

Title Page

Health perception among the elderly in India: A gender perspective

Saddaf Naaz Akhtar¹, Nandita Saikia²

Authors' Affiliations:

¹Centre for the Study of Regional Development, School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New

Delhi, India-110067

Email: sadafdpsjsr@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-0346-5220

²International Institute for Population Sciences, Mumbai, India-400088

Email: nanditasts@gmail.com

Corresponding author:

Saddaf Naaz Akhtar

Doctoral fellow

Centre for the Study of Regional Development, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India-110067

Email: sadafdpsjsr@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-0346-5220

Acknowledgement: None

Competing interest: None

Funding: None

Abstract

There is an urgent need to understand and study the gender-based comprehensive own-perception approaches about health status. Our primary interest is to elucidate and capture whether and what determinants of gender disparity exist in own-perception about current and change in health status in Indian settings among the elderly. Therefore, we intended to examine the gender disparity in own-perception and their differences among the elderly in India. We used cross-sectional data from the 75th National Sample Survey Organizations (NSSO), collected from July 2017 to June 2018. The analytical sample constitutes 42759 cases of the elderly (eliminating two points of transgender). Thus, 21902 older men and 20857 older women have been considered. Two different measurements of own-perception about health status among the elderly have been used. We have calculated absolute gaps in the prevalence of current self-perception and change in health status by background characteristics. We carried out an ordered logistic regression model (or proportional odds model) to determine the predictors of health perception among the elderly. There is a clear gap between men and women in terms of rating poor perception about health; men generally have reported higher perception about their current health status when it comes to rating them excellent in terms of socio-economic outcomes like income, place of residence, and household structure. Despite numerous limitations, this study addressed the significant public health concern, which is crucial to address the challenge of the elderly health and their perception of well-being.

Keywords: current health perception; change in health perception; gender gap; elderly.

Introduction

Aging is an unavoidable process in physiological terms. According to the World Health Organization (2020), the populations around the world are aging faster than in the past, and its demographic transition would have a significant impact on almost all aspects of society (WHO, 2020). Every country throughout the world is experiencing growth in both the proportion and size of the elderly in the population (WHO, 2021). The primary care of the elderly is mainly influenced by health services, health conditions, and socio-economic factors (Nair et al., 2021). Though, gender accentuates a pivotal role in aging with significant gaps and variations in the health conditions and the care received. Hence, the gender gap in the aging process is putting forward many health challenges and opportunities that need to be addressed. Indeed, aging healthy and successfully is an overall goal for the elderly people, policymakers, and other health professionals. Despite that, whether "healthy aging" and "successful aging" truly signify by gender among the elderly themselves is still found to be unclear. Therefore, this question can be explained by assessing self-rated health, which is the easiest way to reveal the current and change in the health status.

Own-perception about health status (OPHS) is one of the most frequent indicators used in social, clinical, and epidemiological research. It is a comprehensive measure of an individual's health status that can even reflect their condition without any clinical diagnosis (Kananen et al., 2021). Despite its non-explicit nature, it seems to be a robust predictor of future functional and physical health status, morbidity, and mortality that may differ by gender, age, place, health status, social class, culture, and countries (Idler & Benyamini, 1997; Jylhä, 2009). Various disease risks screening (My, 2006) and clinical trials (Fayers & Sprangers, 2002) have been performed using self-rated health as a tool in developed countries. Perception about health status is an individual's subjective concept which lies between the social & biological world with psychological experiences. Generally, the empirical research on perception about own health status arrived from the epidemiological tradition that particularly emphasized statistical associations of correlates instead of the process from which these correlations become known (Jylhä, 2009).

A large body of literature concerning OPHS has been suggested to explain its determinants and outcomes, which may reflect ill-health behavior (Garrity et al., 1978; Lee et al., 2012; Leinonen et al., 2001; Singh et al., 2013; Zimmer et al., 2000). Apart from this, OPHS also reflects psychosocial or lifestyle conditions (Harrington et al., 2010). A previous study conducted in Thailand has revealed that self-assessed health is a robust indicator of functional status, chronic diseases, and psychosocial symptoms among the elderly (Haseen et al., 2010). Another study has suggested that the elderly involved in activities of daily living limitations, worse chronic & mental health conditions, poorer self-reported memory have lower self-rated health in the United States and China (Xu et al., 2019). Despite that, previous research conducted in Taiwan has found psychological and physical propensities associations with poor SRH among the elderly (Lee et al., 2012). A longitudinal study revealed that the elderly's physical and functional activities had been the strong predictors in self-assessments of health in Finland (Leinonen et al., 2001).

While the general public health and well-being among the Indian population have been challenging, the health disparities between older men and women have not reduced significantly. However, few studies have been

conducted in India on own-perception about health status from a gender perspective (Bora & Saikia, 2015; Kumar & Pradhan, 2019; Singh et al., 2013). Earlier studies showed that gender impacts unhealthy and healthy lifestyles perceptions and gender gaps exist during health-related decision-making. Still, own-perception about health status by gender is unknown and difficult to understand because of the paucity of empirical research from both the aspects of theoretical and conceptual vagueness.

To our best knowledge, no research has been yet performed on current and changes together in health perception by gender in India among the elderly. Moreover, we already know that population aging is an emerging issue for India with significant socio-demographic, economic, and public health implications. It is an inescapable process that faces various health challenges. Older men and women present an attractive comparative setting to the medical practitioners, policymakers, and researchers to recognize the factors influencing the elderly's health perception to identify illness behavior (Garrity et al., 1978). At the same time, the comprehensive understanding of the elderly's health perception is poorly understood concerning gender.

There is an urgent need to understand and study the gender-based comprehensive self-perception approaches about health status. In the present study, our main interest is to elucidate and capture whether and how gender disparity exists in own-perception about current and change in health status in Indian settings among the elderly. The gender gap in health perception among the elderly is still largely unclear; however, no previous studies have attributed these gaps to the current and change in health perceptions among the elderly people in the Indian context. Therefore, the present study has intended to examine the gender disparity in own-perception and their change among the elderly in India.

Methods

Data source

The present study has used the data from the 25th schedule of the 75th round of the National Sample Survey Organizations (NSSO), collected from July 2017 to June 2018. The NSSO has been a public organization since 1950 under the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (MOSPI) of the Government of India. It is a nationally and state/Union Territory (UT) representative household, cross-sectional, population-based survey. This data is publicly published and can be accessible using <https://www.mospi.gov.in/web/mospi/download-tables-data/-/reports/view/templateTwo/16202?q=TBDCAT>

Analytical sample

The analytical sample constitutes 42759 cases of the elderly (eliminating two cases of transgender). Thus, 21902 older men and 20857 older women have been considered.

Outcome variables

The study has used two different measurements of own-perception about health status among the elderly. Thus, two outcome variables have been used.

- The first outcome variable is the trichotomous variable of own-perception about current health status. During the survey, the respondent asked the question to rate the individual's perception about the

current status of health using the scales. The scales were categorized into three. *Poor as '1', good/fair is taken as '2' and 'Excellent/very good is taken as '3'.*

- The second outcome variable is also a trichotomous variable of own perception about change in the state of health. The questionnaire has been asked the respondent to rate the individual's own perception change in the state of health using the scales. The scales were categorized into five, but we have converted them into three in the present study (See variable description in the Supplemental files). *Somewhat worse/worse as '1', nearly the same is taken as '2', and compared to the previous year: much better/somewhat better is taken as '3'.*

Independent variables

Literature suggests that there are several predictors of own-perception such as social, demographic, physical, cognitive, and mental factors that have been used in Indian settings and other countries as well (Bora & Saikia, 2015; Galenkamp et al., 2013; Kumar & Pradhan, 2019; Lee et al., 2012; Leinonen et al., 2001; Singh et al., 2013; Wagner & Short, 2014). Therefore, the independent variables were applied in the present study mainly emphasized on socio-demographic & economic background characteristics and health information of the elderly. These background characteristics comprise of age groups, regions, place of residence, education level, marital status, household members, wealth quintiles, social groups (caste groups), religion, owned house, health insurance support, living arrangements, economic dependency, any communicable diseases and any chronic diseases (See Supplemental files).

Statistical Analysis

We performed the univariate and bivariate analysis with suitable background characteristics. We have calculated absolute gaps in the prevalence of current own-perception and change in health status by background characteristics. The absolute gender gaps are in two folds defined as:

- $Absolute\ gaps_{current} = OPHS_{current}^{elderly\ females} - OPHS_{current}^{elderly\ males}$
- $Absolute\ gaps_{change} = OPHS_{change}^{elderly\ females} - OPHS_{change}^{elderly\ males}$

The study has then carried out an ordered logistic regression model (or proportional odds model) to determine the predictors of health perception among the elderly. The ordered logistic model is a regression model for an ordinal response variable (Grilli & Rampichini, 2014). Since the study has outcome variables with more than two categories and the values of each category have a sequential order and meet the criteria of proportional odds assumption. The study has used an ordered logistic regression model in terms of proportional odds ratios. The proportional odds ratios are estimated by exponentiating the ordered logit coefficients (UCLA: Statistical Consulting, 2021).

$$logit(y_{ij}) = \log \left[\frac{p_{ij}}{1 - p_{ij}} \right] = \alpha_i - \beta'x_j$$

where, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$

The parameter α_i is known as cut points (or threshold). They are in increasing orders here, are as follow:

1. poor < good < excellent
2. Worst < nearly same < better than before

Results

Sample profile

Table 1 shows the sample profile by gender with suitable socio-economic, demographic, and health characteristics among the elderly in India from the period (2017-18). There are 65% young-old women & 64% young-old and oldest woman (9%) are higher than most aged men (8%) while middle-old women (25%) are lower than middle-old men (27%). The majority of both older women & men belonged to the rural residence, Southern region, Hindu religion, most affluent group. About 63% of older women & 35% of older men have no education. Older women have marginally lower insurance coverage than men. There are 68% older women who are entirely economically dependent, whereas older men are only 27%. About 88% of older women & 86% of older men live with others other than their spouse. However, chronic diseases are higher among older women than men.

[Insert Table 1 here]

Gender gaps in own-perception about current health status

Table 2 shows absolute gender gaps (%) in own-perception about current health status among the elderly in India from 2017-18. About 4% absolute gender gaps (AGG) are observed in poor OPHS_{current} among both young-old and middle-old age groups, which are higher than the oldest-old age. AGG in poor OPHS_{current} is higher in rural (4.7%) than urban areas (3.4%). North-eastern regions (7.65) have the highest AGG in poor OPHS_{current}, whereas Southern regions have the lowest (3.4%). Marginally higher AGG in poor OPHS_{current} is seen among non-married than married and more than five-HH-members. No education (3.6%), Non-Hindu (8.6%), OBC (4.5%), SC/ST (4.3%), and Poorest (8.8%) have the highest AGG in poor OPHS_{current}. Despite that, uncovered insurance support (4.6%) has greater AGG in poor OPHS_{current} than covered insurance (2.6%). Higher AGG in poor OPHS_{current} is reflected among those who are not dependent economically (5.5%), live with others other than a spouse (4.4%), and owned-house (4%). However, lower AGG in poor OPHS_{current} is found among the elderly with communicable diseases (2.5%) but more significant among those with chronic diseases (5%).

Besides that, greater AGG in good OPHS_{current} is reflected among those with higher education (4.6%), Richest group (2.25%), and fully economically dependent (7.5%).

[Insert Table 2 here]

Gender gaps in own-perception about change in health status

Table 3 shows absolute gender gaps (%) in own-perception about change in health status among the elderly in India from 2017-18. Around 3.1% AGG in nearly-same OPHS_{change} are found among oldest-old which is greater

than the young-old (2%) & middle-old (1.6%). AGG in the nearly-same OPHS_{change} is lower among urban (1.3%) than rural (2.6%). Eastern regions (6%) have the highest AGG in nearly-same OPHS_{change}, followed by North-eastern region (4.6%), Southern region (2%) but lowest is seen in the Northern region (1.6%). Unmarried (5.2%), primary education (3.7%), middle-income group (5.5%), covered insurance (4.3%), economically independent (6.45%), living alone (14.5%) & owned house (2.1%) have higher AGG in nearly-same OPHS_{change}. Interestingly, Non-Hindus (1.7%) have marginally lower AGG in nearly-same OPHS_{change} than the Hindus (2.3%), but OBC (4.4%) has higher AGG in nearly-same OPHS_{change} than SC/ST (2.5%). Nearly 2.4% AGG in the nearly-same OPHS_{change} is seen among those with no communicable diseases.

However, young-old age has lower AGG (0.3%) in much-better-OPHS_{change} than middle-old age (1.3%). Urban areas have marginally higher AGG in much-better-OPHS_{change} than rural. Highest AGG in much-better-OPHS_{change} is found in the Northern region (3.15%), followed by the Eastern region (2.3%), Central region (2%), Western region (2%), and lowest in the Southern region (0.9%). Only 1% AGG in much-better-OPHS_{change} is seen among married, fully mobile, and uncovered insurance. Negligible AGG in much-better-OPHS_{change} is observed among those with no education (0.1%) but significantly higher among Higher education (11.3%). Non-Hindu religion (2.06%), General caste (3%), and Richer group (2.5%) have the highest AGG in much-better-OPHS_{change}. More than five HH-members are facing greater AGG in much-better-OPHS_{change}. Interestingly, significantly greater AGG in much-better-OPHS_{change} is observed among the elderly with communicable diseases (10%). Still, there is marginal AGG in much-better-OPHS_{change} reflected among those with chronic diseases.

[Insert Table 3 here]

Determinants of (OPHS_{current}) and (OPHS_{change})

Table 4 shows the result of ordered regression analysis of own-perception about the current (OPHS_{current}) & change (OPHS_{change}) in health status among the elderly in India with suitable background characteristics, 2017-18. **Model 1** in **Table 4** shows that odds of being rated good or excellent (versus poor) are found to be significantly higher among women [OR=1.27; CI=1.21, 1.34] than men. The middle-old [OR=0.5; CI=0.47, 0.52] and oldest-old [OR=0.27; CI=0.25, 0.29] have significantly lower odds of being rated good or excellent (versus poor) compared to young old. The elderly belonging to the Western [OR=1.67; CI=1.55, 1.8] and Southern [OR=1.3; CI=1.21, 1.39] regions had significantly greater odds of being rated good or excellent (versus poor) compared to Northern regions while the North-Eastern, Central and Eastern regions showed lower. The odds ratio of being rated good or excellent (versus poor) is also greater and significant for socio-economic factors like marital status, education, and income (only richer and richest group). The results indicate the greater preference odds of health perception among the household member more than five [OR=1.12; CI=1.07, 1.18] compared to household member ≤ 5 . Lower odds of being rated good or excellent (versus poor) were found among the elderly who receives regular wages, casual wages, and others compared to self-employed.

Despite that, we have also examined key risk predictors like economic independence, living arrangements, place of stay, chronic diseases, communicable diseases and health insurance, and family size. The elderly covered

with health insurance, partial and fully economically dependent, were at lower odds. In contrast, elderly living with others [OR=1.27; CI=1.08, 1.5] show greater odds of having a good or excellent perception of health than living alone. At the same time, it has been found that elderly who stay at their own house [OR=1.16; CI=1.08, 1.25] show higher odds of having a good or excellent perception of health than staying in others' houses. The odds of being rated good or excellent perception about health (versus poor) is found lower with any communicable disease conditions, as can be seen from the odds ratios [OR=0.78; CI=0.68, 0.89], and similar results is being found with any chronic diseases [OR=0.37; CI=0.35, 0.39] respectively.

However, **Model 2** in **Table 4** shows the results of ordered logistic regression for own perception about the change in health status. The model's outcome variable was categorized as (nearly-same or better than before (versus worse) with worse change as the reference category. The result shows a clear and significant association between change in health perception and socio-economic and other risk factors. Socio-economic factors like gender, residence, wealth quintile and household size have positive and significant associations. The odds of being rated nearly-same or better (versus worse) change in health perception were found to be higher among older women [OR=1.1; CI=1.05, 1.15] compared to older men. While the lower odds of a change in health perception were found among middle-old and oldest-old compared to young-old, similar results were found in OPHS_{current}. Now, compared to the rural residence, urban residence [OR=1.14; CI=1.09, 1.19] is showing higher odds of being rated same or better (versus worse) change in health perception. Southern, Western and Northeastern regions show greater while the eastern region showed lower odds of a change in health perception than the Northern region. The socio-economic factors like marital status, educational status, and income (only richer and richest group) reflect the higher odds of being rated the same or better (versus worse) change in health perception. The greater odds of being rated nearly-same or better (versus worse) change in health perception was found among the household member more than five [OR=1.04; CI=1, 1.09] than household member ≤ 5 . Lower odds of being rated nearly-same or better (versus worse) were found among the elderly who receive only casual wages and others than self-employed.

Notwithstanding, the insured elderly, partially and fully economically dependent elderly have lower odds of being rated same or better (versus worse) change in health perception, while the elderly who stays at their own house exhibited higher. Elderly with communicable diseases [OR=0.78; CI=0.69, 0.89], and chronic diseases [OR=0.48; CI=0.46, 0.5] showing lower odds of being rated same or better (versus worse) change in health perception.

[Insert Table 4 here]

Discussion

We have used India's large-scale national sample survey data, where we have examined not only the current health perception but also analyzed it to study the change in health perception among the elderly from a gender perspective. The perception about the health status of the reflects the health condition which is a significant predictor for active and healthy aging. Given the rapid growth of the elderly and increasing life longevity, quality of life at upper ages are the significant factors to be studied from a public health perspective. While

many factors determine the quality of life at older ages, one of the significant factors is the own perception of the elderly, which they want to perceive about their health (Bhan et al., 2017). Therefore, we attempted to examine the current health perception and the change in health perception among the elderly in India, owing to the notion that perception about health is one of the significant factors that shapes the better quality of life at later ages (Akhtar & Saikia, 2021; Ranjan & Muraleedharan, 2020; Smith et al., 2012).

Current health perception

Our results showed a clear and significant association between health perception and socio-economic outcomes. While there is a clear gap between men and women in terms of rating poor perception about health, men generally have reported higher perceptions about their current status of health when it comes to rating them excellent in terms of socio-economic outcomes like income, place of residence, and household structure or size. These results were similar to earlier findings where women generally report poor perceptions about their health stats (Welin et al., 2011). This signifies the importance of better socio-economic conditions from a gender perspective, where women with better socio-economic conditions likely indicate a lower perception of health (Rathbun et al., 2020).

An earlier study has suggested that health perception is affected by health behavior, and it is also attributed to illness, especially to the advanced aged because of the chronic disease, which is unavoidable support to an older age (Dohrmann, 2018). We have also examined the factors like morbidity in which both communicable diseases and chronic diseases showed lower odds of being rated good or excellent in health perception and our finding is also supported by the previous studies (Barreto & Figueiredo, 2009; Cramm & Nieboer, 2016; Diener & Chan, 2011; Dohrmann, 2018).

These factors determine the differences in gender perception of health status were similar to what we witnessed in socio-economic factors like income, residence, family size, and education, where a greater proportion of women reported poor health perception as compared to men (Krewski et al., 2006; Lemyre et al., 2006; Linder et al., 2010). These findings corroborate with earlier results in many other studies reflecting the asymmetry in gender dimension of health perception about their current health (Linder et al., 2010). Factors like economic dependency and health insurance are also key to health perception. The results from our study confirm this association. Similarly, results were found in terms of economic independence reflecting the fact that health perception is independent of whether being insured or financially independent by gender perspective (Ha & Kim, 2019).

Change in health perception

The results in the study were slightly contrasting to what we have obtained about the perception of the current status of health. Although there is a significant and clear association of change in current perception of health with various risk factors as found in the earlier studies (Machón et al., 2016). The perception of women's health has significantly similar in this case. The results are identical to what we witnessed in Model 1 (Table 4). The change in perception among women was found to be higher as compared to men both in terms of socio-economic and health outcomes (Forte et al., 2015). Our finding has also showed that the urban residence and

married elderly have higher odds of being rated nearly-same or better change in health perception and similar results have also been found in the previous studies (Ellis et al., 2021; Goldstein et al., 1984).

However, the factors like educational status of the elderly, income status, and household size also reported better perception about change in health perception after hospitalization (De-Nour & Shanan, 1966). Previous studies have clearly reflected that the perception that can vary once the change in health status is improved among the women (Warmoth et al., 2016; Watcharanat et al., 2019).

The current study provides a detailed analysis of health perception and its gender perspective among the elderly in India. At the same time, the results confirm that women report more likely poor health as compared to men given various socio-economic and health outcomes. A previous study (Husain & Ghosh, 2017) has suggested that there is slightly a better perception about health when we measure the change in current perception of health among women as compared to men. Despite some limitations, this study tried to make a significant account of not only perception about the current health status but also change in the perception of current health status among the elderly.

Limitations

The study could not include the various key factors while examining the health perception phenomena. Factors like body mass index, frailty, and other nutritional health outcomes could not be examined since the data was not available about them in the sample taken for consideration. Secondly, the study was mainly conducted on the elderly aged 50 and above, which might not be the case in terms of the younger population given their less vulnerability to health and socio-economic risks. Moreover, there is already a challenge of age-related discrimination and greater disability likelihood at upper ages, which might have significantly affected the results in this study.

Conclusions

Despite numerous limitations, this study addressed the significant public health concern, which is key to addressing the challenge of the elderly health and their perception of well-being. The elderly are more vulnerable to health and physical outcomes given the age-related life cycle changes, so the increased risk for active and healthy aging is likely a challenge given the low perception about current health status. Moreover, the challenges are multiple given the asymmetry from a gender perspective since women are more prone to these health outcomes, which likely risks their well-being. Therefore, this study identifies a significant gender gap in this domain since identifying the elderly health perception can be significant in terms of their healthcare services and caregiving approaches.

Reference:

Akhtar, S. N., & Saikia, N. (2021). Differentials and predictors of hospitalization among the elderly people in India: Evidence from 75th round of National Sample Survey (2017–18) [Preprint]. Public and Global Health. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.25.21262606>

- Barreto, S. M., & Figueiredo, R. C. de. (2009). Doença crônica, auto-avaliação de saúde e comportamento de risco: Diferença de gênero. *Revista de Saúde Pública*, 43(suppl 2), 38–47.
<https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-89102009000900006>
- Bhan, N., Madhira, P., Muralidharan, A., Kulkarni, B., Murthy, G., Basu, S., & Kinra, S. (2017). Health needs, access to healthcare, and perceptions of ageing in an urbanizing community in India: A qualitative study. *BMC Geriatrics*, 17(1), 156. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-017-0544-y>
- Bora, J. K., & Saikia, N. (2015). Gender Differentials in Self-Rated Health and Self-Reported Disability among Adults in India. *PLOS ONE*, 10(11), e0141953. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0141953>
- Cramm, J. M., & Nieboer, A. P. (2016). Is “disease management” the answer to our problems? No! Population health management and (disease) prevention require “management of overall well-being.” *BMC Health Services Research*, 16(1), 500. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-016-1765-z>
- De-Nour, A. K., & Shanan, J. (1966). Changes in Self Perception During Hospitalisation in an Open Ward of a General Hospital. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 14(2), 133–143.
https://www.jstor.org/stable/45112860?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Diener, E., & Chan, M. Y. (2011). Happy People Live Longer: Subjective Well-Being Contributes to Health and Longevity: HEALTH BENEFITS OF HAPPINESS. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 3(1), 1–43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2010.01045.x>
- Dohrmann, D. (2018). Health-Related Perception and Responsibility Behavior Among Individuals With and Without Chronic Illness [University of Nebraska Medical Center].
<https://digitalcommons.unmc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1313&context=etd>
- Ellis, L. A., Pomare, C., Gillespie, J. A., Root, J., Ansell, J., Holt, J., Wells, L., Tran, Y., Braithwaite, J., & Zurynski, Y. (2021). Changes in public perceptions and experiences of the Australian health care system: A decade of change. *Health Expectations*, 24(1), 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13154>
- Fayers, P. M., & Sprangers, M. A. (2002). Understanding self-rated health. *The Lancet*, 359(9302), 187–188.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(02\)07466-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(02)07466-4)
- Forte, R., Boreham, C., De Vito, G., & Pesce, C. (2015). Health and Quality of Life Perception in Older Adults: The Joint Role of Cognitive Efficiency and Functional Mobility. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 12(9), 11328–11344.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph120911328>

- Galenkamp, H., Deeg, D. J. H., Huisman, M., Hervonen, A., Braam, A. W., & Jylha, M. (2013). Is Self-Rated Health Still Sensitive for Changes in Disease and Functioning Among Nonagenarians? *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 68(5), 848–858. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbt066>
- Garrity, T. F., Somes, G. W., & Marx, M. B. (1978). Factors influencing self-assessment of health. *Social Science & Medicine. Part A: Medical Psychology & Medical Sociology*, 12, 77–81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-7123\(78\)90032-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-7123(78)90032-9)
- Goldstein, M. S., Siegel, J. M., & Boyer, R. (1984). Predicting changes in perceived health status. *American Journal of Public Health*, 74(6), 611–614. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.74.6.611>
- Grilli, L., & Rampichini, C. (2014). Ordered Logit Model. In A. C. Michalos (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research* (pp. 4510–4513). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_2023
- Ha, J., & Kim, J. (2019). Factors influencing perceived health status among elderly workers: Occupational stress, frailty, sleep quality, and motives for food choices. *Clinical Interventions in Aging*, Volume 14, 1493–1501. <https://doi.org/10.2147/CIA.S210205>
- Harrington, J., Perry, I. J., Lutomski, J., Fitzgerald, A. P., Shiely, F., McGee, H., Barry, M. M., Van Lente, E., Morgan, K., & Shelley, E. (2010). Living longer and feeling better: Healthy lifestyle, self-rated health, obesity and depression in Ireland. *The European Journal of Public Health*, 20(1), 91–95. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckp102>
- Husain, Z., & Ghosh, D. (2017). Analysis of Perceived Health Status Among Elderly in India: Gender and Positional Objectivity. In T. Samanta (Ed.), *Cross-Cultural and Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives in Social Gerontology* (pp. 177–202). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-1654-7_10
- Idler, E. L., & Benyamini, Y. (1997). Self-Rated Health and Mortality: A Review of Twenty-Seven Community Studies. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 38(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2955359>
- Jylhä, M. (2009). What is self-rated health and why does it predict mortality? Towards a unified conceptual model. *Social Science & Medicine*, 69(3), 307–316. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.05.013>
- Kananen, L., Enroth, L., Raitanen, J., Jylhävä, J., Bürkle, A., Moreno-Villanueva, M., Bernhardt, J., Toussaint, O., Grubeck-Loebenstien, B., Malavolta, M., Basso, A., Piacenza, F., Collino, S., Gonos, E. S., Sikora, E., Gradinaru, D., Jansen, E. H. J. M., Dollé, M. E. T., Salmon, M., ... Jylhä, M. (2021). Self-rated health in individuals with and without disease is associated with multiple biomarkers representing

- multiple biological domains. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), 6139. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-85668-7>
- Krewski, D., Lemyre, L., Turner, M. C., Lee, J. E. C., Dallaire, C., Bouchard, L., Brand, K., & Mercier, P. (2006). Public Perception of Population Health Risks in Canada: Health Hazards and Sources of Information. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment: An International Journal*, 12(4), 626–644. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10807030600561832>
- Kumar, S., & Pradhan, M. R. (2019). Self-rated health status and its correlates among the elderly in India. *Journal of Public Health*, 27(3), 291–299. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-018-0960-2>
- Lee, H.-L., Huang, H.-C., Lee, M.-D., Chen, J. H., & Lin, K.-C. (2012). Factors affecting trajectory patterns of self-rated health (SRH) in an older population—A community-based longitudinal study. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 54(3), e334–e341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2011.10.009>
- Leinonen, R., Heikkinen, E., & Jylhä, M. (2001). Predictors of decline in self-assessments of health among older people—A 5-year longitudinal study. *Social Science & Medicine*, 52(9), 1329–1341. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(00\)00249-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00249-5)
- Lemyre, L., Lee, J. E. C., Mercier, P., Bouchard, L., & Krewski, D. (2006). The structure of Canadians' health risk perceptions: Environmental, therapeutic and social health risks. *Health, Risk & Society*, 8(2), 185–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698570600677399>
- Linder, J., McLaren, L., Siou, G. L., Csizmadi, I., & Robson, P. J. (2010). The Epidemiology of Weight Perception: Perceived Versus Self-reported Actual Weight Status among Albertan Adults. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 101(1), 56–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03405563>
- Machón, M., Vergara, I., Dorronsoro, M., Vrotsou, K., & Larrañaga, I. (2016). Self-perceived health in functionally independent older people: Associated factors. *BMC Geriatrics*, 16(1), 66. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-016-0239-9>
- May, M. (2006). Cardiovascular disease risk assessment in older women: Can we improve on Framingham? *British Women's Heart and Health prospective cohort study. Heart*, 92(10), 1396–1401. <https://doi.org/10.1136/hrt.2005.085381>
- Nair, S., Sawant, N., Thippeswamy, H., & Desai, G. (2021). Gender Issues in the Care of Elderly: A Narrative Review. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*, 43(5_suppl), S48–S52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02537176211021530>

- Ranjan, A., & Muraleedharan, V. R. (2020). Equity and elderly health in India: Reflections from 75th round National Sample Survey, 2017–18, amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. *Globalization and Health*, 16(1), 93. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-020-00619-7>
- Rathbun, K. P., Loerzel, V., & Edwards, J. (2020). Personal Perception of Health in Urban Women of Low Socioeconomic Status: A Qualitative Study. *Journal of Primary Care & Community Health*, 11, 215013272092595. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2150132720925951>
- Singh, L., Arokiasamy, P., Singh, P. K., & Rai, R. K. (2013). Determinants of Gender Differences in Self-Rated Health Among Older Population: Evidence From India. *SAGE Open*, 3(2), 215824401348791. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244013487914>
- Smith, J. P., Majmudar, M. K., & National Research Council (U.S.) (Eds.). (2012). *Aging in Asia: Findings from new and emerging data initiatives*. National Academies Press.
- UCLA: Statistical Consulting. (2021). ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION. Institute for Digital Research & Education. <https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/stata/output/ordered-logistic-regression/>
- Wagner, D. C., & Short, J. L. (2014). Longitudinal Predictors of Self-Rated Health and Mortality in Older Adults. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 11, 130241. <https://doi.org/10.5888/pcd11.130241>
- Warmoth, K., Tarrant, M., Abraham, C., & Lang, I. A. (2016). Older adults' perceptions of ageing and their health and functioning: A systematic review of observational studies. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 21(5), 531–550. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2015.1096946>
- Watcharanat, P., Tanpichai, P., & Sajjasophon, R. (2019). The Relationship Between The Perception of Elderly's Health Status and Health Behaviors in Nakhon Nayok Province, Thailand. *The Open Public Health Journal*, 12(1), 420–423. <https://doi.org/10.2174/1874944501912010420>
- Welin, C., Wilhelmsen, L., Welin, L., Johansson, S., & Rosengren, A. (2011). Perceived Health in 50-Year-Old Women and Men and the Correlation With Risk Factors, Diseases, and Symptoms. *Gender Medicine*, 8(2), 139–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genm.2011.03.005>
- WHO. (2020). Decade of Healthy Ageing: Plan of Action. <https://www.who.int/initiatives/decade-of-healthy-ageing>
- WHO. (2021). Ageing and health: Fact sheets. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health>

Xu, D., Arling, G., & Wang, K. (2019). A cross-sectional study of self-rated health among older adults: A comparison of China and the United States. *BMJ Open*, 9(7), e027895.

<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027895>

Zimmer, Z., Natividad, J., Lin, H.-S., & Chayovan, N. (2000). A Cross-National Examination of the Determinants of Self-Assessed Health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 41(4), 465.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/2676298>

Table 1 Sample distribution of health perception among the elderly in India by gender with suitable background characteristics, 2017-18. (n=42,759).

Background	Men		Women	
	Samples	Percentage (%)	Samples	Percentage (%)
Age-groups				
Young old	14,094	64.35	13,674	65.56
Middle old	5,977	27.29	5,256	25.2
Oldest old	1,831	8.36	1,927	9.24
Place of residence				
Rural	12,108	55.28	11,489	55.08
Urban	9,794	44.72	9,368	44.92
Regions				
Northern	4,454	20.34	4,340	20.81
Nort-Eastern	2,169	9.9	1,820	8.73
Central	3,256	14.87	3,082	14.78
Eastern	3,672	16.77	3,314	15.89
Western	3,076	14.04	3,110	14.91
Southern	5,275	24.08	5,191	24.89
Marital status				
Never*	3,392	15.49	10,045	48.16
married	18,510	84.51	10,812	51.84
Education status				
No-education	7,746	35.37	13,123	62.92
primary	7,238	33.05	5,145	24.67
secondary	4,429	20.22	1,699	8.15
Higher	2,489	11.36	890	4.27
Religion				
Hindu	16,979	77.52	16,261	77.96
Non-hindu	4,923	22.48	4,596	22.04
Caste groups				
SC/ST	5,153	23.53	4,891	23.45
OBC	8,416	38.43	8,103	38.85
General	8,333	38.05	7,863	37.7
Wealth index				
Poorest	3,666	16.74	3,525	16.9
Poorer	3,622	16.54	3,525	16.9
Middle	4,153	18.96	3,975	19.06
Richer	4,960	22.65	4,673	22.4
Richest	5,501	25.12	5,159	24.74
HH-members				
<= 5	10,556	48.2	10,644	51.03
>5	11,346	51.8	10,213	48.97
HH Type				
Self employed	13,900	63.46	13,007	62.36
Regular wages	2,107	9.62	2,237	10.73
Casual workers	2,469	11.27	2,508	12.02
Others	3,426	15.64	3,105	14.89
Insurance status				
Uncovered	17,286	78.92	16,599	79.58
Covered	4,616	21.08	4,258	20.42
Economically				

independence				
Independent	10,598	48.39	1,812	8.69
Partial	5,328	24.33	4,801	23.02
Fully	5,976	27.29	14,244	68.29
Living arrangements				
Alone	208	0.95	633	3.03
Only with spouse	2,791	12.74	1,758	8.43
Others*	18,903	86.31	18,466	88.54
Place of stay				
Other's house	1,286	5.87	2,724	13.06
Owned house	20,616	94.13	18,133	86.94
Any communicable diseases				
No	21,401	97.71	20,388	97.75
Yes	501	2.29	469	2.25
Any chronic diseases				
No	16,817	76.78	15,846	75.97
Yes	5,085	23.22	5,011	24.03
Total	21,902	100	20,857	100

Source: Authors' own calculation using 75th round of National Sample Survey data.

Note: Never*: includes elderly who were never married or separated or divorced. Non-Hindu*: includes elderly who were belong to Muslims or Christians or Sikhs or Jains or Buddhists or others. Alone*: As an inmate of old age homes or not as an inmate of old age homes. Others*: without spouse but with children or other relations or non-relations. **Abbreviations:** SC- Schedule Caste; ST-Schedule Tribe; OBC- Other Backward Caste.

Table 2 Absolute gender gaps (%) in own-perception about current health status among the elderly in India by gender with suitable background characteristics, 2017-18 (n=42,759).

Background	Men			Women			Absolute gaps		
	Poor	Good	Excellent	Poor	Good	Excellent	Poor	Good	Excellent
Age-groups									
Young old	11.61	75.61	12.78	15.66	75.61	8.73	4.05	0	-4.05
Middle old	24.55	69.1	6.35	29.07	66.43	4.49	4.52	-2.67	-1.86
Oldest old	45.74	50.83	3.42	46.29	50.7	3.01	0.55	-0.13	-0.41
Place of residence									
Rural	19.02	71.68	9.3	23.74	69.87	6.39	4.72	-1.81	-2.91
Urban	14.3	72.97	12.72	17.71	73.62	8.67	3.41	0.65	-4.05
Regions									
Northern	14.48	74.3	11.22	19.22	74.67	6.11	4.74	0.37	-5.11
Nort-Eastern	19.88	70.42	9.7	27.56	63.05	9.39	7.68	-7.37	-0.31
Central	16.56	74.66	8.78	20.44	73.42	6.14	3.88	-1.24	-2.64
Eastern	24.74	67.78	7.48	31.48	64.97	3.55	6.74	-2.81	-3.93
Western	13.15	71.3	15.55	16.92	70.55	12.54	3.77	-0.75	-3.01
Southern	16.37	73.15	10.48	19.76	73.08	7.16	3.39	-0.07	-3.32
Marital status									
Never+sep/div	24.78	67.16	8.06	26.26	67.86	5.88	1.48	0.7	-2.18
Married	16.01	73.1	10.89	16.62	74.79	8.59	0.61	1.69	-2.3
Education status									
No-education	19.61	72.32	8.07	23.24	70.58	6.18	3.63	-1.74	-1.89
Primary	19.13	71.55	9.32	20.86	71.29	7.85	1.73	-0.26	-1.47
Secondary	13.54	72.11	14.35	14.13	73	12.87	0.59	0.89	-1.48
Higher	9.67	72.93	17.4	11.3	77.5	11.2	1.63	4.57	-6.2
Religion									
Hindu	17.59	71.9	10.51	20.98	71.9	7.12	3.39	0	-3.39
Non-hindu	16.96	73.11	9.93	25.58	67.13	7.29	8.62	-5.98	-2.64
Caste groups									
SC/ST	18.12	73.36	8.52	22.54	71.33	6.13	4.42	-2.03	-2.39
OBC	16.49	73.37	10.15	21.02	71.51	7.46	4.53	-1.86	-2.69
General	18.23	69.76	12.01	22.11	70.43	7.46	3.88	0.67	-4.55
Wealth index									
Poorest	19.04	71.89	9.07	25.92	68.18	5.9	6.88	-3.71	-3.17
Poorer	17.14	73.12	9.74	21.17	72.46	6.38	4.03	-0.66	-3.36
Middle	18.26	71.98	9.75	20.84	69.88	9.28	2.58	-2.1	-0.47

Richer	18.51	71.6	9.89	21.81	71.19	7	3.3	-0.41	-2.89
Richest	14.4	71.95	13.65	18.44	74.2	7.36	4.04	2.25	-6.29
Household members									
<= 5	16.92	73.14	9.94	21.04	72.04	6.92	4.12	-1.1	-3.02
>5	18.24	70.71	11.05	22.78	69.73	7.5	4.54	-0.98	-3.55
HH Type									
Self employed	15.93	72.57	11.5	20.83	71.11	8.06	4.9	-1.46	-3.44
Regular wages	17.86	74.77	7.37	22.55	72.83	4.62	4.69	-1.94	-2.75
Casual workers	20.42	69.88	9.7	24.43	69.67	5.91	4.01	-0.21	-3.79
Others	20.02	71.18	8.81	21.6	71.76	6.64	1.58	0.58	-2.17
Insurance status									
Uncovered	17.03	71.86	11.11	21.66	70.87	7.48	4.63	-0.99	-3.63
Covered	19.43	73.12	7.45	22.09	72.19	5.72	2.66	-0.93	-1.73
Economically independence									
Independent	9.25	76.42	14.33	14.75	71.33	13.92	5.5	-5.09	-0.41
Partial	17.1	73.79	9.12	16.49	75.23	8.28	-0.61	1.44	-0.84
Fully	33.91	62.17	3.92	24.57	69.67	5.75	-9.34	7.5	1.83
Living arrangements									
Alone	27.51	67.94	4.56	25.22	67.06	7.72	-2.29	-0.88	3.16
Only with spouse	15.69	75	9.31	17.01	74.99	8	1.32	-0.01	-1.31
Others*	17.68	71.54	10.78	22.05	70.95	7	4.37	-0.59	-3.78
Place of stay									
Other's house	28.48	65.99	5.53	28.12	67.38	4.5	-0.36	1.39	-1.03
Owned house	16.8	72.48	10.72	20.79	71.66	7.54	3.99	-0.82	-3.18
Any communicable diseases									
No	17.38	72.15	10.47	21.66	71.13	7.21	4.28	-1.02	-3.26
Yes	24.36	68.74	6.9	26.89	69.96	3.14	2.53	1.22	-3.76
Any chronic diseases									
No	13.42	74.4	12.17	17.36	74.21	8.43	3.94	-0.19	-3.74
Yes	31.71	64.03	4.26	36.7	60.53	2.77	4.99	-3.5	-1.49

Source: Authors' own calculation using 75th round of National Sample Survey data.

Note: Never*: includes elderly who were never married or separated or divorced. Non-Hindu*: includes elderly who were belong to Muslims or Christians or Sikhs or Jains or Buddhists or others. Alone*: As an inmate of old age homes or not as an inmate of old age homes. Others*: without spouse but with children or other relations or non-relations. **Abbreviations:** SC- Schedule Caste; ST-Schedule Tribe; OBC- Other Backward Caste.

Table 3 Absolute gender gaps (%) in own-perception about change in health status among the elderly in India by gender with suitable background characteristics, 2017-18. (n=42,759).

Background	Men			Women			Absolute gaps		
	Worse	Nearly same	Better than before	Worse	Nearly same	Better than before	Worse	Nearly same	Better than before
Age-groups									
Young old	15.05	65.05	19.9	17.31	63.08	19.61	-2.26	1.97	0.29
Middle old	24.91	57.79	17.3	27.82	56.18	16	-2.91	1.61	1.3
Oldest old	42.05	44.77	13.19	44.98	41.66	13.37	-2.93	3.11	-0.18
Place of residence									
Rural	21.27	61.11	17.62	24.38	58.45	17.17	-3.11	2.66	0.45
Urban	16.13	62.83	21.04	18.37	61.52	20.12	-2.24	1.31	0.92
Regions									
Northern	16.63	67.13	16.24	21.44	65.47	13.09	-4.81	1.66	3.15
Nort-Eastern	19.8	61.69	18.51	23.36	57.1	19.54	-3.56	4.59	-1.03
Central	22.01	60.87	17.12	23.96	60.95	15.09	-1.95	-0.08	2.03
Eastern	23.65	65	11.35	27.26	59.06	13.68	-3.61	5.94	-2.33
Western	17.82	58.27	23.91	19.83	58.28	21.88	-2.01	-0.01	2.03
Southern	17.11	58.54	24.35	19.98	56.57	23.45	-2.87	1.97	0.9
Marital status									
Never*	24.01	61.52	14.47	25.89	56.31	17.81	-1.88	5.21	-3.34
Married	18.7	61.7	19.6	18.43	63.04	18.53	0.27	-1.34	1.07
Education status									
No-education	21.92	61.2	16.89	24.29	58.96	16.75	-2.37	2.24	0.14
Primary	20.43	61.87	17.7	19.98	58.16	21.86	0.45	3.71	-4.16
Secondary	16.54	60.05	23.41	15.47	60.37	24.16	1.07	-0.32	-0.75
Higher	12.12	65.77	22.12	11.93	77.27	10.81	0.19	-11.5	11.31
Religion									
Hindu	19.39	61.75	18.86	21.98	59.46	18.56	-2.59	2.29	0.3
Non-hindu	20.63	61.26	18.12	24.45	59.5	16.06	-3.82	1.76	2.06

Caste groups									
SC/ST	19.11	64.5	16.39	22.33	61.95	15.72	-3.22	2.55	0.67
OBC	19.27	61.12	19.62	22.41	56.74	20.85	-3.14	4.38	-1.23
General	20.31	60.41	19.28	22.4	61.26	16.34	-2.09	-0.85	2.94
Wealth index									
Poorest	20.82	61.49	17.69	23.55	60.46	15.99	-2.73	1.03	1.7
Poorer	19.85	63.27	16.88	24.3	58.97	16.73	-4.45	4.3	0.15
Middle	20.15	61.19	18.66	23.45	55.69	20.86	-3.3	5.5	-2.2
Richer	20.94	58.83	20.24	22.43	59.83	17.74	-1.49	-1	2.5
Richest	16.2	63.6	20.21	18.12	62.18	19.7	-1.92	1.42	0.51
Household members									
<= 5	18.56	62.41	19.03	22.35	58.47	19.18	-3.79	3.94	-0.15
>5	20.98	60.68	18.34	22.45	60.94	16.61	-1.47	-0.26	1.73
HH Type									
Self employed®	18.04	62.54	19.42	22.34	59.53	18.13	4.3	-3.01	-1.29
Regular wages	21.06	61.31	17.63	23.58	56.13	20.29	2.52	-5.18	2.66
Casual workers	22.9	59.31	17.79	23.61	59	17.39	0.71	-0.31	-0.4
Others	21.22	61.01	17.77	20.66	61.47	17.87	-0.56	0.46	0.1
Insurance status									
Uncovered	19.4	61.36	19.24	22.04	59.63	18.33	-2.64	1.73	0.91
Covered	20.42	63	16.57	23.91	58.74	17.35	-3.49	4.26	-0.78
Economically independence									
Independent	13.41	66.15	20.43	15.66	59.7	24.65	-2.25	6.45	-4.22
Partial	19.04	60.46	20.5	20.05	57.08	22.86	-1.01	3.38	-2.36
Fully	32.15	53.99	13.86	24.19	60.25	15.56	7.96	-6.26	-1.7
Living arrangements									
Alone	19.72	67.18	13.09	23.03	52.64	24.33	-3.31	14.54	-11.24
Only with spouse	18.41	62.1	19.49	20.44	61.05	18.51	-2.03	1.05	0.98
Others*	19.86	61.46	18.68	22.58	59.81	17.61	-2.72	1.65	1.07
Place of stay									
Other's house	29.17	57.22	13.62	31.22	57.14	11.64	-2.05	0.08	1.98
Owned house	19	61.95	19.05	21.08	59.81	19.11	-2.08	2.14	-0.06
Any communicable diseases									
No	19.45	61.91	18.64	22.29	59.51	18.2	-2.84	2.4	0.44
Yes	28.79	46.62	24.58	28.48	56.55	14.96	0.31	-9.93	9.62
Any chronic									

diseases

No	16.26	63.58	20.16	18.8	61.55	19.65	-2.54	2.03	0.51
Yes	31.28	54.99	13.73	34.63	52.35	13.01	-3.35	2.64	0.72

Source: Authors' own calculation using 75th round of National Sample Survey data.

Note: Never*: includes elderly who were never married or separated or divorced. Non-Hindu*: includes elderly who were belong to Muslims or Christians or Sikhs or Jains or Buddhists or others. Alone*: As an inmate of old age homes or not as an inmate of old age homes. Others*: without spouse but with children or other relations or non-relations. **Abbreviations:** SC- Schedule Caste; ST-Schedule Tribe; OBC- Other Backward Caste.

Table 4 Ordered regression analysis of own-perception about current & change in health status among the elderly in India with suitable background characteristics, 2017-18. (n=42,759).

Background Characteristics	Own perception about current	Own perception about change in
	health status	health status
	<i>Proportional Odds Ratio [C.I.]</i>	<i>Proportional Odds Ratio [C.I.]</i>
	Model 1	Model 2
Gender		
Men®		
Women	1.27††† [1.21,1.34]	1.1††† [1.05,1.15]
Age-groups		
Young old®		
Middle old	0.5††† [0.47,0.52]	0.67††† [0.65,0.71]
Oldest old	0.27††† [0.25,0.29]	0.43††† [0.4,0.46]
Place of residence		
Rural®		
Urban	1.04[0.99,1.09]	1.14††† [1.09,1.19]
Regions		
Northern®		
North-Eastern	0.86††† [0.79,0.94]	1.12††† [1.03,1.2]
Central	0.93†[0.86,1]	0.99[0.93,1.06]
Eastern	0.69††† [0.64,0.74]	0.89††† [0.83,0.95]
Western	1.67††† [1.55,1.8]	1.39††† [1.3,1.48]
Southern	1.3††† [1.21,1.39]	1.52††† [1.43,1.61]
Marital status		
Never+sep/div®		
Married	1.2††† [1.13,1.26]	1.08††† [1.02,1.13]
Education status		
No-education®		
Primary	1.21††† [1.15,1.28]	1.08††† [1.03,1.13]
Secondary	1.47††† [1.36,1.58]	1.23††† [1.15,1.31]
Higher	1.58††† [1.43,1.74]	1.3††† [1.2,1.42]
Religion		
Hindu®		
Non-hindu	0.92††† [0.87,0.97]	0.93††† [0.88,0.97]
Caste groups		
SC/ST®		
OBC	1.04[0.98,1.1]	0.99[0.94,1.04]
General	0.92††† [0.87,0.98]	0.97[0.92,1.02]
Wealth index		

Poorest [Ⓢ]		
Poorer	1.06[0.99,1.14]	1.03[0.96,1.1]
Middle	1.04[0.97,1.12]	1.01[0.95,1.08]
Richer	1.1†† [1.02,1.18]	1.07†† [1,1.14]
Richest	1.23††† [1.13,1.34]	1.16††† [1.07,1.25]
Household members		
Less than or equal 5 [Ⓢ]		
More than 5	1.12††† [1.07,1.18]	1.04† [1,1.09]
HH Type		
Self employed [Ⓢ]		
Regular wages	0.92†† [0.86,0.99]	0.99[0.93,1.06]
Casual workers	0.8††† [0.75,0.86]	0.91††† [0.86,0.97]
Others	0.81††† [0.75,0.87]	0.89††† [0.83,0.95]
Insurance status		
uncovered [Ⓢ]		
covered	0.95† [0.9,1]	0.91††† [0.87,0.95]
Economically independence		
Independent [Ⓢ]		
Partial	0.57††† [0.53,0.6]	0.89††† [0.84,0.94]
Fully	0.34††† [0.32,0.36]	0.63††† [0.6,0.67]
Living arrangements		
Alone [Ⓢ]		
Only with spouse	1.02[0.86,1.21]	0.96[0.82,1.12]
Others*	1.27††† [1.08,1.5]	1.06[0.91,1.22]
Place of stay		
Other's house [Ⓢ]		
Owned house	1.16††† [1.08,1.25]	1.21††† [1.13,1.3]
Any communicable diseases		
No [Ⓢ]		
Yes	0.78††† [0.68,0.89]	0.78††† [0.69,0.89]
Any chronic diseases		
No [Ⓢ]		
Yes	0.37††† [0.35,0.39]	0.48††† [0.46,0.5]
Cut1	-1.75[-1.95, -1.55]	-1.22[-1.4, -1.04]
Cut2	2.39[2.19,2.59]	1.55[1.37,1.73]

Source: Authors' own calculation using 75th round of National Sample Survey data.

Note: Never*: includes elderly who were never married or separated or divorced. Non-Hindu*: includes elderly who were belong to Muslims or Christians or Sikhs or Jains or Buddhists or others. Alone*: As an inmate of old age homes or not as an inmate of old age homes. Others*: without spouse but with children or other relations or

non-relations. Own-perception about current health status is the dependent variable and poor perception is taken as a reference category for model 1; Own-perception about change in health status is another dependent variable and worse change in perception is taken as a reference category for model 2; 95% confidence interval in the parentheses; Significant level at: ††† significant at 1 percent and †† significant at 5 percent; ® is the reference category of the independent variables. Cut1 is estimated cut point on the latent variable used to differentiate poor health perception from good health perception and excellent health perception when values of the predictor variables are evaluated at zero. Cut2 is the estimated cut point on the latent variable used to differentiate poor and good health perception from excellent health perception when values of the predictor variables are evaluated at zero. Similarly, cut1 & cut2 are estimated on the latent variable with respect to the level of change in the health perception, i.e., worst, nearly same and better than before. **Abbreviations:** SC- Schedule Caste; ST- Schedule Tribe; OBC- Other Backward Caste.