
Personal computer	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.86	0.97
Car	0.92	0.85	0.75	0.60	0.35	0.69
Motorcycle	0.98	0.93	0.87	0.85	0.85	0.90
Bicycle	0.90	0.84	0.79	0.68	0.61	0.76
Not having the following in the household						
Cold water on tap	0.21	0.22	0.18	0.17	0.10	0.18
Hot water on tap	0.74	0.66	0.68	0.69	0.65	0.68
Water closet/toilet	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bathroom	0.61	0.57	0.57	0.59	0.53	0.57
Kitchen	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01
Having had, in the past 12 months, constantly to do without the following						
Food of first level of needs (bread, sugar, milk)	0.33	0.15	0.08	0.04	0.02	0.12
Heating	0.13	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.01	0.06
Clothes	0.49	0.25	0.13	0.06	0.02	0.19
Electricity	0.23	0.11	0.07	0.06	0.02	0.10
Water indoors	0.29	0.27	0.21	0.21	0.12	0.22
Fuel for car	0.90	0.83	0.78	0.64	0.35	0.70
Medical service	0.43	0.27	0.15	0.12	0.07	0.21
Drugs	0.43	0.26	0.16	0.11	0.05	0.20
Household repairs	0.60	0.34	0.23	0.15	0.04	0.27
Definitely dissatisfied with the following						
Housing	0.13	0.08	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.06
Water quality	0.22	0.12	0.14	0.10	0.08	0.13
Air purity	0.26	0.17	0.15	0.10	0.10	0.15
Climate	0.13	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.07
Electricity support	0.10	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.06
Security level	0.17	0.12	0.11	0.07	0.07	0.11
Public transport	0.17	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.10
Work/job/main study	0.22	0.15	0.09	0.08	0.03	0.11

Table B. LLH: cut-off points for wealth quintiles in Kazakhstan

Wealth quintile	Deprivation index value	
	Highest	Lowest
Poorest	0.9084	0.7893
Second	0.7893	0.7474
Middle	0.7474	0.7117
Fourth	0.7117	0.6656
Richest	0.6654	0.0791

Table C. LLH: sample sizes by quintile in Kazakhstan

Group	Quintile					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
All	400	400	400	400	400	2000
Urban	120	117	149	170	194	750
Rural	280	283	251	230	206	1250
Female	226	221	212	230	211	1100
Male	174	179	188	170	189	900

Kyrgyzstan

Tables 14–16 describe health, health behaviour and access to health care by asset quintile.

Table 14. Asset quintiles by total population, Kyrgyzstan

Indicator	Quintiles					Population average	Poor/rich ratio
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest		
HEALTH INDICATORS							
Perceived health status							
Self-rated health “good” or “quite good” (%)	73.9	81.1	84.8	83.6	89.4	82.6	0.8
“Satisfied” or “quite satisfied” with own health (%)	68.8	75.0	80.0	82.5	85.0	78.3	0.8
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	33.0	30.8	29.0	31.5	25.5	30.0	1.3
Diseases							
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	17.5	14.0	17.5	16.5	11.0	15.3	1.6
Has angina (%)	9.0	9.0	11.5	12.0	9.3	10.2	1.0
Has had diabetes (%)	1.3	0.5	1.0	1.3	0.8	1.0	1.7
Has had tuberculosis (%)	3.0	3.3	2.8	4.0	3.5	3.3	0.9
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS							
Alcohol intake							
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	26.5	13.2	17.3	21.0	25.3	20.7	1.0
High alcohol intake (%)	3.8	2.8	3.3	3.3	3.8	3.4	1.0
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	2.3	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.3	1.5
Smoking							
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	68.0	72.0	71.0	70.0	66.0	69.4	1.0
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	23.8	24.8	25.0	24.0	29.0	25.3	0.8
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	7.3	5.5	9.0	8.3	10.8	8.2	0.7
Nutrition							
BMI (kg/m ²)	23.2	23.1	23.8	23.9	23.9	23.6	1.0
Underweight (%)	6.0	5.3	4.8	5.3	7.0	5.7	0.9
Overweight (%)	17.8	20.3	20.3	23.3	24.0	21.1	0.7
Obese (%)	14.0	13.8	13.8	13.3	14.5	13.9	1.0
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS							
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	50.3	49.0	49.5	52.3	62.8	52.8	0.8
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	52.0	21.4	14.7	13.3	9.5	22.2	5.5
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	28.0	39.3	47.1	50.0	42.9	41.4	0.7
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	13.8	15.5	11.5	10.5	9.3	12.1	1.5
“Definitely dissatisfied” with health system (%)	24.8	18.8	19.5	21.5	16.8	20.3	1.5
SOCIAL CAPITAL							
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	79.0	85.8	86.3	84.8	89.8	85.1	0.9
Has “a great deal” of control over life (%)	38.8	44.8	47.3	37.3	48.3	43.3	0.8

Table 15. Asset quintiles by gender, Kyrgyzstan

Indicator	Quintiles: male					Quintiles: female				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	82.5	89.8	90.4	91.8	91.0	67.4	74.1	79.9	77.4	88.0
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	76.4	82.7	87.2	89.4	87.3	62.8	68.8	73.6	77.4	82.9
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	26.4	22.9	24.5	22.9	24.3	38.1	37.1	33.0	37.8	26.5
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	8.6	8.9	10.1	7.6	6.9	24.3	18.1	24.1	23.0	14.7
Has angina (%)	6.3	5.6	9.6	7.6	9.0	11.1	11.8	13.2	15.2	9.5
Has had diabetes (%)	1.1	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.5	1.3	0.5	1.4	1.7	0.9
Has had tuberculosis (%)	1.1	4.5	4.3	5.3	4.2	4.4	2.3	1.4	3.0	2.8
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	48.5	27.1	34.1	37.0	47.4	9.8	2.2	2.9	9.3	5.7
High alcohol intake (%)	7.6	6.3	6.6	6.6	7.6	0.9	0.0	0.5	0.9	0.5
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	4.7	1.1	2.2	1.8	2.7	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.5
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	35.1	43.0	43.1	43.5	38.1	93.4	95.5	95.8	89.6	91.0
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	51.1	51.4	50.0	48.2	52.9	2.7	3.2	2.8	6.1	7.6
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	16.1	11.7	19.1	18.2	20.6	0.4	0.5	0.0	0.9	1.9
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	23.3	23.3	24.1	24.2	23.9	23.1	23.0	23.4	23.8	23.9
Underweight (%)	3.4	3.4	2.1	2.9	4.2	8.0	6.8	7.1	7.0	9.5
Overweight (%)	19.0	20.7	25.5	27.6	27.0	16.8	19.9	15.6	20.0	21.3
Obese (%)	9.8	11.7	9.6	8.8	10.1	17.3	15.4	17.5	16.5	18.5
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	42.5	35.8	37.8	42.9	47.1	56.2	59.7	59.9	59.1	76.8
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	6.3	3.9	2.1	2.4	0.0	11.1	3.6	3.3	1.7	0.9
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	13.2	7.3	8.5	7.1	3.7	8.0	6.8	7.5	7.4	5.7
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	13.8	16.8	11.2	14.1	11.6	13.7	14.5	11.8	7.8	7.1
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	26.4	18.4	16.5	19.4	13.8	23.5	19.0	22.2	23.0	19.4
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	81.6	84.9	87.8	85.3	88.9	77.0	86.4	84.9	84.3	90.5
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	41.4	48.0	47.3	37.1	48.1	36.7	42.1	47.2	37.4	48.3

Table 16. Asset quintiles by place of residence (urban/rural), Kyrgyzstan

Indicator	Quintiles: urban					Quintiles: rural				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	55.9	72.2	75.2	78.0	87.4	81.6	84.8	90.4	87.7	91.3
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	50.8	62.4	73.8	78.2	84.5	76.4	80.2	83.7	85.7	85.4
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	45.0	41.0	33.6	31.8	23.7	27.9	26.5	26.3	31.3	27.2
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	25.8	13.7	20.1	18.8	10.8	13.9	14.1	15.9	14.8	11.2
Has angina (%)	15.0	12.8	12.1	12.4	9.3	6.4	7.4	11.2	11.7	9.2
Has had diabetes (%)	2.5	1.7	2.0	0.0	1.5	0.7	0.0	0.4	2.2	0.0
Has had tuberculosis (%)	4.2	6.8	1.3	4.1	4.6	2.5	1.8	3.6	3.9	2.4
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	31.0	11.2	13.0	26.0	27.2	24.5	14.1	20.0	17.3	23.5
High alcohol intake (%)	4.2	2.7	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.6	2.9	3.3	3.1	4.0
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	2.5	0.0	0.7	1.2	1.6	2.2	0.7	1.2	0.9	1.5
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	73.3	72.6	71.1	68.2	69.1	65.7	71.7	70.9	71.3	63.1
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	19.2	23.1	22.8	22.4	28.9	25.7	25.4	26.3	25.2	29.1
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	9.2	7.7	11.4	8.8	11.3	6.4	4.6	7.6	7.8	10.2
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	22.78	23.28	23.65	23.67	23.68	23.35	23.07	23.82	24.14	24.13
Underweight (%)	7.5	6.8	5.4	5.9	9.8	5.4	4.6	4.4	4.8	4.4
Overweight (%)	15.0	20.5	16.8	22.9	23.2	18.9	20.1	22.3	23.5	24.8
Obese (%)	15.8	12.0	15.4	11.2	13.4	13.2	14.5	12.7	14.8	15.5
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	56.7	57.3	56.4	58.8	68.6	47.5	45.6	45.4	47.4	57.3
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	6.7	2.6	4.7	2.4	1.0	10.0	4.2	1.6	1.7	0.0
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	7.5	8.5	10.1	3.5	5.2	11.4	6.4	6.8	10.0	4.4
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	0.8	0.9	1.3	0.6	0.0	19.3	21.6	17.5	17.8	18.0
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	35.8	23.9	24.2	25.9	21.1	20.0	16.6	16.7	18.3	12.6
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	67.5	78.6	79.9	80.6	85.6	83.9	88.7	90.0	87.8	93.7
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	29.2	40.2	38.9	30.6	45.4	42.9	46.6	52.2	42.2	51.0

Appendix

Table A. LLH: assets and asset weights used to construct the deprivation index for Kyrgyzstan

Assets	Quintile					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
Availability of heat and good water						
No heating	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Bad quality water	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Possession of durables						
Television	0.66	0.48	0.36	0.31	0.14	0.39
Telephone	0.90	0.86	0.75	0.63	0.47	0.72
Video recorder	1.00	0.98	0.94	0.85	0.57	0.87
Washing machine	0.72	0.55	0.47	0.40	0.24	0.48
Dishwasher	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.95	0.99
Video camera	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95	0.99
Personal computer	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.93	0.99
Car	0.96	0.90	0.81	0.72	0.46	0.77
Motorcycle	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.95	0.88	0.96
Bicycle	0.93	0.86	0.77	0.75	0.58	0.77
Not having the following in the household						
Cold water on tap	0.34	0.26	0.17	0.13	0.09	0.20
Hot water on tap	0.88	0.89	0.83	0.75	0.69	0.81
Water closet/toilet	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02
Bathroom	0.80	0.76	0.74	0.64	0.53	0.70
Kitchen	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.03
Having had, in the past 12 months, constantly to do without the following						
Food of first level of needs (bread, sugar, milk)	0.61	0.44	0.36	0.21	0.07	0.34
Heating	0.52	0.30	0.21	0.13	0.08	0.25
Clothes	0.60	0.42	0.29	0.19	0.07	0.31
Electricity	0.64	0.48	0.34	0.20	0.10	0.35
Water indoors	0.57	0.39	0.34	0.20	0.15	0.33
Fuel for car	0.82	0.75	0.69	0.67	0.48	0.68
Medical service	0.51	0.29	0.23	0.18	0.08	0.26
Drugs	0.49	0.29	0.22	0.17	0.07	0.25
Household repairs	0.47	0.26	0.18	0.17	0.12	0.24
Definitely dissatisfied with the following						
Housing	0.12	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.06
Water quality	0.16	0.09	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.07
Air purity	0.06	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04
Climate	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03
Electricity support	0.28	0.14	0.12	0.07	0.06	0.13
Security level	0.21	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.10
Public transport	0.37	0.26	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.19
Work/job/main study	0.28	0.19	0.14	0.12	0.07	0.16

Table B. LLH: cut-off points for wealth quintiles in Kyrgyzstan

Wealth quintile	Deprivation index value	
	Highest	Lowest
Poorest	0.9279	0.7972
Second	0.7969	0.7629
Middle	0.7628	0.7245
Fourth	0.7244	0.6674
Richest	0.6672	0.2166

Table C. LLH: sample sizes by quintile in Kyrgyzstan

Group	Quintile					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
All	400	400	400	400	400	2000
Urban	120	117	149	170	194	750
Rural	280	283	251	230	206	1250
Female	226	221	212	230	211	1100
Male	174	179	188	170	189	900

Republic of Moldova

Tables 17–19 describe health, health behaviour and access to health care by asset quintile.

Table 17. Asset quintiles by total population, Republic of Moldova

Indicator	Quintiles					Population average	Poor/ rich ratio
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest		
HEALTH INDICATORS							
Perceived health status							
Self-rated health “good” or “quite good” (%)	38.4	46.0	56.3	62.0	75.6	55.7	0.5
“Satisfied” or “quite satisfied” with own health (%)	41.5	50.8	56.5	61.3	76.8	57.4	0.5
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	51.0	40.3	40.5	36.3	25.8	38.8	2.0
Diseases							
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	31.3	28.0	26.8	26.0	18.5	26.1	1.7
Has angina (%)	14.5	10.0	12.8	12.5	13.3	12.6	1.1
Has had diabetes (%)	3.3	2.5	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.3	2.2
Has had tuberculosis (%)	6.0	7.3	6.8	5.8	9.0	7.0	0.7
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS							
Alcohol intake							
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	70.9	57.8	73.0	61.8	56.1	63.9	1.3
High alcohol intake (%)	11.8	8.0	11.5	8.0	8.3	9.5	1.4
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	4.8	3.5	4.5	2.5	2.3	3.5	2.1
Smoking							
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	71.5	74.3	69.3	71.3	71.0	71.5	1.0
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	23.3	19.0	22.5	22.3	21.3	21.7	1.1
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	11.8	8.0	9.8	11.0	9.0	9.9	1.3
Nutrition							
BMI (kg/m ²)	25.2	25.5	25.6	26.0	25.6	25.6	1.0
Underweight (%)	2.0	1.3	1.0	2.5	0.8	1.5	2.7
Overweight (%)	32.0	32.3	35.8	36.0	29.3	33.1	1.1
Obese (%)	23.5	22.0	19.8	21.8	23.8	22.2	1.0
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS							
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	51.8	62.8	63.3	61.5	63.8	60.6	0.8
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	66.7	52.2	54.5	29.6	33.3	47.3	2.0
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	34.4	32.6	38.6	51.9	51.9	41.9	0.7
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	27.3	31.5	28.0	32.5	24.3	28.7	1.1
“Definitely dissatisfied” with health system (%)	46.5	38.0	37.5	36.3	35.5	38.8	1.3
SOCIAL CAPITAL							
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	73.0	80.0	87.0	88.3	93.3	84.3	0.8
Has “a great deal” of control over life (%)	12.8	19.5	20.5	23.0	33.0	21.8	0.4

Table 18. Asset quintiles by gender, Republic of Moldova

Indicator	Quintiles: male					Quintiles: female				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	43.6	50.0	55.4	68.7	80.7	34.5	43.1	57.1	56.3	71.0
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	44.2	52.0	55.6	67.4	80.7	39.5	49.8	57.3	56.0	73.2
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	48.3	38.0	39.0	29.3	24.1	53.1	41.9	41.8	42.1	27.2
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	26.2	22.8	23.0	19.0	16.6	35.1	31.9	30.0	31.9	20.2
Has angina (%)	14.5	7.6	14.4	10.3	12.8	14.5	11.8	11.3	14.4	13.6
Has had diabetes (%)	1.7	1.2	2.1	1.6	1.1	4.4	3.5	1.9	2.3	1.9
Has had tuberculosis (%)	8.1	5.8	7.0	7.1	6.4	4.4	8.3	6.6	4.6	11.3
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	133.8	104.5	134.4	116.0	99.4	23.5	23.3	19.1	15.6	18.2
High alcohol intake (%)	20.9	14.2	21.4	15.2	15.1	4.8	3.5	2.8	1.9	2.3
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	8.7	6.5	8.0	4.9	3.2	1.8	1.3	1.4	0.5	1.4
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	39.5	46.2	37.4	44.6	46.5	95.6	95.2	97.2	94.0	92.5
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	50.0	39.2	45.5	43.5	38.5	3.1	3.9	2.3	4.2	6.1
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	26.2	18.1	20.9	21.2	18.7	0.9	0.4	0.0	2.3	0.5
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	25.3	25.8	25.7	26.4	25.8	25.2	25.3	25.6	25.7	25.4
Underweight (%)	1.7	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	2.2	2.2	1.4	4.6	1.4
Overweight (%)	42.4	39.2	41.2	43.5	33.7	24.1	27.1	31.0	29.6	25.4
Obese (%)	18.6	19.3	17.6	18.5	24.6	27.2	24.0	21.6	24.5	23.0
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	43.6	63.7	55.6	54.3	55.6	57.9	62.0	70.0	67.6	70.9
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	20.3	6.4	9.6	1.6	4.8	17.1	7.9	4.2	5.1	1.4
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	9.3	6.4	9.1	8.2	9.1	11.0	8.7	5.6	7.4	4.7
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	26.2	27.5	25.7	33.2	26.2	28.1	34.5	30.0	31.9	22.5
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	44.2	34.5	40.6	37.5	38.0	48.2	40.6	34.7	35.2	33.3
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	73.8	83.0	89.8	90.2	92.5	72.4	77.7	84.5	86.6	93.9
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	14.5	21.1	21.9	21.2	33.2	11.4	18.3	19.2	24.5	32.9

Table 19. Asset quintiles by place of residence (urban/rural), Republic of Moldova

Indicator	Quintiles: urban					Quintiles: rural				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	34.7	45.8	59.8	63.8	82.7	41.2	46.2	53.8	60.9	70.1
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	37.1	47.8	57.9	60.1	83.2	44.8	52.7	55.5	62.0	71.5
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	58.2	44.1	38.6	35.4	22.9	45.7	37.7	41.9	36.8	28.1
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	42.9	32.9	24.6	31.0	18.4	22.6	24.7	28.4	22.7	18.6
Has angina (%)	17.1	10.6	14.0	12.0	12.8	12.6	9.6	11.8	12.8	13.6
Has had diabetes (%)	5.3	3.1	2.9	3.8	2.8	1.7	2.1	1.3	0.8	0.5
Has had tuberculosis (%)	9.4	8.1	6.4	7.6	7.8	3.5	6.7	7.0	4.5	10.0
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	52.9	34.9	55.3	36.3	50.0	84.3	73.2	86.2	78.5	60.9
High alcohol intake (%)	7.6	4.4	9.4	4.4	6.7	14.8	10.5	13.1	10.3	9.5
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	4.1	2.5	2.3	1.9	2.2	5.2	4.2	6.1	2.9	2.3
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	67.1	70.8	63.7	68.4	69.3	74.8	76.6	73.4	73.1	72.4
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	25.3	23.6	26.3	24.1	23.5	21.7	15.9	19.7	21.1	19.5
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	14.1	8.7	11.7	10.1	10.6	10.0	7.5	8.3	11.6	7.7
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	26.2	25.6	25.8	25.5	25.3	24.6	25.4	25.5	26.3	25.8
Underweight (%)	0.6	1.9	1.2	3.8	1.7	3.0	0.8	0.9	1.7	0.0
Overweight (%)	36.5	34.8	38.6	36.1	28.5	28.7	30.5	33.6	36.0	29.9
Obese (%)	28.8	24.2	20.5	19.6	24.6	19.6	20.5	19.2	23.1	23.1
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	62.9	72.7	71.3	70.9	68.2	43.5	56.1	57.2	55.4	60.2
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	16.5	6.8	4.7	1.9	2.8	20.0	7.5	8.3	4.5	3.2
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	8.2	6.8	2.9	5.7	6.1	11.7	8.4	10.5	9.1	7.2
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	0.6	2.5	2.3	0.0	0.6	47.0	51.0	47.2	53.7	43.4
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	48.8	47.8	35.1	36.1	36.3	44.8	31.4	39.3	36.4	34.8
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	72.9	82.0	90.6	88.6	93.3	73.0	78.7	84.3	88.0	93.2
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	12.9	18.0	19.3	17.1	22.9	12.6	20.5	21.4	26.9	41.2

Appendix

Table A. LLH: assets and asset weights used to construct the deprivation index for the Republic of Moldova

Assets	Quintile					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
Availability of heat and good water						
No heating	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01
Bad quality water	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Possession of durables						
Television	0.77	0.49	0.40	0.28	0.15	0.42
Telephone	0.72	0.59	0.52	0.47	0.28	0.51
Video recorder	1.00	0.97	0.95	0.88	0.60	0.88
Washing machine	0.79	0.56	0.43	0.31	0.15	0.45
Dishwasher	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00
Video camera	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.99
Personal computer	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.94	0.99
Car	0.99	0.94	0.87	0.74	0.58	0.82
Motorcycle	1.00	0.97	0.94	0.90	0.81	0.92
Bicycle	0.96	0.89	0.84	0.76	0.57	0.80
Not having the following in the household						
Cold water on tap	0.45	0.36	0.31	0.33	0.24	0.34
Hot water on tap	0.85	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.60	0.74
Water closet/toilet	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bathroom	0.70	0.55	0.50	0.41	0.26	0.48
Kitchen	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.03
Having had, in the past 12 months, constantly to do without the following						
Food of first level of needs (bread, sugar, milk)	0.46	0.29	0.22	0.14	0.06	0.23
Heating	0.43	0.23	0.20	0.15	0.06	0.22
Clothes	0.62	0.35	0.27	0.19	0.06	0.30
Electricity	0.47	0.31	0.27	0.20	0.08	0.27
Water indoors	0.69	0.54	0.47	0.38	0.27	0.47
Fuel for car	0.93	0.86	0.84	0.75	0.55	0.79
Medical service	0.52	0.27	0.20	0.14	0.06	0.24
Drugs	0.52	0.23	0.18	0.15	0.06	0.23
Household repairs	0.46	0.30	0.22	0.16	0.08	0.24
Definitely dissatisfied with the following						
Housing	0.09	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.05
Water quality	0.11	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.08
Air purity	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.07
Climate	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.02
Electricity support	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.04
Security level	0.23	0.13	0.16	0.13	0.13	0.15
Public transport	0.24	0.13	0.15	0.15	0.12	0.16
Work/job/main study	0.24	0.11	0.11	0.04	0.04	0.11

Table B. LLH: cut-off points for wealth quintiles in the Republic of Moldova

Wealth quintile	Deprivation index value	
	Highest	Lowest
Poorest	0.9459	0.8384
Second	0.8383	0.8049
Middle	0.8049	0.7732
Fourth	0.7732	0.7290
Richest	0.7290	0.2576

Table C. LLH: sample sizes by quintile in the Republic of Moldova

Group	Quintile					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
All	400	400	400	400	400	2000
Urban	170	161	171	158	179	839
Rural	230	239	229	242	221	1161
Female	228	229	213	216	213	1099
Male	172	171	187	184	187	901

Russian Federation

Tables 20–22 describe health, health behaviour and access to health care by asset quintile.

Table 20. Asset quintiles by total population, Russian Federation

Indicator	Quintiles					Population average	Poor/rich ratio
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest		
HEALTH INDICATORS							
Perceived health status							
Self-rated health “good” or “quite good” (%)	42.1	56.1	64.4	71.0	80.1	62.8	0.5
“Satisfied” or “quite satisfied” with own health (%)	41.5	54.7	64.3	68.5	78.8	61.6	0.5
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	58.7	46.4	43.1	41.3	31.3	44.2	1.9
Diseases							
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	39.5	32.6	29.7	30.7	20.2	30.6	2.0
Has angina (%)	23.9	19.6	17.0	16.2	12.5	17.8	1.9
Has had diabetes (%)	4.2	2.5	3.0	1.6	1.1	2.5	3.8
Has had tuberculosis (%)	4.4	3.6	3.9	4.0	6.0	4.4	0.7
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS							
Alcohol intake							
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	57.2	53.2	68.6	63.2	66.0	61.7	0.9
High alcohol intake (%)	7.7	7.9	9.6	8.9	10.5	8.9	0.7
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	3.9	2.9	4.4	2.9	3.0	3.4	1.3
Smoking							
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	61.5	57.1	51.7	50.9	47.1	53.6	1.3
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	30.8	33.2	37.6	35.3	37.8	34.9	0.8
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	19.3	20.0	23.5	22.5	21.3	21.3	0.9
Nutrition							
BMI (kg/m ²)	25.5	25.3	25.2	25.1	25.1	25.3	1.0
Underweight (%)	1.7	2.4	2.1	3.0	2.1	2.3	0.8
Overweight (%)	26.9	28.2	30.1	28.3	31.1	28.9	0.9
Obese (%)	27.1	25.2	22.0	21.1	19.6	23.0	1.4
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS							
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	65.7	70.3	71.3	71.5	69.7	69.7	0.9
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	13.1	19.5	6.6	5.3	2.2	9.3	6.0
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	48.2	45.1	45.9	45.6	43.5	45.7	1.1
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	13.0	15.1	16.6	15.6	16.6	15.4	0.8
“Definitely dissatisfied” with health system (%)	44.3	35.8	27.6	29.6	29.1	33.3	1.5
SOCIAL CAPITAL							
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	77.6	84.8	86.8	90.0	93.6	86.5	0.8
Has “a great deal” of control over life (%)	12.6	18.6	23.1	25.6	32.1	22.4	0.4

Table 21. Asset quintiles by gender, Russian Federation

Indicator	Quintiles: male					Quintiles: female				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	51.5	60.6	70.8	77.3	82.7	38.0	53.4	59.4	64.9	76.8
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	50.4	63.2	70.0	75.5	83.0	37.6	49.3	59.9	61.7	73.5
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	50.4	40.0	38.3	35.9	27.4	62.4	50.5	46.8	46.7	36.2
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	32.1	24.8	21.7	26.0	15.4	42.8	37.5	35.9	35.3	26.2
Has angina (%)	17.5	14.2	14.3	10.4	10.2	26.8	23.0	19.1	22.0	15.3
Has had diabetes (%)	2.0	1.9	1.7	0.8	1.1	5.2	2.9	4.0	2.5	1.1
Has had tuberculosis (%)	4.9	3.9	2.9	4.3	5.0	4.1	3.5	4.7	3.7	7.2
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	137.5	115.0	123.2	104.1		21.6	14.6	26.5	23.2	17.4
High alcohol intake (%)	19.9	17.6	17.8	15.7	16.5	2.3	1.8	3.3	2.2	3.1
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	8.1	5.5	7.5	4.6	5.3	2.0	1.2	2.0	1.2	0.3
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	22.0	18.7	20.6	21.7	25.1	79.0	81.3	75.8	79.5	74.1
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	52.4	46.8	48.0	42.7	35.5	4.7	3.1	4.4	2.7	3.9
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	52.4	46.8	48.0	42.7	35.5	4.7	3.1	4.4	2.7	3.9
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	24.8	24.5	25.0	25.0	24.8	25.9	25.9	25.3	25.3	25.4
Underweight (%)	1.2	2.3	1.1	1.8	0.9	2.0	2.4	2.9	4.2	3.6
Overweight (%)	29.3	29.0	35.7	30.8	33.0	25.9	27.7	25.7	25.9	28.7
Obese (%)	18.3	16.8	13.4	17.2	15.6	30.9	30.5	28.6	24.9	24.5
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	59.3	59.7	66.9	64.4	67.6	68.5	77.0	74.7	78.5	72.1
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	2.0	1.6	0.3	0.3	0.0	2.5	2.9	0.7	0.7	0.6
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	12.6	6.8	4.9	8.1	5.0	10.8	8.1	7.3	5.2	6.1
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	14.6	11.6	14.3	15.9	16.5	12.2	17.3	18.4	15.3	16.7
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	45.1	39.4	27.4	28.8	29.6	43.9	33.6	27.7	30.4	28.4
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	78.5	83.5	86.0	87.9	92.3	77.2	85.5	87.4	92.1	95.3
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	10.2	20.0	23.1	24.2	33.9	13.7	17.7	23.1	26.9	29.8

Table 22. Asset quintiles by place of residence (urban/rural), Russian Federation

Indicator	Quintiles: urban					Quintiles: rural				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	40.7	59.0	67.7	73.8	83.2	45.4	49.8	58.6	66.3	74.7
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	42.9	55.4	66.1	70.8	80.2	38.3	53.2	61.1	64.6	76.4
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	60.9	45.4	42.1	40.7	29.7	53.8	48.8	44.9	42.4	34.2
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	41.1	30.8	29.3	29.0	19.6	35.8	36.5	30.5	33.7	21.2
Has angina (%)	24.4	20.4	17.2	16.9	12.4	22.9	17.9	16.5	15.2	12.7
Has had diabetes (%)	5.3	2.0	3.3	1.8	1.4	1.7	3.6	2.5	1.3	0.7
Has had tuberculosis (%)	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4	7.3	3.8	1.6	2.8	3.4	3.8
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	57.1	48.0	63.2	68.2	63.9	57.6	64.6	78.5	54.6	69.8
High alcohol intake (%)	8.2	6.6	9.7	10.4	9.9	6.7	10.8	9.5	6.4	11.4
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	3.9	1.6	3.5	3.0	2.2	3.8	5.6	6.0	2.7	4.5
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	61.2	55.2	48.3	49.6	45.8	62.1	61.1	57.9	53.2	49.3
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	30.6	34.2	40.1	36.1	39.5	31.3	31.0	33.0	34.0	34.9
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	19.2	19.5	23.6	20.8	20.8	19.6	21.0	23.2	25.3	22.3
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	25.5	25.2	25.1	25.0	24.8	25.6	25.6	25.5	25.5	25.6
Underweight (%)	2.1	2.4	1.9	3.2	2.6	0.8	2.4	2.5	2.7	1.4
Overweight (%)	28.6	29.3	29.7	26.6	29.7	22.9	25.8	30.9	31.3	33.6
Obese (%)	25.4	21.9	20.3	19.0	17.7	30.8	32.5	24.9	24.6	22.9
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	66.7	72.9	71.3	71.4	69.7	63.3	64.7	71.2	71.7	69.5
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	1.6	1.6	0.4	0.4	0.2	4.2	4.0	0.7	0.7	0.3
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	12.1	6.2	5.8	6.7	4.9	9.6	10.7	7.0	6.4	6.5
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	1.4	0.7	0.4	0.4	2.6	40.0	46.4	46.0	41.4	41.1
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	47.9	36.8	30.6	33.9	32.8	35.8	33.7	22.1	22.2	22.6
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	78.6	86.5	87.4	91.3	93.1	75.0	81.0	85.6	87.9	94.5
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	13.0	17.9	21.7	23.4	32.6	11.7	20.2	25.6	29.3	31.2

Appendix

Table A. LLH: assets and asset weights used to construct the deprivation index for the Russian Federation

Assets	Quintile					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
Availability of heat and good water						
No heating	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bad quality water	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Possession of durables						
Television	0.28	0.19	0.13	0.09	0.03	0.15
Telephone	0.69	0.56	0.52	0.43	0.29	0.50
Video recorder	0.86	0.75	0.64	0.49	0.25	0.60
Washing machine	0.34	0.26	0.20	0.14	0.06	0.20
Dishwasher	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.99
Video camera	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.98	0.75	0.94
Personal computer	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.93	0.70	0.92
Car	0.93	0.87	0.76	0.59	0.38	0.71
Motorcycle	0.99	0.97	0.94	0.90	0.76	0.91
Bicycle	0.89	0.81	0.76	0.66	0.49	0.72
Not having the following in the household						
Cold water on tap	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.05	0.06
Hot water on tap	0.35	0.34	0.32	0.31	0.27	0.32
Water closet/toilet	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01
Bathroom	0.32	0.29	0.29	0.28	0.24	0.28
Kitchen	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Having had, in the past 12 months, constantly to do without the following						
Food of first level of needs (bread, sugar, milk)	0.40	0.21	0.16	0.09	0.03	0.18
Heating	0.11	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.06
Clothes	0.57	0.34	0.20	0.15	0.05	0.26
Electricity	0.19	0.11	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.09
Water indoors	0.13	0.11	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.09
Fuel for car	0.89	0.82	0.73	0.58	0.43	0.69
Medical service	0.39	0.19	0.13	0.09	0.06	0.17
Drugs	0.49	0.23	0.17	0.12	0.07	0.22
Household repairs	0.62	0.42	0.25	0.19	0.09	0.31
Definitely dissatisfied with the following						
Housing	0.27	0.15	0.13	0.09	0.08	0.14
Water quality	0.45	0.25	0.21	0.15	0.15	0.24
Air purity	0.39	0.24	0.19	0.14	0.13	0.22
Climate	0.15	0.09	0.07	0.04	0.05	0.08
Electricity support	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.04
Security level	0.31	0.18	0.13	0.10	0.09	0.17
Public transport	0.30	0.22	0.18	0.14	0.11	0.19
Work/job/main study	0.15	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.08

Table B. LLH: cut-off points for wealth quintiles in the Russian Federation

Wealth quintile	Deprivation index value	
	Highest	Lowest
Poorest	0.9157	0.7614
Second	0.7613	0.7094
Middle	0.7093	0.6623
Fourth	0.6623	0.6056
Richest	0.6055	0.1204

Table C. LLH: sample sizes by quintile in the Russian Federation

Group	Quintile					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
All	802	801	801	801	801	4006
Urban	562	549	516	504	509	2640
Rural	240	252	285	297	292	1366
Female	556	491	451	405	359	2262
Male	246	310	350	396	442	1744

Ukraine

Tables 23–25 describe health, health behaviour and access to health care by asset quintile.

Table 23. Asset quintiles by total population, Ukraine

Indicator	Quintiles					Population average	Poor/rich ratio
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest		
HEALTH INDICATORS							
Perceived health status	26.6	34.8	50.0	59.8	77.0	49.7	0.3
Self-rated health “good” or “quite good” (%)	31.0	39.4	53.5	59.8	75.4	51.8	0.4
“Satisfied” or “quite satisfied” with own health (%)	59.0	50.4	46.9	43.8	29.0	45.8	2.0
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)							
Diseases							
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	47.1	42.5	35.6	31.9	21.9	35.8	2.2
Has angina (%)	19.8	20.6	19.6	18.5	15.8	18.9	1.3
Has had diabetes (%)	4.0	3.1	1.3	3.3	1.5	2.6	2.7
Has had tuberculosis (%)	4.2	3.5	2.1	2.5	4.8	3.4	0.9
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS							
Alcohol intake							
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	31.8	43.6	37.9	47.1	62.4	44.6	0.5
High alcohol intake (%)	5.7	7.0	6.9	6.1	9.0	6.9	0.6
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	2.5	2.5	1.9	2.9	2.8	2.5	0.9
Smoking							
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	71.0	66.7	64.6	62.3	57.3	64.4	1.2
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	24.0	25.4	29.2	25.2	31.7	27.1	0.8
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	15.0	15.4	16.3	15.8	19.0	16.3	0.8
Nutrition							
BMI (kg/m ²)	25.3	25.7	25.2	25.4	24.9	25.3	1.0
Underweight (%)	3.5	1.7	2.5	2.3	1.9	2.4	1.9
Overweight (%)	26.0	27.1	29.2	30.0	25.4	27.5	1.0
Obese (%)	29.6	30.0	24.6	25.6	22.9	26.5	1.3
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS							
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	62.9	63.8	60.4	60.8	65.8	62.8	1.0
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	54.1	47.3	17.7	16.7	3.1	27.8	17.3
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	40.4	32.4	48.1	40.7	28.1	38.0	1.4
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	9.0	8.5	5.8	9.2	6.7	7.8	1.3
“Definitely dissatisfied” with health system (%)	55.6	41.7	42.1	39.0	34.0	42.5	1.6
SOCIAL CAPITAL							
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	79.4	80.4	85.4	89.6	91.3	85.2	0.9
Has “a great deal” of control over life (%)	10.8	10.4	13.3	17.5	25.6	15.5	0.4

Table 24. Asset quintiles by gender, Ukraine

Indicator	Quintiles: male					Quintiles: female				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	36.5	46.5	57.5	62.2	82.3	22.6	28.1	45.7	58.2	71.7
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	39.4	51.7	60.1	65.3	82.6	27.5	32.4	49.7	56.0	68.2
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	46.5	45.4	38.8	40.8	21.6	64.2	53.3	51.7	45.8	36.4
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	32.4	33.9	28.1	26.0	17.8	53.3	47.4	40.1	35.9	25.9
Has angina (%)	17.6	17.2	15.7	13.8	10.4	20.7	22.5	21.9	21.8	21.3
Has had diabetes (%)	1.4	2.9	0.0	2.0	2.1	5.0	3.3	2.0	4.2	0.8
Has had tuberculosis (%)	2.1	2.3	2.8	2.0	3.3	5.0	4.2	1.7	2.8	6.3
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	83.3	110.2	88.4	99.7	106.3	10.5	5.7	8.7	10.7	19.4
High alcohol intake (%)	13.7	17.4	16.0	13.3	14.2	2.4	1.0	1.7	1.1	3.8
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	5.0	7.0	4.6	6.2	4.7	1.5	0.0	0.3	0.7	0.8
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	32.4	29.3	29.8	27.6	33.2	87.3	87.9	85.1	86.3	81.6
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	57.0	54.0	58.4	48.5	47.3	10.1	9.2	11.9	9.2	15.9
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	42.3	36.2	39.3	34.2	32.8	3.6	3.6	2.6	3.2	5.0
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	24.4	25.0	24.6	25.4	25.2	25.7	26.1	25.6	25.5	24.6
Underweight (%)	0.7	0.6	1.1	1.0	0.4	4.7	2.3	3.3	3.2	3.3
Overweight (%)	26.8	29.9	29.2	34.7	30.3	25.7	25.5	29.1	26.8	20.5
Obese (%)	16.2	20.7	17.4	18.9	21.6	35.2	35.3	28.8	30.3	24.3
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	56.3	58.0	48.3	59.7	63.5	65.7	67.0	67.5	61.6	68.2
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	12.7	5.7	3.9	0.5	0.0	14.5	8.8	4.0	3.5	0.4
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	13.4	6.9	12.4	6.6	5.4	10.9	6.5	10.6	9.5	4.6
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	8.5	7.5	6.7	8.7	7.5	9.2	9.2	5.3	9.5	5.9
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	59.2	44.8	47.2	41.3	37.8	54.1	39.9	39.1	37.3	30.1
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	82.4	81.6	85.4	88.8	90.5	78.1	79.7	85.4	90.1	92.1
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	11.3	10.9	16.9	18.4	28.6	10.7	10.1	11.3	16.9	22.6

Table 25. Asset quintiles by place of residence (urban/rural), Ukraine

Indicator	Quintiles: urban					Quintiles: rural				
	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest	Lowest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Highest
HEALTH INDICATORS										
Perceived health status										
Self-rated health "good" or "quite good" (%)	29.8	34.2	51.9	65.8	77.2	20.7	35.9	47.0	52.2	76.8
"Satisfied" or "quite satisfied" with own health (%)	33.7	40.8	56.6	66.9	77.7	26.2	36.7	48.6	50.7	71.8
Presence of health problems/chronic diseases (%)	57.7	51.1	46.1	40.9	28.1	61.3	49.1	48.1	47.4	30.3
Diseases										
Has or has had heart-related disease (%)	46.8	42.4	32.9	29.0	21.2	47.6	42.6	40.0	35.5	22.9
Has angina (%)	19.6	21.2	20.3	16.7	13.0	20.2	19.5	18.4	20.9	20.2
Has had diabetes (%)	4.8	3.5	1.7	2.6	1.7	2.4	2.4	0.5	4.3	1.1
Has had tuberculosis (%)	5.1	3.2	2.7	3.0	5.1	2.4	4.1	1.1	1.9	4.3
HEALTH BEHAVIOUR INDICATORS										
Alcohol intake										
Total alcohol intake per week (g)	36.8	42.5	30.5	56.8	67.7	22.4	45.6	49.9	34.8	54.0
High alcohol intake (%)	6.8	7.8	5.8	7.5	9.4	3.7	5.4	8.7	4.3	8.2
High-risk alcohol intake (%)	3.2	2.3	0.7	3.7	3.1	1.2	3.0	3.8	1.9	2.2
Smoking										
Does not smoke and has never smoked (%)	70.2	63.7	63.1	57.6	52.1	72.6	72.2	67.0	68.2	65.4
Smokes at least one cigarette per day (%)	24.0	26.7	30.2	29.4	34.9	23.8	23.1	27.6	19.9	26.6
Smokes more than 10 per day (%)	14.7	15.1	16.3	18.2	20.5	15.5	16.0	16.2	12.8	16.5
Nutrition										
BMI (kg/m ²)	25.2	25.7	25.1	25.0	25.0	25.5	25.7	25.4	26.0	24.7
Underweight (%)	3.8	2.3	2.4	3.3	2.1	3.0	0.6	2.7	0.9	1.6
Overweight (%)	27.9	27.7	30.5	27.9	27.4	22.6	26.0	27.0	32.7	22.3
Obese (%)	27.2	30.2	22.0	21.6	19.9	33.9	29.6	28.6	30.8	27.7
HEALTH CARE ACCESS INDICATORS										
Has visited a doctor in last 12 months (%)	66.7	64.6	62.0	63.2	69.9	56.0	62.1	57.8	57.8	59.6
Did not visit a doctor when sick as did not have enough money (%)	9.3	7.1	2.7	1.5	0.0	22.6	8.9	5.9	3.3	0.5
Treated him-/herself with home-made remedies (%)	10.6	6.8	11.9	7.1	3.4	13.7	6.5	10.3	10.0	7.4
Lives more than 10 km from a hospital (%)	0.3	0.6	1.4	0.0	0.0	25.0	23.1	13.0	20.9	17.0
"Definitely dissatisfied" with health system (%)	55.8	43.1	40.7	39.0	32.2	55.4	39.1	44.3	38.9	36.7
SOCIAL CAPITAL										
Can count on someone to help in a crisis (%)	79.2	80.4	87.1	89.6	90.4	79.8	80.5	82.7	89.6	92.6
Has "a great deal" of control over life (%)	11.9	10.6	14.2	18.2	26.7	8.9	10.1	11.9	16.6	23.9

Appendix

Table A. LLH: assets and asset weights used to construct the deprivation index for Ukraine

Assets	Quintile					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
Availability of heat and good water						
No heating	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01
Bad quality water	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Possession of durables						
Television	0.49	0.40	0.25	0.20	0.05	0.28
Telephone	0.68	0.60	0.53	0.45	0.27	0.50
Video recorder	0.99	0.95	0.90	0.79	0.44	0.82
Washing machine	0.59	0.48	0.36	0.30	0.14	0.37
Dishwasher	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	1.00
Video camera	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.91	0.98
Personal computer	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.84	0.96
Car	0.96	0.94	0.87	0.74	0.46	0.79
Motorcycle	0.99	0.98	0.94	0.91	0.79	0.92
Bicycle	0.78	0.69	0.55	0.50	0.41	0.58
Not having the following in the household						
Cold water on tap	0.19	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.08	0.14
Hot water on tap	0.61	0.56	0.53	0.52	0.35	0.51
Water closet/toilet	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
Bathroom	0.47	0.41	0.35	0.35	0.20	0.36
Kitchen	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
Having had, in the past 12 months, constantly to do without the following						
Food of first level of needs (bread, sugar, milk)	0.69	0.44	0.29	0.18	0.04	0.33
Heating	0.49	0.28	0.21	0.10	0.04	0.22
Clothes	0.85	0.60	0.43	0.27	0.09	0.45
Electricity	0.50	0.30	0.21	0.13	0.05	0.24
Water indoors	0.43	0.27	0.23	0.21	0.11	0.25
Fuel for car	0.91	0.88	0.83	0.74	0.47	0.77
Medical service	0.66	0.40	0.24	0.19	0.07	0.31
Drugs	0.70	0.41	0.25	0.17	0.07	0.32
Household repairs	0.84	0.65	0.43	0.27	0.13	0.46
Definitely dissatisfied with the following						
Housing	0.26	0.13	0.10	0.07	0.04	0.12
Water quality	0.40	0.28	0.25	0.16	0.16	0.25
Air purity	0.35	0.24	0.23	0.17	0.13	0.22
Climate	0.09	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.07
Electricity support	0.22	0.14	0.13	0.08	0.06	0.13
Security level	0.39	0.23	0.18	0.13	0.08	0.20
Public transport	0.32	0.23	0.22	0.17	0.13	0.21
Work/job/main study	0.26	0.11	0.12	0.06	0.02	0.11

Table B. LLH: cut-off points for wealth quintiles in Ukraine

Wealth quintile	Deprivation index value	
	Highest	Lowest
Poorest	0.9344	0.8077
Second	0.8076	0.7655
Middle	0.7654	0.7211
Fourth	0.7211	0.6635
Richest	0.6635	0.0418

Table C. LLH: sample sizes by quintile in Ukraine

Group	Quintile					Total
	Poorest	Second	Middle	Fourth	Richest	
All	480	480	480	480	480	2400
Urban	312	311	295	269	292	1479
Rural	168	169	185	211	188	921
Female	338	306	302	284	239	1469
Male	142	174	178	196	241	931

References

- Aassve A, Mazzucco S, Mencarini L (2005). Childbearing and well-being: a comparative analysis of European welfare regimes. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 15(4):283–299.
- Betti G, Verma V (1999). Measuring the degree of poverty in a dynamic and comparative context: a multi-dimensional approach using fuzzy set theory. *Proceedings of the ICCS-VI. Lahore, Pakistan, August 27–31*, 11:289–301.
- Cerlioli A, Zani S (1990). A fuzzy approach to the measurement of poverty. In: Dagum C, Zenga M, eds. *Income and wealth distribution, inequality and poverty, studies in contemporary economics*. Berlin, Springer Verlag:272–284.
- Cheli B, Lemmi A (1995). A totally fuzzy and relative approach to the multidimensional analysis of poverty. *Economic Notes*, 24:115–134.
- EUROSTAT (2002). *Income, poverty and social exclusion: second report*. Luxembourg, European Social Statistics:76–92.
- Ferguson BD et al. (2003). Estimating permanent income using indicator variables. In: Murray CJL, Evans DB, eds. *Health systems performance assessment: debates, methods and empiricism*. Geneva, World Health Organization.
- Filmer D, Pritchett L (1998). *Estimating wealth effects without expenditure data – or tears: an application to educational enrolments in states of India*. Washington, DC, World Bank (World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, No. 1994).
- Gwatkin DR et al. (2007). *Socio-economic differences in health, nutrition, and population in [name of country]*. Washington, DC, World Bank.
- Institute for Advanced Studies (2004). Living Conditions, Lifestyle and Health [web site]. Vienna, Institute for Advanced Studies (<http://www.ihh.at>, accessed 17 January 2008).
- Miceli D (1998). *Measuring poverty using fuzzy sets*. Canberra, National Centre for Social and Economic Modelling, University of Canberra (Discussion Paper, No. 38).
- Montgomery MR et al. (1997). *Measuring living standards with DHS data: any reason to worry?* New York, Population Council.
- Pomerleau J, McKee M (in press). Hazardous alcohol drinking in the former Soviet Union: a cross-sectional study of eight countries. *Alcohol and Alcoholism*.
- Pomerleau J et al. (2003). *Comparative health report. Dimension: health conditions and health behaviours*. Vienna, Institute for Advanced Studies (Living Conditions, Lifestyles and Health Work Package, No. 26, Working Paper, No.10).
- (2005). Drinking in the Commonwealth of Independent States: evidence from eight countries. *Addiction*, 100:1647–1668.
- Qizilbash M (2002). A note on the measurement of poverty and vulnerability in the South African context. *Journal of International Development*, 14:757–772.
- Rehn N, Room R, Edwards G. (2001). *Alcohol in the European Region: consumption, harm and policies*. Copenhagen, WHO Regional Office for Europe.
- Rose G (1962). The diagnosis of ischaemic heart pain and intermittent claudication in field surveys. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 27:645–658.
- Rutstein S (1999). *Wealth versus expenditure: comparison between the DHS wealth index and household expenditures in four departments of Guatemala*. Calverton, Maryland, ORC Macro (unpublished).

- Wagstaff A et al. (1991). On the measurement of inequalities in health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 33:545–557.
- Whelan CT et al. (2001). Income, deprivation, and economic strain: an analysis of the European Community Household Panel. *European Sociological Review*, 17:357–372.
- WHO (1998). *Obesity: preventing and managing the global epidemic. Report of a WHO consultation on obesity*. Geneva, World Health Organization.
- 2000. *International guide for monitoring alcohol consumption and related harm*. Geneva, World Health Organization.
- WHO European Office for Investment for Health and Development (2008). Socioeconomic determinants of health [web site]. Copenhagen, WHO Regional Office for Europe (<http://www.euro.who.int/socialdeterminants/publications/publications>, accessed 17 January 2008).

The WHO Regional Office for Europe

The World Health Organization (WHO) is a specialized agency of the United Nations created in 1948 with the primary responsibility for international health matters and public health. The WHO Regional Office for Europe is one of six regional offices throughout the world, each with its own programme geared to the particular health conditions of the countries it serves.

Member States

Albania
Andorra
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belarus
Belgium
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Israel
Italy
Kazakhstan
Kyrgyzstan
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Monaco
Montenegro
Netherlands
Norway
Poland
Portugal
Republic of Moldova
Romania
Russian Federation
San Marino
Serbia
Slovakia
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Tajikistan
The former Yugoslav
Republic of Macedonia
Turkey
Turkmenistan
Ukraine
United Kingdom

World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe

Scherfigsvej 8
DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø
Denmark
Tel.: +45 39 17 17 17
Fax: +45 39 17 18 18
E-mail: postmaster@euro.who.int
Web site: www.euro.who.int

