

1 The family as a health producer: household composition
2 and health behaviours in a Southern Europe population

3

4 **Authors:** Ricardo Alves 1, Judite Gonçalves 1 2 3, Julian Perelman 1

5 1 NOVA National School of Public Health, Public Health Research Centre,
6 Comprehensive Health Research Center, NOVA University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal

7 2 School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, UK

8 3 NOVA School of Business and Economics, NOVA University Lisbon, Carcavelos,
9 Portugal

10

11 **Corresponding author**

12 Ricardo Alves

13 Email: r.alves@ensp.unl.pt

14 **Address:**

15 Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública da Universidade Nova de Lisboa

16 Avenida Padre Cruz

17 1600-560 Lisboa

18 Portugal

19 **ORCID:** 0000-0002-0437-2827

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 The family as a health producer: household composition and
27 health behaviours in a Southern Europe population

28

29 **Abstract**

30 Objectives

31 In the context of rapid transformations in family structures, understanding how
32 household composition can affect adults' health behaviours is crucial, particularly when
33 considering the potential role of such close social relationships in shaping those
34 behaviours. This paper documents how household structure relates to individual health
35 behaviours.

36 Study design

37 We pooled cross-sectional data from the Portuguese National Health Interview Surveys
38 of 2014 and 2019, covering 26,000+ households.

39 Methods

40 Linear and logistic regression models were used to assess the association between
41 different household compositions (single dwelling adults, single parents, couples with
42 or without children) and adherence to the Mediterranean diet, frequency of physical
43 activity, likelihood of risky alcohol consumption, and smoking, distinguishing between
44 men and women.

45 Results

46 People living alone and single parents were significantly less likely to adhere to the
47 Mediterranean diet than individuals living in couple. Single dwellers had significantly
48 higher likelihood of engaging in risky alcohol consumption or being smokers than
49 individuals living in couple and/or with children. Analyses by gender revealed that
50 women in couples with children were less likely to practice physical activity than
51 women in couples without children; this difference was not observed among men.

52 Conclusions

53 Overall, family contexts strongly correlate with individual health behaviours, with
54 people living alone or in single-parent households appearing at higher risk of having
55 less healthy diets, risky alcohol consumption, and smoking. This study identifies key
56 target groups for policies aiming to improve population health (behaviours) including,
57 critically, single dwellers and single parent households.

58

59 **Keywords:** Health behaviours, household composition, Grossman model

60

61 **Word count:** 3581

62 **Number of tables:** 3

63 **Number of Figures:** 3

64 **Running head:** The family as a health producer: household and health behaviours

65

66 **Key messages:**

67 **What is already known on this topic:** Social relationships, particularly within
68 the family, play a significant role in shaping individuals' health behaviors. With
69 rapid changes in family structures, understanding how household composition
70 influences adult behaviors is crucial.

71 **What this study adds:** This study reveals that single dwellers generally exhibit
72 unhealthier behaviors, except in the case of physical activity. Additionally, it
73 highlights that having children tends to promote healthier lifestyles among
74 couples.

75 **How this study might affect research, practice, or policy:** The findings
76 underscore the importance of considering household composition in health
77 interventions and policy development. Specifically, attention may need to be
78 directed towards individuals living alone and single-parent households to
79 address potential health disparities and promote healthier behaviors.

80

81 **Declarations**

82

83 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

84 This survey used in this study is part of the EHIS (European Health Interview Survey)
85 project, which regular collection is provided for in the regulations on public health
86 statistics and health and safety at work by the European Commission (Regulation (EC)
87 No. 1338/2008) (1). Comprehensive information about the guidelines, questionnaire,
88 anonymization rules, ethics approval and consent procedures for participation can be
89 found in the European Health Interview Survey section of the Eurostat website:
90 <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/microdata/european-health-interview-survey>.

91 Consent to participate was obtained from all the participants in the study. This survey

92 followed ethical standards, approved by the appropriate ethics committee, and
93 complied with the Declaration of Helsinki. Patients and the public were not and will not
94 be involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of the
95 research.

96

97 **Consent for publication**

98 Not applicable

99

100 **Availability of data and materials**

101 The data that support the findings of this study are available from Portuguese National
102 Institute for Statistics, but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were
103 used under license for the current study, and so are not publicly available. Data are
104 however available from the authors upon reasonable request and with permission of
105 Portuguese National Institute for Statistics.

106

107 **Competing interests**

108 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

109

110 **Funding**

111 This work was supported by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology—
112 FCT (2021/06359/BD).

113

114 **Authors' contributions**

115 RA, JG and JP contributed to the conception, design and interpretation of the work; RA
116 also contributed to the analysis of the data. All authors read and approved the final
117 manuscript.

118

119 **Acknowledgements**

120 Not applicable

121

122 The family as a health producer: household composition and
123 health behaviours in a Southern Europe population

124

125 **Background**

126 Poor diets, low physical activity, smoking, and alcohol consumption are risk factors that
127 represent massive and growing contributions to the global burden of disease (2).
128 Individual health is strongly determined by such behaviours, which in turn relate to
129 close contextual factors, such as living conditions, social environment, and family
130 structures, which have been rapidly changing. For example, in the last decade, single
131 adult households in Europe increased in proportion of all households by 29.6%, and the
132 average number of people per household has dropped by about 0.4 members (3). These
133 changes may affect the relationships and dynamics within households, hence affecting
134 behaviours and lifestyles, including those related to health. This study documents the
135 relationship between household composition and a comprehensive array of health
136 behaviours.

137 The Grossman model of demand for health has often been used to understand
138 individuals' health-related behaviours (4). The model posits that individual demand for
139 medical services, or time and effort invested in healthy behaviours, result from the
140 demand for “good health”, taking into account the trade-off between present costs and
141 future utility. One limitation of the Grossman model, identified by Jacobson (2000), is
142 that it is based on the individual as the sole producer of health, neglecting the influence
143 of other family members (5). Jacobson's proposal of the “family as health producer”
144 model postulates that other family members' actions and behaviours, as well as living
145 arrangements and other household characteristics, influence the individual's stock of
146 health, health preferences, and behaviours.

147 Empirical findings mostly support that premise. Regarding diet, home-cooked and
148 family meals tend to include more fruits and vegetables and be healthier (6,7).
149 However, single-headed families may face obstacles to having regular family meals and
150 spending time on food preparation at home (8–10), due to higher opportunity costs of
151 working fewer hours with a single breadwinner, and lack of economies of scale in meal
152 preparation costs (conceptual framework in Figure 1). Nevertheless, when there are
153 children, these hurdles may be balanced by considerations regarding the positive
154 externalities of healthier meals for the children. This externality argument equally
155 applies to double-headed households, which additionally benefit from economies of
156 scale and lower opportunity costs of meal preparation arising from task sharing at home
157 and as breadwinners. From an empirical perspective, some studies also found that diet
158 patterns from single or double-headed households do not significantly vary in diet
159 quality (9,11). People living alone have no economies of scale, on the one hand, but on
160 the other hand, may face lower opportunity costs since they do not have to devote time
161 to childcare.

162 Family composition also plays a role in tobacco use, exercise, and risky alcohol
163 consumption. A large meta-analysis showed the positive role of family support on
164 exercise behaviour (12). However, adults with young children may exercise less due to
165 lack of time caused by parental responsibilities (i.e., opportunity costs), especially when
166 they are single parents (13). A large body of evidence indicates that adolescents are
167 more likely to smoke when their parents also smoke, regardless of socioeconomic
168 position (14,15). Moreover, the strongest predictors of alcohol use among adolescents
169 are their perceptions of their parents' drinking habits and fathers' actual drinking (16).
170 Childless adults may be less likely to adopt healthy behaviours due the absence of
171 positive externalities (i.e., less worried about being a bad influence). Inversely, adults
172 with children and, to lesser extent, childless couples, could be more prone to adopt
173 healthy behaviours because of altruism, i.e., they account for the wellbeing benefits of
174 them not smoking/drinking for their children and/or spouse.

175 Considering that each individual plays a role in the production not only of their own
176 health, but also the health of family members, through their behaviours, our objective is
177 to investigate the association between family structure and individual health behaviours
178 (diet, exercise, alcohol consumption, and smoking). Given the ongoing changes in
179 modern families' structure, daily routines, and division of labour within the family
180 (3,9,17), our contribution is furthered, as we provide up-to-date findings for a
181 comprehensive range of health behaviours. Such information is relevant to inform the
182 need and targeting of policies and interventions aiming to promote healthier behaviours
183 and improve population health, from school or workplace programs to wider welfare
184 policies.

185 Portugal is a relevant case study for both its unique features, on the one side, and its
186 similarities to other (European) countries, on the other. Average household size and

187 structure closely resembles the European average (3). Like many other European
188 countries, Portugal is witnessing a rise in single-person households, and a decrease in
189 the average number of individuals per household (3). Yet, conversely to the broader
190 European context, but perhaps similarly to other Mediterranean countries, Portugal's
191 socio-cultural background entails specific gender roles in both work and family life
192 (18,19). Despite high levels of labour market participation by both men and women, a
193 traditional "division" of domestic and caregiving responsibilities persists, with the
194 burden falling mostly on women. Our analyses by gender shed light on the relationship
195 between such couple dynamics and health behaviours.

196

197

198 **Methods**

199 *Study design and population*

200 This is an observational study. We pooled cross-sectional data from the Portuguese
201 National Health Interview Surveys of 2014 and 2019. Both surveys are based on
202 representative samples of the non-institutionalized adult population living in Portugal
203 (1,20). The surveys followed a regional and multistage stratified sampling scheme. The
204 primary units (areas) were systematically selected in proportionality to the number of
205 households in the region, and the secondary units (households) were based on random
206 sampling within primary units. The data were collected by the National Institute for
207 Statistics and are available on demand. This survey followed ethical standards,
208 approved by the appropriate ethics committee, and complied with the Declaration of
209 Helsinki. Patients and the public were not and will not be involved in the design, or
210 conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of the research.

211 Data from the 2014 survey were collected between September and December 2014 and
212 data from the 2019 survey between September 2019 and January 2020 (i.e., pre-
213 COVID-19), through CAPI/CAWI, with one selected resident from each household. A
214 total of 18,204 individuals were interviewed in 2014, and 14,617 different individuals in
215 2019 (i.e., repeated cross-sections). Similar questions and survey methodology allowed
216 us to pool data from the two surveys.

217 Of the 32,821 individuals, we included only 26,464 between the ages of 25 and 79. At
218 older ages, more people are institutionalized, and the sample loses representativeness.
219 Moreover, older individuals tend to have less agency with regards to health behaviours,
220 due to cognitive or health reasons. Additionally, in the Survey, the classification of
221 households into households with or without children adopts a cut-off age of 25 years to
222 define children. For this reason, we excluded individuals younger than 25.

223 *Outcomes*

224 Adherence to the Mediterranean Diet (MD) was assessed using an adapted version of
225 the KIDMED index (21,22). Our adapted index considered 13 different diet-related
226 questions. Survey participants were asked if they had eaten the following types of foods
227 in the previous day: legumes, fish, fruit, fresh fruit juice, vegetables, vegetable-based
228 soup, bread, potatoes, pasta or rice, and dairy products (nine common foods in the MD),
229 sweets, sugar-sweetened beverages, fast food, and meat (not representative of the MD).
230 Foods characteristic to the MD were scored +1, while the four less healthy types of food
231 were scored -1. Compared to the original KIDMED index, our modified version
232 excluded 3 types of food: olive oil, pulses, and baked goods or pastries, because this
233 information is not available in the Survey. As a result, the values in our adjusted index
234 span from strong adherence (>6), moderate adherence (3-5), to weak adherence (<2),
235 departing from the initial three-tier scale: strong adherence (>8), moderate adherence
236 (4-7), and weak adherence (<3).

237 The frequency of physical activity was measured by the average number of days per
238 week that participants engaged in exercise, including sports and leisure activities.

239 Risky alcohol consumption and smoking were coded as dichotomous variables. Alcohol
240 consumption was considered risky if the participant reported risky alcohol consumption
241 occasions (≥ 6 drinks in one episode, 10 grams of alcohol each) at least 2 - 3 days per
242 month over the last 12 months. Available evidence suggests that frequent episodes of
243 binge drinking may lead to accelerated alcohol metabolism and disruption of
244 antioxidant mechanisms, leading to adverse health outcomes beyond the period of
245 intoxication (23). Finally, participants who reported smoking daily were coded as being
246 smokers.

247 *Key explanatory variable and covariates*

248 The explanatory variable of interest was household composition (five different groups):
249 people living alone (reference category), couples without children under 25 years old,
250 couples with children under 25, single parents with children under 25, and other
251 household compositions (i.e., two, non-couple, or more adults —e.g., adult with elderly
252 parents).

253 Gender, age (25-39, 40-64, and 65-79), survey year (2014 and 2019), income quintiles,
254 education (no education, primary, secondary, and tertiary education), employment status
255 (employed, unemployed, and not in labour force —retirees, students, persons with a
256 disability, and homemakers), and region (North, Centre, Lisbon Metropolitan Area,
257 Alentejo, Algarve, Madeira, and the Azores) were included as covariates. The National
258 Institute for Statistics provides only income quintiles and not income data, for
259 confidentiality reasons.

260 *Statistical Analysis*

261 Linear regression models were used to evaluate the association between different
262 household compositions and adherence to the MD and frequency of physical activity.
263 Risky alcohol consumption and smoking habits were analysed using logistic
264 regressions. All regression models controlled for the covariates listed in the previous
265 section. For ease of interpretation, results are presented in the form of adjusted means
266 and probabilities, calculated for each type of household. Confidence intervals were
267 computed based on standard errors adjusted for heteroskedasticity.

268 All analyses were also stratified by gender, taking into account previous findings from
269 the health behaviours literature, all well as potential differences in household roles and
270 responsibilities between men and women (9,24,25).

271 To check that results were not influenced by methodological differences across the 2014
272 and 2019 surveys, as a robustness check we also conducted stratified analysis by year.

273 **Results**

274 A total of 26,464 participants were included, from both the 2014 and 2019 surveys.
275 Table 1 presents the sample characteristics. The mean MD score was 3.8, the mean
276 number of days of exercise per week was 1, 7% of the individuals reported risky alcohol
277 consumption, and almost 18% were daily smokers. Around 1 in 3 participants were
278 members of couples without children under 25 years old, 25% were members of couples
279 with children under 25 years old, 23% were adults living alone, 5% were single parents
280 with children under 25 years old, and other household compositions represented the
281 remainder 15% of the total sample. The gender composition of the sample is 44% males
282 and 56% females.

283

284

285 Table 1. Baseline characteristics of participants in the 2014 and 2019 Portuguese National Health Surveys (95% conf.
286 intervals for means)

Variables	2014	2019	Total
Health behaviours			
Mean MD score	3.95 (3.92,3.98)	3.69 (3.65,3.72)	3.84 (3.82,3.86)
Mean days of exercise per week	1.12 (1.08,1.15)	1.03 (0.99,1.06)	1.08 (1.05,1.10)
% risky alcohol consumption	886 (5.84%)	983 (8.69%)	1,869 (7.06%)
% daily smokers	2,742 (18.08%)	1,965 (17.38%)	4,707 (17.77%)
Household composition			
Living alone	3,321 (21.91%)	2,644 (23.39%)	5,965 (22.54%)
Single parent with children under 25	609 (4.02%)	627 (5.55%)	1,236 (4.67%)
Couple without children under 25	4,206 (27.75%)	4,419 (39.09%)	8,625 (32.59%)
Couple with children under 25	3,890 (25.66%)	2,815 (24.90%)	6,705 (25.34%)
Other household compositions	3,132 (79.63%)	801 (20.36%)	3,933 (14.86%)
Gender			
Male	5,035 (43.94)	6,271 (44.53%)	14,768 (44.20%)
Female	8,497 (56.06%)	5,035 (55.47%)	11,696 (55.80%)
Age			
25 - 39	5,022 (33.13%)	2,449 (21.66 %)	7,471 (28.23%)
40 - 64	6,036 (39.82%)	4,771 (42.20%)	10,807 (40.84%)
65 - 79	4,100 (27.05%)	4,086 (36.14 %)	8,186 (30.93%)
Education			
No educ./Pre-primary educ.	7,934 (52.34%)	4,855 (42.94 %)	12,789 (48.33%)
Primary educ./ Secondary educ.	4,594 (30.31%)	4,101 (36.27%)	8,695 (32.86%)
Tertiary educ.	2,630 (17.35%)	2,350 (20.79 %)	4,980 (18.82%)
Region			
North	2,287 (15.09%)	1,660 (14.68%)	3,947 (14.91%)
Centre	2,628 (17.34%)	1,931 (17.08%)	4,559 (17.23%)
Lisbon Metropolitan Area	2,569 (16.95%)	1,856 (16.42%)	4,425 (16.72%)
Alentejo	1,772 (11.69%)	1,396 (12.35%)	3,168 (11.97%)
Algarve	2,152 (14.20%)	1,312 (11.60%)	3,464 (13.09 %)
Madeira	1,988 (13.12%)	1,521 (13.45%)	3,509 (13.26%)
Azores	1,762 (11.62%)	1,630 (14.42%)	3,392 (12.82%)
Employment status			
Employed	7,504 (49.51%)	6,322 (55.92%)	13,826 (52.24%)
Unemployed	1,850 (12.20%)	965 (8.54%)	2,815 (10.64%)
Not in labour force	5,804 (38.29%)	4,019 (35.55%)	9,823 (37.12%)
Income			
1th Quintile	3,102 (20.46%)	2,223 (19.66%)	5,325 (20.12%)
2nd Quintile	2,955 (19.49%)	2,200 (19.46%)	5,155 (19.48%)
3rd Quintile	2,983 (19.68%)	2,314 (20.47%)	5,297 (20.02%)
4th Quintile	3,017 (19.90%)	2,270 (20.08%)	5,387 (19.98%)
5th Quintile	3,101 (20.46%)	2,229 (20.33%)	5,400 (20.41%)
Survey year	15,158 (57.28%)	11,306 (42.72%)	26,464 (100%)

288 The main results are presented in Table 2 and Figure 2. Focusing on statistically
289 significant differences ($P < 0.05$) and starting with adherence to the MD, members of
290 couples with children (95% CI: 3.82, 3.96) and couples without children (95% CI: 3.77,
291 3.91) showed higher MD adherence than adults living alone, i.e., significantly higher
292 adjusted mean MD score. The adjusted mean days of physical activity per week was
293 significantly lower among members of couples with children (95% CI: 0.95, 1.09),
294 compared with couples without children (95% CI: 1.15, 1.29) and adults living alone
295 (95% CI: 1.20, 1.37). The adjusted probability of risky alcohol consumption was
296 significantly lower among members of couples with children (95% CI: 4.3, 5.8),
297 members of couples without children (95% CI: 4.5, 6.3), and single parents (95% CI:
298 3.0, 6.2), compared with adults living alone (95% CI: 7.2, 8.5). The same is true,
299 qualitatively, for the adjusted probabilities of smoking daily: people living alone had
300 significantly higher adjusted probability of being smokers than individuals with any
301 other household composition (95% CI: 23.5, 27.6).

302

303

304

305

306

307

308 Table 2. Adjusted mean MD score, mean days of exercise per week, probability of risky alcohol consumption, and
 309 probability of daily smoking by household composition, overall and by gender (95% conf. intervals)

Variables	Living alone ^{Ref}	Couple without children under 25	Couple with children under 25	Single parent with children under 25	Other household composition
Adj. mean MD score	3.69 (3.61, 3.77)	3.84** (3.77, 3.91)	3.89** (3.82, 3.96)	3.80 (3.63, 3.97)	3.74 (3.65, 3.83)
Men	3.55 (3.42, 3.67)	3.62 (3.52, 3.73)	3.68 (3.58, 3.77)	3.76 (3.32, 4.19)	3.59 (3.46, 3.72)
Women	3.83 (3.72, 3.94)	4.05** (3.96, 4.14)	4.08** (3.98, 4.18)	3.80 (3.62, 3.98)	3.90 (3.77, 4.02)
Adj. mean days exercise p/week	1.28 (1.20, 1.37)	1.22 (1.15, 1.29)	1.02** (0.95, 1.09)	1.14* (0.97, 1.31)	1.08** (0.98, 1.17)
Men	1.45 (1.30, 1.59)	1.33 (1.22, 1.44)	1.24* (1.13, 1.35)	1.36 (0.95, 1.77)	1.21* (1.07, 1.35)
Women	1.16 (1.06, 1.27)	1.10 (1.00, 1.20)	0.84** (0.75, 0.93)	1.06 (0.87, 1.24)	0.92** (0.80, 1.04)
Adj. prob. risky alcohol consump.	7,3% (7.2, 8.5)	5,4%** (4.5, 6.3)	5,0%** (4.3, 5.8)	4,6%** (3.0, 6.2)	6,3% (5.1, 7.6)
Men	13,9% (11.6, 16.2)	10,3%** (8.5, 12.2)	9,1%** (7.6, 10.6)	12,7% (6.4, 18.9)	11,1% (9.8, 13.3)
Women	1,5% (0.8, 2.1)	1,0% (0.5, 1.4)	1,1% (0.7, 1.5)	1,3% (0.6, 2.1)	1,4% (0.8, 2.1)
Adj. prob daily smoking	25,5% (23.5, 27.6)	17,4%** (15.9, 18.9)	14,4%** (13.6, 16.2)	19,2%** (15.9, 22.6)	19,7%** (17.7, 21.7)
Men	34,9% (31.5, 38.4)	26,8%** (24.1, 29.5)	23,2%** (20.9, 25.5)	22,1%** (13.3, 30.8)	28,6%** (25.3, 32.0)
Women	17,2% (14.8, 19.5)	9,3%** (7.8, 10.9)	7,7%** (6.5, 9.0)	16,0% (12.8, 19.3)	11,1%** (9.0, 13.2)

310

311 Statistically significant difference in comparison with the reference category ** ($p < 0.05$) * ($p < 0.10$)

312^{Ref} Reference category

313 Adjusted for age, year, income, education, employment status, labour status and region

314

315

316 The analyses by gender reveal, first, that except for physical activity, women have
317 healthier habits than men, with significantly higher adherence to the MD and
318 significantly lower adjusted probabilities of risky alcohol consumption and smoking
319 (Table 2 and Figure 3). This is true regardless of household composition, although in
320 the case of single parents, the differences between men and women are generally not
321 statistically significant due to lack of precision. These analyses also reveal that women
322 exclusively drive the previous result of higher adherence to the MD among members of
323 couples, with or without children, than among adults living alone; i.e., there are no
324 significant differences in adherence to the MD across men living in different types of
325 households. Similarly, less frequent physical activity among members of couples with
326 children, compared with couples without children and adults living alone, is another
327 result driven exclusively by women. Risky alcohol consumption among women is
328 similarly very low across all household compositions. Among men, risky alcohol
329 consumption is significantly less likely among members of couples with children (95%
330 CI: 7.6, 10.6) than among single dwelling adults (95% CI: 11.6, 16.2). Lastly, single
331 dwelling women and single mothers are significantly more likely to be smokers than
332 women in other types of households; for men, those living alone are more likely to be
333 smokers than those living in other kinds of arrangements.

334 Our robustness check showed similar patterns in health behaviours across different
335 household compositions in 2014 and 2019 (Table A1 in the Appendix).

336

337 **Discussion**

338 Our study shows how family structure relates to individuals' health-related behaviours.
339 Generally speaking, with the exception of physical activity, the presence of a partner
340 and the presence of children correlate with the adoption of healthier behaviours,

341 especially among women. These results held after adjusting for economic and social
342 characteristics, indicating that the positive externalities of family integration are, to
343 some extent, independent from socioeconomic background.

344 The observed patterns align with previous scientific evidence linking close social
345 relationships within households and adoption of healthier behaviours. Various studies
346 highlight the role played by the interactions between family members in shaping the
347 family's daily routines and division of labour (26,27), with a direct impact on ability to
348 have nutritious meals (7,28), quit smoking (29) and avoid risky drinking habits (16,30).
349 For instance, there is evidence that dual-headed families may be in a better position to
350 follow healthier diets because they share the cost and responsibility over the meals
351 (7,9), and can more easily overcome everyday obstacles like lack of time to cook (8) or
352 higher cost of some healthy foods (31). Conversely, for single-parent families, there are
353 no economies of scale, and opportunity costs of buying and preparing food are higher
354 because the burden is not shared. Furthermore, lack of family support has shown to
355 result in less parental monitoring over meals and less importance or priority attached to
356 food choices (32,33).

357 Prior literature suggests that spouse support may help smoking cessation (29) and that
358 divorce increases the likelihood of smoking and binge drinking (24), which together
359 may explain the lower likelihood of smoking and risky alcohol consumption amongst
360 couples observed here. However, negative externalities have also been documented, i.e.,
361 smoking husband leading to wife initiating smoking (29,34). Other studies suggest a
362 weak link between social support and smoking status (35), or hypothesize that the
363 correlation between smoking and living with a partner reflects matching on the marriage
364 market(36) (i.e., reverse causality). With regards to the presence of children, the lower
365 likelihood of smoking and risky alcohol consumption may result from parents' greater

366 feeling of responsibility and wanting to set a good example (37). From an extended
367 Grossman model point of view, parents may embody in their utility function not only
368 the benefits of healthy behaviours for themselves but also for their children (i.e.,
369 altruism).

370 Physical activity did not follow a similar pattern to other health behaviours, suggesting
371 a different relative importance of underlying channels (38). Lack of time (i.e.,
372 opportunity costs) due to parental responsibilities and single breadwinner status may
373 partly explain why couples with children exercise less (13) (not smoking or not drinking
374 does not directly require time). Sedentarism may be a less obvious “bad example” than
375 smoking or risky drinking and may not represent a large enough incentive for a more
376 active lifestyle. Moreover, prior literature suggests that friends, physicians, and work
377 colleagues may play a greater role on exercise adherence than close family members
378 (12), which could also explain why living in a dual-headed family does not seem to be
379 particularly advantageous for physical activity.

380 We found that differences in MD patterns between single- and dual-headed households
381 are only significant among women. This outcome may seem surprising, as we might
382 expect partnered/married men to rip the most benefits from living in a dual-headed
383 household, especially when considering the still gendered nature of home food
384 preparation (17). However, employed men, which represent more than half of our
385 sample, may often opt for less healthy meal choices out of home. Additionally, as
386 women are generally more engaged in family meal planning and preparation, the
387 positive externalities of having children may influence them more.

388 Lastly, the less frequent engagement in physical activity among couples with children
389 was also only significant for women. This may reflect the unequal sharing of parental
390 responsibilities, especially in the context of Portugal (25).

391 Overall, the unique socio-cultural context of Portugal with regards to gender roles, in
392 both work and family environments, may provide an explanation for some of our
393 findings. In Portugal, women have high labour-market participation, but still shoulder
394 the bulk of domestic and caregiving responsibilities (18). This sets Portugal apart within
395 the wider European context of work and family relations, as it does not conform to
396 either a traditional male breadwinner model or a more gender equitable modern model
397 (19). Therefore, it is important to note that the findings of this study may not be readily
398 applicable to other European countries.

399 One limitation of this study is its observational design, since it draws cross-sectional
400 data from the Portuguese National Health Surveys. So, it is not possible to follow
401 individuals over time, to understand how changes in household structure (e.g., marriage,
402 having children) causally impact health behaviours. Studies with a longitudinal design
403 would be able to address endogeneity from omitted, unmeasured, variables (e.g.,
404 individual characteristics that determine both likelihood of building a family and health
405 behaviours) or reverse causality (e.g., behaviours such as excessive alcohol
406 consumption leading to social disconnection from family members, matching of
407 smokers in the marriage market). Nevertheless, we don't see this endogeneity as a major
408 limitation, as marriage decisions and decisions to have children are hardly amenable to
409 policy intervention. More relevant policies and interventions to promote healthy
410 behaviours may be for example food vouchers or other welfare benefits, and our
411 descriptive results may help identify groups that should be targeted (e.g., single
412 parents).

413 One last limitation is the use of a MD-adherence index to proxy a healthy diet. This
414 index is based on the consumption of items belonging to large food groups that do not
415 fully account for quality or nutritional value of specific foods (e.g., fresh vs processed

416 fish). However, more detailed dietary assessment methods like food diaries are
417 challenging to implement on such large representative surveys. We may argue that this
418 limitation is balanced by the representativeness of the large sample used in this study.

419

420 **Conclusion**

421 This study found that individuals living alone and single parents may have a harder time
422 sticking to healthy eating habits. This is likely due to factors such as high, unshared,
423 costs and limited time for meal preparation (39,40). Positive externalities of healthy
424 habits for other family members, especially children, may explain why smoking and
425 risky drinking habits are less common among individuals living in couple and/or with
426 children.

427 These findings are particularly relevant in the current European context, where there is a
428 growing prevalence of single adult families (30.7% increase between 2009 and 2022)
429 and a decreasing average number of household members (3). Although they represent a
430 growing segment of society, single dwellers are often overlooked in political rhetoric
431 and major policy discussions. Single dwellers are usually the sole bearers of expenses
432 like rent or mortgage payments, utilities, and other living costs (including food), and
433 may sometimes not have adequate social support networks.

434 Social security systems may play a crucial role both in the promotion of healthy
435 behaviours, and in compensating for the detrimental impacts of unhealthy behaviours
436 for health and social outcomes of individuals. This can be achieved through the
437 implementation of comprehensive programs, aimed especially at single dwellers and
438 single parent families, encompassing financial assistance (e.g., food vouchers or single
439 family tax benefits), labour market support (e.g., inclusive employer practices, flexible

440 work schedules, subsidized childcare) (39), and health promotion services in the
441 community addressing adult isolation (41,42).

442

443 **References**

- 444 1. Instituto Nacional de Estatística. Inquérito Nacional de Saúde 2019. Destaque
445 [Internet]. 2020;2019(Ins 2019):1–12. Available from:
446 https://www.ine.pt/xportal/xmain?xpid=INE&xpgid=ine_destaques&DESTAQUEESdest_boui=414434213&DESTAQUESmodo=2
- 448 2. Abbafati C, Abbas KM, Abbasi-Kangevari M, Abd-Allah F, Abdelalim A,
449 Abdollahi M, et al. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and
450 territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease
451 Study 2019. *Lancet*. 2020;396(10258):1223–49.
- 452 3. European Commission - Eurostat. Household composition statistics - Statistics
453 Explained [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Jun 21]. Available from:
454 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Household_composition_statistics&oldid=567984#Increasing_number_of_households_composed_of_adults_living_alone
- 457 4. Grossman M. The Demand for Health. *Demand Heal*. 2017 Dec 31;
- 458 5. Jacobson L. The family as producer of health - An extended grossman model. *J*
459 *Health Econ*. 2000;19(5):611–37.
- 460 6. Wolfson JA, Bleich SN. Is cooking at home associated with better diet quality or
461 weight-loss intention? *Public Health Nutr*. 2015;18(8):1397–406.
- 462 7. Berge JM, Hoppmann C, Hanson C, Neumark-Sztainer D. Perspectives about

- 463 Family Meals from Single-Headed and Dual-Headed Households: A Qualitative
464 Analysis. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2013;113(12):1632–9.
- 465 8. Monsivais P, Aggarwal A, Drewnowski A. Time spent on home food preparation
466 and indicators of healthy eating. *Am J Prev Med [Internet]*. 2014;47(6):796–802.
467 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2014.07.033>
- 468 9. Sharif MZ, Alcalá HE, Albert SL, Fischer H. Deconstructing family meals: Do
469 family structure, gender and employment status influence the odds of having a
470 family meal? *Appetite*. 2017;114:187–93.
- 471 10. Mills S, Brown H, Wrieden W, White M, Adams J. Frequency of eating home
472 cooked meals and potential benefits for diet and health: Cross-sectional analysis
473 of a population-based cohort study. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2017;14(1):1–11.
- 474 11. Schnettler B, Miranda H, Miranda-Zapata E, Lobos G, Denegri M, Lapo M, et al.
475 Diet quality and satisfaction with different domains of life in single- and dual-
476 headed households: Comparing mother-adolescent dyads. *Child Youth Serv Rev*.
477 2018;89(April):124–31.
- 478 12. Carron A V., Hausenblas HA, Mack D. Social influence and exercise: A meta-
479 analysis. *J Sport Exerc Psychol*. 1996;18(1):1–16.
- 480 13. Kolt GS, Paterson JE, Chadha NK, Cheung VYM. Barriers to Physical Activity
481 Participation in Older Adults. *Med Sci Sport Exerc*. 2004;36(Supplement):S322.
- 482 14. Leonardi-Bee J, Jere ML, Britton J. Exposure to parental and sibling smoking
483 and the risk of smoking uptake in childhood and adolescence: A systematic
484 review and meta-analysis. *Thorax*. 2011;66(10):847–55.
- 485 15. Alves J, Filipe R, Machado J, Nunes B, Perelman J. Change in the Prevalence
486 and Social Patterning of First-and Second-Hand Smoking in Portugal: A

- 487 Repeated Cross-Sectional Study (2005 and 2014). *Int J Environ Res Public Heal*
488 *Artic.*
- 489 16. Wilks J, Callan VJ, Austin DA. Parent, Peer and Personal Determinants of
490 Adolescent Drinking. *Br J Addict.* 1989;84(6):619–30.
- 491 17. Hearst MO, Sevcik S, Fulkerson JA, Pasch KE, Harnack LJ, Lytle LA. Stressed
492 Out and Overcommitted! The Relationships Between Time Demands and Family
493 Rules and Parents’ and Their Child’s Weight Status. *Heal Educ Behav.*
494 2012;39(4):446–54.
- 495 18. Amâncio L, Santos MH. Gender Equality and Modernity in Portugal. An
496 Analysis on the Obstacles to Gender Equality in Highly Qualified Professions.
497 *Soc Sci [Internet].* 2021;10(5). Available from: [https://www.mdpi.com/2076-](https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0760/10/5/162)
498 [0760/10/5/162](https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0760/10/5/162)
- 499 19. Matias M, Andrade C, Fontaine AM. The interplay of gender, work and family in
500 Portuguese families. *Work Organ Labour Glob [Internet].* 2012 Jun 29;6(1):11–
501 26. Available from:
502 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.13169/workorgalaboglob.6.1.0011>
- 503 20. Instituto Nacional de Estatística. Inquerito Nacional de Saúde 2014. Lisboa:
504 Instituto Nacional de Estatística; 2016.
- 505 21. Štefan L, Prosoli R, Juranko D, Čule M, Milinović I, Novak D, et al. The
506 reliability of the mediterranean diet quality index (KIDMED) questionnaire.
507 *Nutrients.* 2017;9(4).
- 508 22. Rei M, Severo M, Rodrigues S. Reproducibility and validity of the
509 Mediterranean Diet Quality Index (KIDMED Index) in a sample of Portuguese
510 adolescents. *Br J Nutr.* 2020;1–12.

- 511 23. Molina PE, Nelson S, Molina PE. Binge Drinking ' s Effects on the Body. p. 99–
512 109.
- 513 24. Umberson D. Gender, marital status and the social control of health behavior.
514 Soc Sci Med. 1992;34(8):907–17.
- 515 25. Craig L. Does father care mean fathers share?: A comparison of how mothers and
516 fathers in intact families spend time with children. Gend Soc. 2006;20(2):259–
517 81.
- 518 26. Becker GS. A treatise on the family: Enlarged edition. Harvard university press;
519 1991.
- 520 27. Bauer KW, Neumark-Sztainer D, Fulkerson JA, Hannan PJ, Story M. Familial
521 correlates of adolescent girls' physical activity, television use, dietary intake,
522 weight, and body composition. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act. 2011;8:1–10.
- 523 28. Schmeer KK. Family structure and obesity in early childhood. Soc Sci Res.
524 2012;41(4):820–32.
- 525 29. Homish GG, Leonard KE. Spousal influence on smoking behaviors in a US
526 community sample of newly married couples. Soc Sci Med. 2005;61(12):2557–
527 67.
- 528 30. Wilsnack SC, Wilsnack RW. Epidemiology of women's drinking. J Subst Abuse.
529 1991;3(2):133–57.
- 530 31. Alves R, Lopes C, Rodrigues S, Perelman J. Adhering to a Mediterranean diet in
531 a Mediterranean country: An excess cost for families? Br J Nutr. 2021;
- 532 32. Formisano A, Hunsberger M, Bammann K, Vanaelst B, Molnar D, Moreno LA,
533 et al. Family structure and childhood obesity: Results of the IDEFICS Project.

- 534 Public Health Nutr. 2013;17(10):2307–15.
- 535 33. Reicks M, Banna J, Cluskey M, Gunther C, Hongu N, Richards R, et al.
536 Influence of parenting practices on eating behaviors of early adolescents during
537 independent eating occasions: Implications for obesity prevention. *Nutrients*.
538 2015;7(10):8783–801.
- 539 34. Daly KA, Lund EM, Harty KC, Ersted SA. Factors associated with late smoking
540 initiation in Minnesota women. *Am J Public Health*. 1993;83(9):1333–5.
- 541 35. Clark AE, Etilé F. Don't give up on me baby: Spousal correlation in smoking
542 behaviour. *J Health Econ*. 2006;25(5):958–78.
- 543 36. Becker GS. A Theory of Marriage: Part I. *J Polit Econ*. 1973;81(4):813–46.
- 544 37. Umberson D. Family Status and Health Behaviors□: Social Control as a
545 Dimension of Social Integration. *J Health Soc Behav*. 1987;28(3):306–19.
- 546 38. Deslippe AL, Soanes A, Bouchaud CC, Beckenstein H, Slim M, Plourde H, et al.
547 Barriers and facilitators to diet, physical activity and lifestyle behavior
548 intervention adherence: a qualitative systematic review of the literature. *Int J*
549 *Behav Nutr Phys Act* [Internet]. 2023;20(1):1–25. Available from:
550 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-023-01424-2>
- 551 39. Bowman D, Wickramasinghe S. Trampolines not traps□: Enabling economic
552 security for single mothers and their children. Victoria; 2020.
- 553 40. Stack RJ, Meredith A. The Impact of Financial Hardship on Single Parents: An
554 Exploration of the Journey From Social Distress to Seeking Help. *J Fam Econ*
555 *Issues* [Internet]. 2018;39(2):233–42. Available from:
556 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10834-017-9551-6>

557 41. Freedman A, Nicolle J. Social Isolation and Loneliness: The New Geriatric
558 Giants. *Can Fam Physician*. 2020;66:176–82.

559 42. Cattan M, White M, Bond J, Laearmouth A. Preventing social isolation and
560 loneliness among older people: a systematic review of health promotion
561 interventions. *Ageing & Soc*. 2005;25(1):41–67.

562


563

564

565


566

Figure 1. Conceptual framework: economic justifications for adoption of (un)healthy behaviours, by household structure



It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/).


Figure 2 - Adjusted mean MD score, mean days of exercise per week, probability of risky alcohol consumption, and probability of daily smoking by household composition (95% conf. intervals)



Adjusted for age, year, income, education, employment status, labour status and region

It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/).

Figure 3 - Adjusted mean MD score, mean days of exercise per week, probability of risky alcohol consumption, and probability of daily smoking by household composition, by gender (95% conf. intervals)



Adjusted for age, year, income, education, employment status, labour status and region