preliminary version, please do not quote

Gender differences in trajectories of health limitations in Germany between 1995 and 2001. A study based on the German Socio Economic Panel (SOEP)

Rasmus Hoffmann[+] and Gabriele Doblhammer[*]

[+]Institute for Sociology and Demography
University of Rostock
18057 Rostock, Germany

*Rostock Centre for the Study of Demographic Change
Konrad Zuse Strasse 1
18057 Rostock, Germany

Abstract

Objectives.

Disability research rarely investigated gender differentials in individual-level trajectories. Furthermore, studies about the relationship between course types and subsequent mortality are still missing. Here, we investigate course types, explore confounding by socio-economic and demographic correlates and whether the gender gap in morbidity results from differences in the onset of and/or survival with disability.

Methods.

Using the German Socioeconomic Panel (GSOEP) we perform cluster analyses based on four aspects of individual disability trajectories and multinomial logistic regressions to explore possible confounding and the relationship with subsequent mortality.

Results.

The frequency of disability trajectories of stable good health is lower among women while they tend to experience courses that involve extended periods of moderate and severe disability, independent from socioeconomic and demographic characteristics. The mortality advantage of women does not depend on the disability trajectory: their mortality is always half that of men.

Discussion.

Disability does not make men and women more equal in the face of death. Our results are consistent with earlier studies in showing that mortality selection and differences in chronic conditions may explain the gender gap in disability and mortality but our results extend previous research in showing that in the German context both factors are important.

Introduction

Gender differences in health and mortality have been of longstanding interest to researchers (see e.g. Case & Paxson, 2005; Idler, 2003; McIntyre, Ford, & Hunt, 1999; McIntyre, Hunt, & Sweeting, 1996; Molarius & Janson, 2002; Nusselder & Looman, 2004). Why women live longer than men but suffer from worse health, however, is still an unresolved puzzle. Much of disability research, in general, but also in the area of gender differentials, has focused on the prevalence of disability exploring healthy life expectancy (e.g. Robine, Jagger, Mathers, Crimmins, & Suzman, 2002) or the incidence of disability by studying transitions between health states (for a literature review see e.g. Doblhammer, Hoffmann, Muth, & Nusselder, 2007). To gain deeper insights into the gender-specific disablement process and its relationship with mortality, however, it is crucial to understand the heterogeneity of disabled persons by identifying distinct individual-level trajectories of disability (Aldwin, Spiro 3rd, Levenson, & Cupertino, 2001; Maddox & Clark, 1992; Nelson & Dannefer, 1992).

A series of studies uses courses of health and disability to analyze functional impairment and disability (Li, Duncan, McAuley, Harmer, & Smolkowski, 2000; Liang et al., 2003; Maddox & Clark, 1992; Verbrugge & Jette, 1994), physical symptoms (Aldwin et al., 2001), health trajectories (Clipp, Pavalko, & Elder, 1992; Liang et al., 2005; McDonough & Berglund, 2003). Liang et al. (2007) combine courses of functional status and subjective health while Taylor & Lynch (2004) explore trajectories of impairment in relation to depressive symptoms later in life. Two recent Dutch studies contribute to the knowledge in this research area (Deeg, 2005; Nusselder, Looman, & Mackenbach, 2006) in the European context. Deeg (2005) analysed the first three cycles of the Longitudinal Aging Study Amsterdam (LASA), Nusselder et al. (2006) used a longitudinal study of 2,867 Dutch persons aged 15-74.

The findings concerning gender differences in disability trajectories are at best controversial. In the study of Deeg (2005) gender and age together with socio-economic characteristics (such as education, having a partner or living in an institution) as well as nine chronic conditions have been found to be predictive factors

of the trajectories. In Nusselder's study the trajectories were partly associated with age; however, they were not associated with gender. McDonough and Berglund (2003) report worse initial self-rated health status among US women which declines at a slower rate than that of males. On the contrary, Liang et al (2003) find a lower risk of experiencing early onset of disability among Japanese women and pose the question whether or not health trajectories are universal or vary according to gender, ethnicity and culture. An early study by Maddox and Clark (1992) reports higher levels of disability for women over time which were eliminated once education and economic status was controlled for.

The objectives of this study are (1) to identify different course types of disability in a representative sample of the Germany population, (2) to assess their relative frequency by gender, (3) to explore whether socio-economic or demographic correlates explain gender differences in course types and (4) to analyse the association of course types with subsequent deaths in the 2002-2005 period separately for males and females. By this we want to gain a better understanding whether women have an earlier onset of disability, a lower chance of recovery and a lower mortality once they are disabled.

Given the possibility that health trajectories depend on the cultural background we follow a similar methodological approach as Deeg (2005) and Nusselder (2006) in order to make our study comparable to another European population, namely the Dutch. The results section is divided into four parts: first, we present trajectories based on a cluster analysis for the survivors from 1995 to 2001; second, we report the outcome of a similar analysis of persons who died during this period. Third, we present a multinomial logistic regression model of risk factors for the survivors and deceased in the same period; fourth, for persons who survived the 1995-2001 period, we use additional information on subsequent mortality between 2002 and 2005.

Data

The German Socio-Economic Panel Study started in 1984 in West Germany. A total of 5,921 households, i.e. 12,290 persons aged above 16 were surveyed. In 1990, East Germany was included into the panel, expanding it by 2,179 households and 4,453

persons. The data of the SOEP consist of seven samples. The original samples, introduced at the start of the SOEP, are Sample A 'Residents in the FRG' and Sample B 'Foreigners in the FRG'. In 1990, Sample C was drawn from German residents in the GDR (Haisken-DeNew & Frick, 2005). We limit our analysis to Samples A and C.

The German Socio-Economic Panel includes a variety of health and disability questions posed over different time periods. Between 1984 and 1987, in 1992, and between 1995 and 2001 the respondents were asked to answer a question on self-perceived disability: 'Not regarding occasional illnesses, is the fulfilment of everyday activities, e.g. in the household, your job or education hindered by your condition of health, and, if so, to what extent?' The question had three possible answer categories: not at all, slightly, to a great extent.

We have chosen to use this variable on self-perceived disability for our analysis because it has been used for a long period of time without interruption or changes in the wording and because it comes closest to the meaning of functional limitation and disability. This means that the disability score used in our analysis has three discrete levels, ranging from 1 to 3. We admit that the concept of functional limitations is not the same as the concept of disability. Not all single functional limitations lead to disability, suffice to mention a limitation that can be outbalanced by a technical device just as glasses are used in remedy of problems in vision. However, the meaning of disability and functional limitation is similar (Verbrugge & Jette, 1994). In the literature important definitions of disability have been developed by Katz, Ford, Moskowitz, Jackson, & Jaffe (1963); Lawton & Brody (1969); Nagi (1976); Rosow & Breslau (1966). Functional limitations are less well defined than disability and are denoted and measured as functional status, physical function, and functional competency. Although there are differences in concepts and measurements of disability versus functional limitations, we use the term disability for the status that is measured by the SOEP question above.

We look at the 1995-2001 period, which means that we follow health trajectories of individual respondents over a seven-year period, with seven points in time. In 1995, a total of 3,919 persons in the SOEP were aged 50+. These respondents are divided into three groups: 2,639 respondents who survived until 2001 and have information about

their disability level for each of the seven years. A total of 191 persons are excluded. They were part of the 1995 sample and survived to 2001 but have information missing on their disability level. A different set of calculations with these respondents included produced similar results (not shown here).

The second group consists of 497 individuals who died between 1995 and 2001. However, only 165 of them (who died in 1999, 2000 or 2001 and where complete information on health is available) can be analysed in full detail. This is because at least four health observations (1995-1998) are necessary to calculate the parameters, the latter which are input to the cluster analysis (see below). For each of the three possible years of death, the trajectories of the decedents are analysed separately; 69 individuals who do not have full health information prior to death are excluded. Persons who died between 1995 and 1998 are grouped under 'immediate death', regardless of the availability of health information. The third group comprises 592 individuals who were lost to follow up. Table 1 gives an overview of the individuals included, of the persons lost to follow-up, and of the number of deaths.

[Table 1 about here]

We also have information on deaths and attrition of the 2002-2005 period. There have been 230 deaths and 314 cases of attrition; these will be used to analyse the subsequent mortality and loss to follow-up after the core observation period.

All socio-economic and demographic correlates of disability trajectories are taken from the beginning of the observation period i.e. in the year 1995. Low education combines the categories with no school-leaving certificate or a maximum of 8/9 years of schooling or missing information on schooling, high education with 10 or 12/13 years of schooling, with a certificate. Respondents who are living with a partner in the same household are compared to those who live alone. Respondents residing in the area of the former GDR are coded as East Germans regardless of their place of birth.

Methods

This paper relies heavily on the methods developed in the two articles authored by Deeg (2005) and Nusselder et al. (2006). A two-step procedure is followed in order to identify similar trajectories of disability among individuals.

First, the level and time course of disability for each respondent is characterized by four aspects: the level, direction, the concavity/convexity, and the variability of the trajectory. We use separate linear regression to asses the four aspects for each individual. The level of disability is defined as the intercept of a linear regression model that regresses the year on the disability outcome. The slope of the model is used to indicate the direction of the change. A positive slope indicates deterioration; a negative one indicates an improvement in disability. The concavity/convexity of the time trend is measured by adding a quadratic term to the equation and by measuring the distance between the quadratic regression curve and the straight linear regression line. A positive difference indicates a convex shape, a negative one indicates a concave shape. All of the three measures are estimated for the middle of the time period that the individual lived through. The fourth aspect, the variability of the trajectory, is measured by the root mean square error of the quadratic function.

Second, the four aspects are the input variables for a cluster analysis that groups individuals with similar levels and time courses into separate clusters. In order to assure that each of the four aspects influences the cluster analysis equally, we standardize them, using their mean and standard deviation. We perform a hierarchical agglomerative complete linkage cluster analysis based on Euclidian distances. The number of clusters is decided on the basis of the Calinski-Harabasz pseudo-F statistic. Contrary to earlier studies (Deeg, 2005; Nusselder et al., 2006), we treat the stable disability trajectories (stable healthy, stable moderate disability, stable severe disability) separately and do not include them in the cluster analysis. Differently from the study by Nusselder et al. (2006), we use the method of cluster analysis also to identify disability trajectories among the deceased.

Results

Trajectories of disability among survivors

Among the survivors of the seven-year period, the cluster analysis identifies eight trajectories in addition to the three stable trajectories of respondents who had no change in their disability level. These trajectories can be divided into three groups according to the number of years spent in disability. The first group (26% of the respondents surviving from 1995 to 2001) comprises all trajectories that are primarily healthy (figure 1). About 14% remain fully healthy and 4% show a delayed but fast disablement process in the last two to three years of the seven-year period. A total of 2% experience some recovery, followed again by severe disability, and 5 % recover from severe disability.

[Figure 1 about here]
[Figure 2 about here]
[Figure 3 about here]

The second group includes respondents who follow trajectories of moderate disability (38%, figure 2): a total of 9% have stable moderate disability, 13% experience continuous deterioration to moderate disability and 16 % experience a slight improvement. The third group (36%) consists of four trajectories that include primarily severe disability. A total of 10% become severely disabled after some moderate improvement and 20 % experience slight deterioration, 2 % experience severe deterioration of health, followed by complete recovery, and about 4 % have a severe disability that is stable. All groups that experience substantial improvement over the whole or over a part of the observation period combined add up to 25% of those who survived in the 1995-2001 period. The two most frequent trajectories both start with moderate disability, one slightly deteriorating (20%) and the other slightly improving (16%).

Table 2 presents the frequencies for all eleven trajectories and for gender specific differences. The order of appearance in table 2 is from favourable to unfavourable health trajectories, measured in terms of the proportion of years spent with moderate

and/or severe disability. At this detailed level, significant gender differences only exist for two trajectories: more men have 'stable good health' (17% versus 9%) and more women belong to the cluster 'moderate disability, deterioration, stable' (22% versus 18%).

[Table 2 about here]

In principal, the identified trajectories apply over the whole age range above age 50. Therefore we are not able to ascribe certain trajectories to certain distinct age groups. However, different trajectory groups have different frequencies across age groups, shown in table 3. For the presentation of the results that is to follow, we use the reduced number of three trajectory groups, i.e. not the eleven trajectories originally identified.

[Table 3 about here]

Among men aged 50-59 in 1995, a total of 35% follow a healthy trajectory, 33% experience trajectories with moderate disability and 32% have severe disability. This age group has more healthy men than women and more moderately disabled women than men but almost the same proportion of men and women that are severely disabled. The difference between the two sexes is significant at p=0.063. In the next age group (60-69) the basic gender pattern remains, and this despite a general shift from healthy trajectories to trajectories with moderate and severe disabilities. The differences between the two sexes disappear in the age group 70 to 79. The two sexes differ most at the highest ages (80+): only 7 % of women follow a healthy trajectory compared to 34 % of males. At the same time, 60 % of females but only 25 % of males at these ages experience trajectories of severe disability. Despite the small numbers, the gender differences are significant at p=0.054.

Trajectories of the deceased between 1995 and 2001

The analysis of the deceased is separated into two groups of persons: one group, classed as 'immediate death', died between 1995 and 1998; the other group survived

long enough (at least four years) to allow estimating the four aspects of the level and the time course of the individual health trajectory (see the section on methods). In the latter group, three groups are analysed separately: those who had their last interview in 1998 and died in 1999 (n=60), those who died in 2000 (n=54), and those who died in 2001 (n=51).

The cluster analysis of the deceased in 1999 identifies three health trajectories in addition to three stable disability courses. The cluster analysis of the deceased from 2000 and 2001 only identified two trajectories each (in addition to three stable disability courses). To summarize the results, we only present the trajectories of persons who died in 2001 (figure 4). This is because the identified five trajectories 'moderate disability, recovery, deterioration' and 'moderate disability, deterioration, stable' plus the three stable trajectories are similar in all three years.

[Figure 4 about here]

Table 4 presents the frequencies for the three stable trajectories and for the two deteriorating trajectories presented in figure 4. The frequencies are based on all of the three years (1999, 2000 and 2001). The table also includes a very small recovery group that is only found among persons who died in 1999 and therefore not shown in figure 4. Again, we collapsed categories with trajectories with generally 'moderate' and those with 'severe' disability in order to reduce their number. A slightly greater number of men than women have moderate disability and more women than men have severe disability prior to death. Dying healthy is much more common among men, dying in stable severe disability is more common for women. Less men die during the first four years (immediate death), a fact that can be attributed to the age structure.

[Table 4 about here]

Comparing the profiles of the two deteriorating trajectories among the deceased with the health courses among the survivors, we find large similarities with the two trajectories 'moderate disability, deterioration, stable' and 'moderate disability, recovery, deterioration'. We thus give them the same names. Both among the

survivors and the deceased, the two trajectories are among the largest trajectory groups.

Socio-economic and demographic correlates of the trajectories of the survivors and the deceased

The following multinomial logistic regression integrates survivors and deceased persons in one model by calculating the odds ratios for five alternative outcomes. These outcomes are: immediate death, severe disability prior to death, moderate disability prior to death, and healthy and moderate disability for the survivors. The reference group are persons who survived whilst being severely disabled.

[Table 5 about here]

Women following the healthy trajectories have an odds ratio of 0.83 (p=0.07), which implies a 17% lower chance than men to survive healthy instead of surviving with severe disability. The chance to survive healthily declines with increasing age, and high education is associated with better health. No significant gender differences exist for moderate disability versus severe disability whereas the effects of age and education remain significant.

The right column of table 5 shows that the risk of dying instead of surviving with severe disability increases steeply with age. Being a women substantially reduces the risk of dying: women have a 42% lower risk of dying with moderate disability than men (instead of surviving with severe disability), a 36% lower risk of dying whilst in severe disability, and a 53% lower risk of dying between 1995 and 1998 ('immediate death'). The similar impact of the sex variable on the risk of dying on different disability levels suggests that this impact is relatively independent from the health status. The east/west and partner variables do not have a significant impact on the disability trajectories.

Subsequent mortality between 2002 and 2005 of the survivors of the 1995 -2001 period

Additional data was available for the persons who survived from 1995 to 2001, data that include subsequent death and attrition between 2002 and 2005. It allows for another multinomial logistic regression, with mortality and attrition as the two possible outcomes. As before, we distinguish between three types of trajectories over the past seven years: 'healthy', 'moderate disability', and 'severe disability'. Since we are mainly interested in the mortality difference between men and women for a given disability status, we include an interaction effect between sex and the respective disability trajectory (table 6).

[Table 6 about here]

For both sexes, mortality is highest among those who suffered primarily from severe disability during the last seven years. The mortality disadvantage of persons with severe disability is almost the same for the two sexes: 1.59 for males and 1.61 for females. Age and educational gradients in mortality are highly significant and follow the expected direction, i.e. mortality rises with age and low education. There are no significant differences between East and West Germany. Interestingly, attrition does not differ significantly by the past disability trajectory. However, it increases significantly with age.

[Figure 5 about here]

In a second step, we standardize the interaction effect such that males represent the reference group in each of the disability trajectories, and we run repeated models to estimate the significance of the sex difference within each trajectory (figure 5). We find that for both moderate and severe disability, women have about half the mortality risk of men. This shows that severe disability compared to moderate disability does not change the gender gap in mortality. Compared to healthy persons, disability seems to increase the mortality difference between men and women: after seven relatively healthy years, the gender gap is smaller and not statistically significant.

Discussion

This study is the first analysis of German data that concentrates on individual-level disability trajectories using a large data set (SOEP) that offers repeated measures of functional limitations per person over the time period 1995 to 2001. A cluster analysis identified eleven trajectories among respondents who survived the whole observation period. Their relative frequency shows that women have a lower likelihood to follow disability trajectories of stable good health while they tend to experience both improving and deteriorating courses that involve moderate disability. In addition, women are more likely to experience trajectories that start with moderate disability, deteriorate and involve severe disability over an extended period of time. These gender differences are significant in the youngest and the oldest age group (50-59 and 80+). We find that sex, age, and education have an impact on the disability status and on mortality while marital status and East/West German differences exert an influence that is very small. Gender differences in trajectories remain even when corrected for other socio-economic and demographic characteristics. The mortality follow-up for the years 2002-2005 showed that the mortality advantage of women does not depend on the disability trajectory. For trajectories that involve extended periods of moderate or severe disability the mortality of women is always half that of men.

It is a fact that women have a lower general mortality than men and this is true at almost all ages, in almost all health conditions, in almost all situations and in all countries (Barford, Dorling, Smith, & Shaw, 2006). Although women have a higher life expectancy, they have on average worse health than men, both in terms of self-rated health and functional status (Arber & Ginn, 1993; Christensen, 2001; Liang et al., 2002; Verbrugge, 1984, 1989). Surprisingly, some research findings suggest that although women have the same probability of contracting illnesses, their overall health status is worse than that of men (Klein, 1998). This could imply that they recover less easily from diseases than men. Our results do not support this explanation since we do not find a significant greater number of men in trajectory groups that show the potential to recover. However, our results demonstrated that women have a health disadvantage already starting at middle ages.

We find that a significantly larger proportion of women follow disadvantaged disability trajectories. However, this only applies to the youngest (50-59) and oldest age group (80+). This gender-specific age pattern is consistent with the explanation of an earlier onset of disability combined with lower mortality: women become disabled earlier than men, and this may explain the difference at ages 50-59. Then, men catch up during the disablement process, and this reduces the gender difference in disability at ages 60-79. At the same time, selection is stronger among males than females as males have a higher mortality. The result is that at the highest age group, 80+, many disabled men already died, again improving the average disability status in that group; this, in turn, results in generally better health trajectories. The finding implies that women not only live longer with moderate and severe disabilities but also that they start to develop disabilities earlier in life.

It is not yet known why women have a health disadvantage and a mortality advantage. One explanation involves biological differences, i.e. genetically, men and women have different physical constitutions and different health and mortality trajectories (Christensen, 2001). Another explanation refers to the fact that women have a different self-assessment of their body. They perceive more problems, they have more sorrows, and they are more prone to depression (Delbès & Gaymu, 2002). As a result, they may be likely to report less serious ailments (Spiers, Jagger, Clarke, & Arthur, 2003). Women understand their bodies better, they admit to having illnesses more readily (Idler, 2003; Verbrugge, 1989), and in medical examinations, they rank their health worse than men, they also follow more medical treatments than men (Oakes & Rossi, 2003), and they generally exhibit better health behaviour (Luy & Di Giulio, 2005). The statement 'Women suffer, men die' (Hoffmann, 2008) captures these gender differences. In this study, we cannot examine further the influence of subjective assessment as we only use a single subjective health measure.

Turning to mortality we find that the mortality advantage of women is independent from their past disability trajectories. This is surprising because one understanding of the interplay between disability and mortality is that persons who have a higher level of disability over an extended period of time are more advanced in the process of disablement, therefore they are closer to death. Other influencing factors, such as sex, should have less of an impact on mortality when a person is already disabled. In other

words, we would have expected that the gender gap in mortality narrows with growing disability. However, we find that this is not true.

One explanation is that women suffer from different chronic diseases than men. Nusselder & Looman (2004) decomposed differences in health expectancies by cause of death and by cause of disability. They showed that most of the additional years that women spend in disability are caused by disability arising from arthritis, followed by disability that is not attributable to diseases. The two types of diseases largely counterbalance the mortality advantage that women have in terms of heart disease and cancer. The finding is supported by Case & Paxson (2005), who explained gender differences in self-reported health entirely by sex-specific differences in the distribution of chronic diseases. However, the effects of disability in terms of hospitalization and mortality seem to be more severe for men than they are for women, and this is particularly true for smoking-related causes of death, such as asthma, bronchitis, or emphysema.

Given the possible dependence of health trajectories on the cultural background (Liang et al., 2005) we decided to model this study according to the two recent studies of the Dutch population by Deeg (2005) and Nusselder et al. (2006). Although we applied a similar statistical model there remain large differences between the study designs. Contrary to the study of Deeg (2005), we observed disability scores for each of the seven years. In contrast to Nusselder et al. (2006), we focused solely on the middle-aged and the elderly. Our study identified eleven course types among survivors of a seven year-period who were aged 50-100 at baseline in the year 1995. Deeg (2005) and Nusselder et al. (2006), by contrast, report five and nine trajectories, respectively. As a result, the proportion of the population experiencing a certain disability course is difficult to compare between the three studies. Deeg (2005) as well as Nusselder et al. (2006) assign a large proportion of the population to the category entirely non-disabled: 53% among those aged 55-85 of Deeg's sample compared to 74% of Nusselder's sample, aged 15-74. In our sample (persons aged 50+), however, we only find 14% of individuals who do not have any disability. This may partly be due to the number of measurements used: with seven measurements the chance of always providing an answer in the best health category is smaller than it is with three measurements used by Deeg (2005), even if the total observation time is very similar

in all of the three studies. However, Nusselder et al. (2006) have six measurements and their results also show a much higher proportion of stable non-disabled persons (see above). The trajectory of severe disability that is stable is 4% in our study, this compares to 3% in Deeg's sample and between 1 and 2% of the sample used by Nusselder et al..Unfortunately neither of the two studies reports the frequency of trajectories by gender.

One explanation for the divergence is the difference in the age range of the study populations. Another possible explanation is the fact that different indicators of disability were used in the three studies. While our study uses a question on being limited in conducting daily activities, a question that has three possible outcomes, Deeg (2005) explores whether the respondent had any difficulty with one of the following three tasks: climbing stairs, cutting one's toenails, and using one's own or public transportation. The response categories ranged from 0="no difficulty" to 3="not able to perform". Nusselder et al. (2006) used answers to 12 disability questions that have response categories similar to those of Deeg (2005), and they calculated the weighted means of the twelve variables by applying the method of principal component analysis.

In summary, our study for the first time explored disability trajectories in Germany and it is one of the few that focuses on gender differences in disability trajectories in relation to mortality. In the German context the disability disadvantage of women stems from both an earlier onset of disability and a lower mortality once disabled. Future research about the puzzle why women experience lower mortality but higher disability should explore disability trajectories in the context of causes of death and the underlying chronic conditions.

References

Aldwin, C. M., Spiro 3rd, A., Levenson, M. R., & Cupertino, A. P. (2001). Longitudinal findings from the Normative Aging Study: III. Personality, individual health trajectories, and mortality. *Psychology and Aging, 16*(3), 450-465.

Arber, S., & Ginn, J. (1993). Gender and inequalities in health in later life. *Social Science and Medicine, 36*(1), 33-46.

Barford, A., Dorling, D., Smith, G. D., & Shaw, M. (2006). Life expectancy: women now on top everywhere. *British Medical Journal, 332*(7545), 808.

Case, A., & Paxson, C. (2005). Sex differences in morbidity and mortality. *Demography, 42*(2), 189-214.

Christensen, K. (2001). *Hvorfor aeldes vi forskelligt?* (2nd ed.). Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Clipp, E. C., Pavalko, E. K., & Elder, G. H. (1992). Trajectories of health: In concept and empirical pattern. *Behavior, Health, and Aging, 2*(3), 159–179.

Deeg, D. J. H. (2005). Longitudinal characterization of course types of functional limitations. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 27(5), 253-261.

Delbès, C., & Gaymu, J. (2002). Le choc du veuvage à l'orée de la vieillesse: vécus masculin et féminin. *Population, 57*(6), 879-909.

Doblhammer, G., Hoffmann, R., Muth, E., & Nusselder, W. (2007). The effect of sex, obesity, and smoking on health transitions: A statistical meta-analysis based on a systematic literature review. *Rostock Center - Discussion Paper, 7*, 1-26.

Haisken-DeNew, J. P., & Frick, J. R. (2005). Desktop Companion to the German Socio-Economic Panel Study. *German Institute for Economic Research (DIW), Berlin*.

Hoffmann, R. (2008). Socioeconomic differences in old age mortality. New York et al.: Springer (forthcoming).

Idler, E. L. (2003). Discussion: Gender Differences in Self-Rated Health, in Mortality, and in the Relationship Between the Two. *The Gerontologist, 43*(3), 372-375.

Katz, S., Ford, A. B., Moskowitz, R. W., Jackson, B. A., & Jaffe, M. W. (1963). Studies of illness in the aged - The index of ADL: A standardized measure of biological and psychosocial function. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 185*(2), 914-919.

Klein, T. (1998). Soziale Determinanten der aktiven Lebenserwartung. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie, 28*(6), 448-464.

Lawton, M. P., & Brody, E. M. (1969). Assessment of older people: self-maintaining and instrumental activities of daily living. *The Gerontologist, 9*(3), 179-186.

Li, F., Duncan, T. E., McAuley, E., Harmer, P., & Smolkowski, K. (2000). A Didactic Example of Latent Curve Analysis Applicable to the Study of Aging. *Journal of Aging and Health, 12*(3), 388-425.

Liang, J., Bennett, J., Krause, N., Kobayashi, E., Kim, H., Brown, J. W., et al. (2002). Old age mortality in Japan: does the socioeconomic gradient interact with gender and age? *Journal of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 57*(5), 294-307.

Liang, J., Shaw, B. A., Bennett, J. M., Krause, N., Kobayashi, E., Fukaya, T., et al. (2007). Intertwining courses of functional status and subjective health among older Japanese. *Journal of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 62*(5), S340-348.

Liang, J., Shaw, B. A., Krause, N., Bennett, J. M., Kobayashi, E., Fukaya, T., et al. (2005). How Does Self-Assessed Health Change With Age? A Study of Older Adults in Japan. *Journal of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 60*(4), S224-232.

Liang, J., Shaw, B. A., Krause, N. M., Bennett, J. M., Blaum, C., Kobayashi, E., et al. (2003). Changes in functional status among older adults in Japan: successful and usual aging. *Psychology and Aging, 18*(4), 684-695.

Luy, M., & Di Giulio, P. (2005). Der Einfluss von Verhaltensweisen und Lebensstilen auf die Mortalitätsdifferenzen der Geschlechter. In K. Gärtner, E. Grünheid & M. Luy (Eds.), *Lebensstile, Lebensphasen, Lebensqualität – Interdisziplinäre Analysen von Gesundheit und Sterblichkeit aus dem Lebenserwartungssurvey des BiB* (pp. 365-392). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Maddox, G. L., & Clark, D. O. (1992). Trajectories of Functional Impairment in Later Life. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 33*(2), 114-125.

McDonough, P., & Berglund, P. (2003). Histories of Poverty and Self-Rated Health Trajectories. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 44*(2), 198-214.

McIntyre, S., Ford, G., & Hunt, K. (1999). Do women 'over-report'morbidity? Men's and women's responses to structured prompting on a standard question on long standing illness. *Social Science and Medicine, 48*(1), 89–98.

McIntyre, S., Hunt, K., & Sweeting, H. (1996). Gender differences in health: Are things really as simple as they seem? *Social Science and Medicine, 42*(4), 617-624.

Molarius, A., & Janson, S. (2002). Self-rated health, chronic diseases, and symptoms among middle-aged and elderly men and women. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 55*(4), 364-370.

Nagi, S. Z. (1976). An epidemiology of disability among adults in the United States. *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly: Health and Society, 54*(4), 439-467.

Nelson, E. A., & Dannefer, D. (1992). Aged heterogeneity: fact or fiction? The fate of diversity in gerontological research. *The Gerontologist, 32*(1), 17-23.

Nusselder, W. J., & Looman, C. W. N. (2004). Decomposition of Differences in Health Expectancy by Cause. *Demography, 41*(2), 315-334.

Nusselder, W. J., Looman, C. W. N., & Mackenbach, J. P. (2006). The level and time course of disability: Trajectories of disability in adults and young elderly. *Disability and Rehabilitation, 28*(16), 1015-1026.

Oakes, J. M., & Rossi, P. H. (2003). The measurement of SES in health research: current practice and steps toward a new approach. *Social Science and Medicine, 56*(4), 769-784.

Robine, J. M., Jagger, C., Mathers, C. D., Crimmins, E. M., & Suzman, R. M. (2002). Determining health expectancies. Chichester: Wiley.

Rosow, I., & Breslau, N. (1966). A Guttman Health Scale for the aged. *Journals of Gerontology, 21*, 556-559.

Spiers, N., Jagger, C., Clarke, M., & Arthur, A. (2003). Are Gender Differences in the Relationship Between Self-Rated Health and Mortality Enduring? Results From Three Birth Cohorts in Melton Mowbray, United Kingdom. *The Gerontologist, 43*(3), 406-411.

Taylor, M. G., & Lynch, S. M. (2004). Trajectories of Impairment, Social Support, and Depressive Symptoms in Later Life. *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 59*(4), S238-S246.

Verbrugge, L. M. (1984). Longer Life but Worsening Health? Trends in Health and Mortality of Middle-Aged and Older Persons. *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly. Health and Society, 62*(3), 475-519.
Verbrugge, L. M. (1989). The Twain Meet: Empirical explanations of sex differences in health and mortality. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 30*, 282-304.
Verbrugge, L. M., & Jette, A. M. (1994). The disablement process. *Social Sciences and Medicine, 38*(1), 1-14.

Table 1: Sample size and number of deaths and attrition for 1995-2001, deaths and attrition for the follow-up period of 2002-2005

Year	Attrition[a]	Deaths[a]/ Deaths with full information on disability[b]	Persons alive 1995-2001 with full information on disability
Trajectories 1995-2001			
1995		1/	2639
1996	72	93/	2639
1997	92	87/	2639
1998	131	86/	2639
1999	121	86/60	2639
2000	92	75/54	2639
2001	84	69/51	2639
total	592	497/165	2639
2002 -2005 follow-up of survivors			
2002	66	55	
2003	64	53	
2004	88	61	
2005	96	61	
total	314	230	

[a] all cases; [b] all cases with complete health information; health information does not exist for the follow-up

Table 2: Proportions of disability trajectories of survivors during the 1995- 2001 period and of the mortality follow-up 2002-2005.

	Proportion of trajectories among survivors 1995-2001			abs.	% dying in trajectory during follow-up[a] 2002-2005	% attrition in trajectory during follow-up[a] 2002-2005
in %	Men	Women	Total			
Healthy	30	21	26	673	7	12
stable good health	17	9	14	362	6	11
healthy, delayed severe deterioration	4	4	4	113	13	19
recovery from severe disability	6	6	5	142	3	8
recovery, severe deterioration	3	2	2	56	11	16
Moderate disability	36	41	38	1003	8	12
healthy, continuous deterioration	12	14	13	352	11	11
moderate disability, slightly improving	15	17	16	414	7	11
stable moderate disability	9	10	9	237	5	17
Severe disability	35	38	36	963	13	13
moderate disability, deterioration, stable	18	22	20	535	11	12
moderate disability, recovery, deterioration	9	8	10	252	16	16
healthy, severe deterioration and recovery	3	3	2	66	6	11
stable severe disability	5	5	4	110	20	11
Total	100	100	100	2639	10	12

[a] The proportions are weighted by 1995 survey weights

Table 3: Proportions of trajectories by age and gender in 1995

	Men				Women				p-value
	Healthy	Moderate Disability	Severe Disability	Total	Healthy	Moderate Disability	Severe Disability	Total	LR Test
	%	%	%		%	%	%		
50-59	35	33	32	662	28	39	33	634	**0.063**
60-69	25	40	35	373	18	46	36	478	0.104
70-79	18	37	46	141	18	37	45	264	0.684
80+	34	40	25	24	7	33	60	63	**0.054**
total				1200				1439	

The proportions are weighted by 1995 survey weights

LR: Likelihood Ratio

Table 4: Proportion of men and women in the trajectory groups of the deceased

		Proportion			Abs.
		Men	Women	Total	Total
Moderate disability		16	12	14	69
	recovery	2	1	1	6
	moderate disability, recovery, deterioration	9	8	8	42
	stable healthy	4	0	2	8
	stable moderate	2	3	3	13
Severe disability		24	25	25	96
	moderate disability, deterioration, stable	17	14	16	53
	stable severe disability	7	11	9	43
Immediate death	*death 1995-1998*	59	63	61	267
total		100	100	100	432

The proportions are weighted by 1995 survey weights

Table 5: Multinomial logistic regression of experiencing a trajectory (reference trajectory: survival with severe disability)

		Survivors		Deceased	
Risk	Reference Group	OR	p-value	OR	p-value
		Healthy		Moderate Disability	
Women	Men	**0.83**	**0.07**	**0.58**	**0.05**
East Germany	West Germany	0.94	0.57	0.77	0.34
Age					
60-69	50-59	**0.56**	**0.00**	**2.42**	**0.01**
70-79		**0.40**	**0.00**	**3.52**	**0.00**
80+		**0.36**	**0.00**	**7.38**	**0.00**
High Education	Low/missing	**2.04**	**0.00**	1.00	0.99
Marital Status					
Single	Married	1.31	0.49	2.97	0.22
Widowed		1.08	0.81	0.69	0.69
Divorced		0.91	0.74	0.70	0.65
Partner	No Partner	0.83	0.51	0.76	0.73
Const.		1.50	0.18	0.06	0.00
		Moderate Disability		Severe Disability	
Women	Men	1.11	0.30	**0.64**	**0.07**
East Germany	West Germany	0.98	0.88	0.97	0.91
Age					
60-69	50-59	0.99	0.93	1.36	0.40
70-79		**0.49**	**0.00**	**5.83**	**0.00**
80+		**0.50**	**0.02**	**13.81**	**0.00**
High Education	Low/missing	**1.39**	**0.04**	0.52	0.23
Marital Status					
Single	Married	**1.96**	**0.08**	1.90	0.42
Widowed		1.19	0.55	1.03	0.97
Divorced		1.14	0.64	1.23	0.72
Partner	No Partner	1.33	0.30	1.23	0.73
Const.		0.73	0.29	0.04	0.00
		Severe Disability (RG)		Immediate Death	
Women	Men	1		**0.47**	**0.00**
East Germany	West Germany	1		1.25	0.16
Age					
60-69	50-59	1		**4.35**	**0.00**
70-79		1		**7.04**	**0.00**
80+		1		**49.53**	**0.00**
High Education	Low/missing	1		1.23	0.44
Marital Status					
Single	Married	1		0.87	0.83
Widowed		1		0.95	0.92
Divorced		1		0.86	0.75
Partner	No Partner	1		0.70	0.44
Const.		1		0.09	0.00

Table 6: Odds ratios of subsequent mortality and attrition for survivors of the 1995-2001 period

	Mortality		Attrition	
	OR	p-value	OR	p-value
Disability trajectories				
Males Healthy	0.75	0.34	1.26	0.34
Males Moderate (RG)	1		1	
Males Severe	**1.59**	**0.05**	1.11	0.68
Females Healthy	1.11	0.74	0.99	0.97
Females Moderate (RG)	1		1	
Females Severe	**1.61**	**0.04**	1.12	0.51
Age				
50-59 (RG)	1		1	
60-69	**2.12**	**0.00**	**1.52**	**0.00**
70-79	**7.12**	**0.00**	**2.84**	**0.00**
80+	**22.17**	**0.00**	**6.24**	**0.00**
Region				
West Germany (RG)	1		1	
East Germany	0.92	0.62	1.02	0.90
Education				
Low (RG)	1			
High	**0.39**	**0.00**	1.03	0.87
Constant	0.03	0.00	0.11	0.00

Figure 1: Trajectories of survivors who were primarily healthy (26%)



Figure 2: Trajectories of survivors who reported primarily moderate disability (38%)



Figure 3: Trajectories of survivors who reported primarily severe disability (36%)



Figure 4: Disability trajectories of those who died in 2001

Figure 5: Odds ratios of female versus male mortality in 2002-2005 by type of seven-year disability trajectory