



# Health lifestyles in central Asia: the case of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan

William C. Cockerham<sup>a,\*</sup>, Brian P. Hinote<sup>a</sup>, Pamela Abbott<sup>b</sup>, Christian Haerpfer<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Sociology, University of Alabama at Birmingham, 237 Ullman Building, 1212 University Boulevard, Birmingham, AL 35226, USA*

<sup>b</sup> *School of Law and Social Sciences, Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow, Scotland G4 0BA, UK*

<sup>c</sup> *Institute for Advanced Study, Stumpergasse 56, Vienna 1060, Austria*

## Abstract

There is a growing body of evidence suggesting that negative health lifestyles are the principal social determinants of the mortality crisis in the former socialist states. Little is known, however, about health lifestyles in Central Asia, where the downturn in life expectancy was also experienced. This paper examines health lifestyles in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan in order to fill an important gap in the literature. The data show, consistent with the improved longevity of the Kyrgyz population, that such lifestyles are more positive in Kyrgyzstan despite the somewhat better economic situation in Kazakhstan, where the mortality crisis continues.

© 2004 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

*Keywords:* Lifestyle; Mortality; Central Asia; Kazakhstan; Kyrgyzstan

## Introduction

A growing body of literature on the decline of life expectancy in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe finds negative health lifestyles to be the primary causal factor (Adevi, Goldstein, Preker, & Ringold, 1997; Cockerham, 1997, 1999, 2000a; Cockerham, Snead, & DeWaal, 2002; Ginter, 1997; Janečková, 2001; Kulin & Skakkeback, 1995; Ostrowska, 2001). However, this research typically focuses on the former socialist countries in Europe, while little is known about the more distant Central Asian lands. The purpose of this paper is to fill a gap in the literature by examining health lifestyles in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan and assessing their role in the mortality crisis.

## Health lifestyles

Health lifestyles are collective patterns of health-related behavior based on choices from options available to people according to their life chances (Cockerham, 2000b). Health lifestyle practices typically consist of choices concerning alcohol use, smoking, diet, exercise, and sometimes other activities like rest and relaxation, drug abuse, seat-belt use, and preventive checkups by doctors. These practices are either empowered or constrained by a person's life chances. The concept of life chances was introduced by Weber (1978), and according to Dahrendorf (1979), pertains to an individual's capability to find satisfaction for his or her needs and desires. A person's life chances are largely determined by social position and thereby characteristic of particular status groups.

The status group whose health lifestyle practices are primarily implicated in the rise of mortality in the former Soviet bloc is middle-age, working-class males (Carlson, 1989; Carlson & Tsvetarsky, 1992; Cockerham, 1997, 1999, 2000a; Ginter, 1997; Janečková and Hniličková, 1992; Mezentseva and Rimachevskaya,

\*Corresponding author. Fax: +1-205-975-5614.

E-mail address: wcocker@uab.edu (W.C. Cockerham).

1 1990). Cockerham (1997, 1999) has attempted to explain  
 3 this development theoretically by utilizing Bourdieu's  
 5 (1984) concept of habitus. The habitus can be described  
 7 as an individual's organized repertoire of perceptions  
 9 that guides and evaluates behavioral choices and  
 11 options. It is a mindset that produces a relatively  
 13 enduring framework of dispositions to act in particular  
 15 ways and originates through socialization and experi-  
 17 ence consistent with the reality of the person's class  
 19 circumstances. These dispositions generate stable and  
 21 consistent lifestyle practices that typically reflect the  
 23 normative structure of the prevailing social order and/or  
 25 some group or class in which the individual has been  
 27 socialized.

15 Under state socialism, life choices and life chances  
 17 were aligned with a dominant political ideology negating  
 19 individuality and individual initiative. Individual wants  
 21 and desires were sacrificed in favor of personal effort in  
 23 building a socialist society. The government assumed  
 25 responsibility for health and the belief was prevalent  
 27 that a person's health depended on the health care  
 29 system rather than the individual (Dmitrieva, 2001).  
 31 There is some evidence that this situation promoted a  
 33 passive orientation toward positive health lifestyles that  
 35 was reinforced by the absence of any public health  
 37 policies or programs promoting healthy practices on the  
 39 part of the individual (Cockerham et al., 2002). Nor was  
 41 a sense of personal responsibility for one's own health  
 43 likely to emerge in the immediate aftermath of  
 45 socialism's fall, as established norms for individual  
 47 health promotion were lacking.

33 Rather, a group habitus producing an enduring  
 35 disposition toward a negative health lifestyle, featuring  
 37 especially heavy vodka and cigarette consumption  
 39 emerged among middle-age, working class males in  
 41 particular (Cockerham, 1999, 2000a). The drinking  
 43 aspects of this lifestyle were grounded in a Northern  
 45 European tradition of rapid group consumption of large  
 47 doses of vodka (binge drinking) with a light snack  
 49 (Shkolnikov & Nemtsov, 1994). Little or no social  
 51 stigma is attached to drunkenness, which is the  
 53 normative expectation and outcome of the experience.  
 55 While it can be argued that such a habitus is harmful to  
 a participant's health and well-being, the dispositions it  
 produces may nevertheless be the usual lifestyle practices  
 of a person's group or gender. They are reproduced over  
 time by being regularly acted out and become a self-  
 fulfilling prophecy by which individuals adapt to limited  
 opportunities. Bourdieu (1977) describes, for example,  
 how low educational aspirations of French working-  
 class youth were transmitted intergenerationally through  
 socialization to produce a self-defeating form of  
 behavior about advanced schooling.

High death rates, especially from heart disease, but  
 also from alcohol poisoning, and alcohol-related acci-  
 dents among middle-age, working-class (especially

57 manual workers) men, triggered the rise in male  
 59 mortality in the former socialist nations (Carlson &  
 61 Vågerö, 1998; Chenet, McKee, Leon, Shkolnikov, &  
 63 Vassin, 1998; Cockerham, 1999, 2000a; Notzon et al.,  
 65 1998). The most extreme outcome was in Russia where  
 67 the average length of life at birth for a male decreased  
 69 over seven years between 1987 (64.9 years—a modern  
 71 high) and 1994 (57.6 years—a modern low). In 2002, the  
 73 average life expectancy for Russian males was only 58.5  
 75 years. Environmental pollution, infectious diseases, and  
 77 medically avoidable deaths are not the major causes of  
 79 the premature deaths, while the precise contribution of  
 stress is questionable (Bobak & Feachem, 1995; Cock-  
 erham, 1999; Hertzman, 1995). Rather, it falls to the  
 negative health lifestyles of middle-age, blue-collar  
 males, featuring excessive alcohol consumption, heavy  
 smoking, high-fat diets, and lack of health-promoting  
 physical exercise, to bear the principal responsibility for  
 the shortened life spans (Cockerham, 1999, 2000a;  
 Palosuo, 2000, 2003; Palosuo, Uutele, Zhuravleva, &  
 Lakomova, 1998). Female health lifestyle practices have  
 not been as negative and their life expectancy not as  
 severely curtailed as that of males.

81 Prior to this study, however, the health lifestyle  
 83 situation in the formerly socialist countries of Central  
 85 Asia was virtually unknown. It is also not known  
 87 whether a negative health lifestyle is especially char-  
 89 acteristic of middle age, working-class males. The data  
 for this paper will help clarify the existing pattern for  
 Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. We will begin by briefly  
 providing background information on health indicators  
 in each country, followed by a description of our data  
 and methods, and a presentation of our findings.

## 91 Kazakhstan

93 Kazakhstan is the largest of the Central Asian  
 95 countries with a landmass about the size of the  
 97 European Union. It shares a long northern border with  
 99 Russia, the Caspian Sea and Russia are to the west,  
 101 China is to the east, and Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, and  
 103 Turkmenistan lie to the south. Kazakhstan was reluc-  
 105 tant to declare its independence from the former Soviet  
 107 Union, but did so in December 1991, some 4 months  
 109 after Kyrgyzstan. Kazakhstan joined the loosely con-  
 111 federated Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)  
 at that time. Abbott (2003) notes that GDP of  
 Kazakhstan has improved since the mid-1990s, but in  
 2001 was still below 1989 figures. Some 15.7 percent of  
 the population lived below a per capita poverty line of  
 \$2.15 per day and 31.6 percent below \$4.15 per capita  
 daily in 1999–2000. The population of 14.8 million  
 people in 2001 is 52 percent Kazakh, with ethnic  
 Russians—numbering about five million—constituting  
 the second largest ethnic group. Some 1.3 million

1 Russians, including many of the best-educated people,  
3 left the country between 1990 and 1998, but the Russian  
presence is still extensive (Burke, 2000).

5 As elsewhere in the former socialist countries, the  
leading cause of death is heart disease (Abbott, 2003;  
7 Demographic Yearbook, 1994, 1995; McKee & Chenet,  
2002). Heart disease mortality rates for both sexes have  
9 risen consistently the past few decades, although female  
rates now appear to be declining somewhat (Abbott,  
2003). Alcohol consumption, smoking, diets high in fats  
11 and low in antioxidants, and poor detection and  
treatment of hypertension are considered major con-  
13 tributing factors to the increase in cardiovascular  
mortality (McKee & Chenet, 2002). In 1989, life  
15 expectancy averaged 63.9 years for Kazakh men, but  
stood at 59.8 years in 2000—a decline of 4.1 years. Life  
17 expectancy for females was 73.1 years in 1989 and 71.3  
years in 2000, for a loss of 1.8 years.

19 The reliability and validity of life expectancy data in  
the former socialist countries, including those in Central  
21 Asia, have been questioned in the past. However, it is  
now well established that the rise in adult mortality in  
23 these countries is real and not a statistical artifact, as a  
result of improvements in vital registration systems after  
25 the collapse of communism (Field, 1994; Leon et al.,  
1997; Redmond, 2002).

27 Even though both genders in Kazakhstan saw their  
average years of life expectancy decline between 1989  
29 and 2000—the loss is much greater for males. Between  
1989 and 1999, mortality rates increased 240.5 per  
31 100,000 for 25–39 year-old males and 328.0 per 100,000  
in the 40–59 year-old age group (Abbott, 2003). For  
33 males 60 and over, the increase was only 7.8 per 100,000  
during the same period. Similar to elsewhere in the  
35 former Soviet bloc, it is middle-age men who are  
experiencing the highest rise in mortality.

37 Kazakhstan introduced mandatory national health  
insurance in 1996, but the program was short-lived, as  
39 contributions from payroll taxes were unable to sustain  
the costs of health care delivery (Kulzhanov & Healy,  
41 2002). A high rate of unemployment was a major factor  
in this outcome. In response, a new government agency,  
43 the Medical Service Payment Center, was established to  
pay for health care from general revenue monies, while  
45 the central government funded some services directly.  
The state still owns most health care facilities. Private  
47 practice is allowed, but is mainly offered by state  
employed doctors to supplement their income because  
49 of the low purchasing power of the general population.  
The state spent 3.5 percent of the country's GDP on  
51 health in 1998. Kazakhstan remains a relatively poor  
country with major unresolved health problems, includ-  
53 ing a significant increase in heart disease.

55

## Kyrgyzstan

57

59 Kyrgyzstan is small and poor with agriculture  
dominating the economy. Kazakhstan lies to the north,  
61 China to the east, and the country borders Tajikistan  
and Uzbekistan in the south and west. More than half of  
63 the population in Kyrgyzstan lives in rural areas and  
slightly less than half of all workers are employed in  
65 agriculture, compared to 22 percent of all workers in  
Kazakhstan. About half of the population (49.1 percent)  
67 also lived below the poverty line of a per capita income  
of \$2.15 per day, and 88.0 percent lived below a poverty  
69 line of \$4.15 per capita daily in 1999–2000. Kyrgyzstan  
is not only more rural and much poorer than Kazakh-  
71 stan, but it is also predominately Sunni Muslim. The  
latter should have an important effect on health  
73 lifestyles in that alcohol consumption should be  
considerably less than in Kazakhstan.

75 The population in 2001 numbered 4.9 million, with  
about 60 percent native Kyrgyzs. The remainder are  
77 largely Russians and Uzbeks. Male life expectancy in  
2000 was 64.9 years—some 5.1 years higher than in  
79 Kazakhstan the same year—and 0.6 years higher than in  
Kyrgyzstan in 1989. Male life expectancy decreased in  
81 the mid-1990s, reaching a low of 61.4 years in 1994, but  
subsequently increased slightly past the 1989 level.  
83 Female life expectancy stood at 72.4 years in 1989,  
dropped to 70.4 years in 1995, and returned to the 1989  
85 average of 72.4 years by 2000. Unlike Kazakhstan,  
mortality rates for males in the 40–59 year-old age group  
87 decreased by 2.5 per 100,000 between 1989 and 2000.  
These figures suggest that the mortality crisis in  
89 Kyrgyzstan is easing and that the health lifestyles of  
middle age Kyrgyz men are better than their Kazakh  
91 counterparts.

93 Kyrgyzstan introduced mandatory national health  
insurance in 1997 supported by payroll taxes, but the  
95 insurance system covers only some 4.3 percent of health  
care costs (Sargaldakova, Healy, Kutzin, & Gedik,  
97 2002). The state and patient out-of-pocket payments  
(paying about half of all health expenditures) cover the  
99 remaining costs. The high out-of-pocket costs are due to  
the low level of revenue that can be provided by  
101 insurance and the state. The state still owns all health  
care facilities and about 3 percent of the GDP are spent  
103 on health. Despite much greater poverty, however, the  
Kyrgyz population lives longer than their neighbors do  
105 in Kazakhstan, and their health profile is much better.

## Data and methods

107

109 Data were collected by face-to-face interviews con-  
ducted by trained interviewers in the homes of  
111 respondents in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan in Novem-  
ber 2001. The survey was conducted by national

1 organizations experienced in survey research, which  
 2 were the Center for Study of Public Opinion in  
 3 Kazakhstan and the International Center of Socio-  
 4 logical, Political and Social-Psychological Research in  
 5 Kyrgyzstan. The study was funded by the Copernicus  
 6 Program of the European Union as part of the Living  
 7 Conditions, Lifestyles and Health (LLH) Project.

8 The survey consisted of a representative sample of the  
 9 national adult population age 18 years and over.  
 10 Samples were selected using multi-stage random sam-  
 11 pling with stratification by region and area (urban/rural)  
 12 in Kazakhstan and by area in Kyrgyzstan. There was no  
 13 over- or under-sampling of subgroups. The number of  
 14 primary sampling units was 54 in Kazakhstan and 200 in  
 15 more sparsely populated Kyrgyzstan. Within each  
 16 primary sampling unit, households were selected using  
 17 standardized route procedures and within each house-  
 18 hold the adult with the nearest birthday was selected for  
 19 the interview. If, after three visits (different days/times),  
 20 there was no one at home, the next household on the  
 21 route was selected. The total number of respondents in  
 22 each country is 2000, as this size sample provides reliable  
 23 estimates of proportions that represent 3 percent or  
 24 more of the population at the national level with a  
 25 precision level of 0.75 percent. The response rate was 82  
 26 percent in Kazakhstan and 71 percent in Kyrgyzstan.  
 27 The percentage of eligible respondents who were not  
 28 contacted after three visits and refusals after contact  
 29 were not reported for Kazakhstan, but in Kyrgyzstan  
 30 there was no contact with 15 percent of the sample and  
 31 refusals were 14 percent.

32 Nine exogenous variables were employed in the  
 33 analysis: (1) *Kazakhstan*, coded as resident of Kyrgyz-  
 34 stan=0, Kazakhstan=1; (2) *male*, coded as female=0,  
 35 male=1; (3) *age*, coded in years; (4) *married*, coded as  
 36 single, divorced, widowed=0, married=1; (5) *education*,  
 37 coded as primary or without education=1, non-finished  
 38 secondary education=2, secondary education=3, sec-  
 39 ondary vocational education (i.e., medical, technical,  
 40 pedagogical college)=4, non-finished higher educa-  
 41 tion=5, higher education=6; (6) *disposable income*,  
 42 coded as not enough for nutrition=1, just enough for  
 43 food/clothes=2, enough to buy TV/fridge, but not car/  
 44 apartment=3, can purchase expensive goods (car/  
 45 apartment)=4; (7) *occupation*, coded as agricultural/  
 46 unskilled worker=1, skilled worker=2, office clerk  
 47 without higher education=3, manager/professional=4,  
 48 top manager=5; (8) *Russian*, coded as non-Russian=0,  
 49 ethnic Russian=1; and (9) *Muslim*, coded as non-  
 50 Muslim=0, Muslim=1.

51 Seven health lifestyle dependent variables were ar-  
 52 ranged into a dichotomous format. *Frequent drinker*,  
 53 which measures frequency of alcohol consumption  
 54 among drinkers only, is coded as drink one or less  
 55 times a week=0, drink 2-6 times a week or daily=1;  
*Heavy vodka drinker*, which measures how much vodka

(the drink of preference) a drinker consumes, is coded as  
 57 less than 100g at one sitting=0, over 100 grams  
 58 (between 100 and 300g, half a liter, or more than half  
 59 a liter) at one sitting=1. *Smoking* measures use of  
 60 cigarettes and is coded nonsmoker=0, current smoker  
 61 (defined as smoking at least one cigarette per day [the  
 62 mean is 10-20 daily])=1. *Physical activity at work* is a  
 63 measure of how much physical activity is required by a  
 64 respondent's job and is coded none, minimal or  
 65 some=0, significant or extreme=1. *Daily consumption*  
 66 of vegetables, fruits, and meat are coded separately for  
 67 each food item as seldom, occasionally (once per week),  
 68 and 2-3 times a week=0, daily=1. A measure of self-  
 69 reported health, *health status*, is included. Health status  
 70 is a subjective self-ranking of one's own health and is  
 71 coded bad and rather bad=0, quite good and good=1.  
 72 Table 1 shows the percentage distribution of the  
 73 demographic variables by sex for Kazakhstan and  
 74 Kyrgyzstan separately. The distribution of demographic  
 75 variables is similar for both countries, with the exception  
 76 of Russian ethnicity and religious affiliation. The sample  
 77 in Kazakhstan shows a higher percentage of ethnic  
 78 Russian males (39.5 percent compared to 12.8 percent)  
 79 and females (43.2 percent compared to 22.2 percent); in  
 80 Kyrgyzstan, there are a much higher percentage of  
 81 Muslim males (84.6 percent versus 44.3 percent) and  
 82 females (74.0 percent versus 38.4 percent). This pattern  
 83 is consistent with the national population profile of the  
 84 two countries. Also, among secondary school graduates,  
 85 a higher percentage of Kazakhs have a vocational  
 86 education compared to Kyrgyzs. Additionally, Kazakhs  
 87 have higher overall disposable incomes. These results are  
 88 not surprising, however, since Kazakhstan has under-  
 89 gone more extensive industrialization and the economy  
 90 has improved more.

91 Table 2 shows the prevalence distribution of the  
 92 health lifestyles variables. Table 2 indicates that there  
 93 are more heavy vodka drinkers than frequent drinkers  
 94 for both sexes and countries, but this is because the  
 95 heavy vodka drinkers do not necessarily drink fre-  
 96 quently. Among vodka drinkers only, the percentage of  
 97 heavy drinkers among males is the same (55 percent) in  
 98 both countries. But among females, some 76.2 percent of  
 99 Kyrgyz women vodka drinkers drink heavily compared  
 100 to 47.7 percent of their Kazakh counterparts. As for  
 101 smoking, prevalence percentages for men and women  
 102 are not out of line with Western levels, with the  
 103 somewhat higher exception of Kazakh women (32.2  
 104 percent). As for diet, a greater proportion of Kazakhs  
 105 consume meat daily and about the same proportion in  
 106 both countries consume vegetables daily. However, a  
 107 significantly larger percentage of Kyrgyzs consume fruit  
 108 daily. Finally, with respect to self-rated health, male  
 109 respondents in both countries rate their health better  
 110 than females, with Kazakh females showing the largest  
 111

Table 1  
Percentage distribution of demographic variables among study sample ( $n = 4000$ )

Demographic variables	Kazakhstan ( $N = 2000$ )				Kyrgyzstan ( $N = 2000$ )			
	% Male <sup>a</sup>	( $n$ )	% Female <sup>a</sup>	( $n$ )	% Male <sup>a</sup>	( $n$ )	% Female <sup>a</sup>	( $n$ )
<b>Marital status</b>								
Single, divorced, widowed	29.9	(263)	40.3	(446)	25.0	(223)	33.7	(367)
Married	70.1	(618)	59.7	(661)	75.0	(670)	66.3	(721)
<b>Age</b>								
18–34	42.2	(374)	36.1	(402)	41.7	(375)	42.4	(466)
35–59	43.9	(389)	43.0	(479)	45.0	(405)	41.2	(453)
60 and above	14.0	(124)	20.8	(232)	13.3	(120)	16.5	(181)
<b>Education</b>								
Primary school or none	3.6	(32)	6.4	(71)	3.9	(34)	4.6	(50)
Unfinished secondary education	7.0	(62)	5.7	(63)	4.0	(36)	3.3	(36)
Secondary education	26.2	(232)	22.8	(253)	41.3	(371)	39.8	(437)
Secondary vocational education	36.1	(320)	37.2	(412)	24.6	(221)	24.8	(272)
Unfinished higher education	7.9	(70)	5.9	(65)	7.1	(64)	8.7	(95)
Higher education	19.2	(170)	22.1	(245)	19.2	(173)	18.9	(207)
<b>Disposable income</b>								
Not enough for nutrition	8.5	(74)	14.6	(160)	15.6	(139)	22.4	(242)
Just enough for food/clothes	63.6	(551)	65.3	(716)	68.4	(608)	62.1	(672)
Enough to buy TV/fridge, but not car/flat	22.6	(196)	17.5	(192)	12.7	(113)	11.9	(129)
Can purchase expensive goods (car/flat)	5.3	(46)	2.6	(28)	3.3	(29)	3.6	(39)
<b>Occupation</b>								
Agricultural/unskilled worker	24.2	(164)	19.4	(173)	17.0	(88)	15.9	(99)
Skilled worker	45.9	(311)	22.1	(197)	43.1	(223)	28.8	(179)
Office clerk without higher education	8.0	(54)	31.2	(278)	3.3	(17)	17.1	(106)
Manager/professional	18.6	(126)	25.1	(224)	33.2	(172)	37.2	(231)
Top manager	3.2	(22)	2.1	(19)	3.5	(18)	1.0	(6)
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
Non-Russian	60.5	(530)	56.8	(627)	87.2	(784)	77.8	(854)
Ethnic Russian	39.5	(346)	43.2	(476)	12.8	(115)	22.2	(244)
<b>Religious affiliation</b>								
Non-Muslim	55.7	(486)	61.6	(674)	15.4	(137)	26.0	(285)
Muslim	44.3	(387)	38.4	(421)	84.6	(753)	74.0	(812)

<sup>a</sup> Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding error.

percentage (35.6 percent) of persons reporting bad or rather bad health.

Since we are interested in lifestyle differences both within and between Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, we conducted three logistic regression analyses. Table 3 shows the results for Kazakhstan and Table 4 for Kyrgyzstan, respectively. In Table 5, we have pooled the data and utilized Kazakhstan as a dummy variable in order to observe differences between the two countries, as well as determine the overall pattern of the combined data set to establish a baseline for regional comparisons. Table 6 shows the results for self-reported health status for the two countries both separately and combined.

Multivariate analysis, adjusting for demographic covariates, was performed, as noted, using logistic regression. This procedure is employed when the dependent variable is polytomous and nominal. The independent variables may be continuous, discrete, categorical, or a mix. The advantage of logistic regression is that it provides the probability of a discrete outcome for each dependent variable, rather than predicting the effects of several continuous independent variables on a single dependent variable, as is done in multiple regression. The discrete outcome provided for our analysis is the probability of participation in a particular health lifestyle practice for each case analyzed. Logistic

Table 2  
Prevalence distribution of lifestyle variables among study sample ( $n = 4000$ )

Lifestyle variables	Kazakhstan ( $N = 2000$ )				Kyrgyzstan ( $N = 2000$ )			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
	(%) <sup>a,b</sup>	( $n$ )	(%) <sup>a,b</sup>	( $n$ )	(%) <sup>a,b</sup>	( $n$ )	(%) <sup>a,b</sup>	( $n$ )
Frequent drinker	22.2	(119)	20.1	(30)	14.7	(60)	6.3	(9)
Heavy vodka drinker	55.6	(298)	47.7	(71)	55.5	(226)	76.2	(109)
Smoking	22.2	(119)	32.2	(48)	29.7	(121)	17.5	(25)
Physical activity at work	28.3	(288)	13.4	(141)	12.1	(116)	6.3	(80)
Daily meat consumption	27.8	(282)	25.8	(271)	16.2	(156)	16.5	(210)
Daily vegetable consumption	30.1	(306)	41.4	(434)	38.3	(368)	41.9	(534)
Daily fruit consumption	13.8	(140)	19.4	(203)	33.4	(321)	35.3	(449)
Health status								
Good/rather good	80.5	(707)	64.4	(708)	85.4	(762)	73.9	(803)
Bad/rather bad	19.5	(171)	35.6	(392)	14.6	(130)	26.1	(283)

<sup>a</sup> Prevalence, based on sample size by country.

<sup>b</sup> Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding error.

regression does not produce negative predicted probabilities. Rather, it predicts the probabilities of participating in a specific health lifestyle practice, even though the practice itself may either positive/healthy (e.g., fruit consumption) or negative/unhealthy (e.g., smoking). The statistics presented are the odd ratios, which express the direction and magnitude of the relationship between an independent and dependent variable. The 95 percent confidence intervals associated with the odds ratios are also reported.

## Results

### Kazakhstan

Table 3 shows the logistic regression results for Kazakhstan. The initial health lifestyle variable depicted in Table 3 is frequency of drinking. The results show that males, younger adults, non-Russians, and non-Muslims drink most often. Males demonstrate the most robust drinking frequency of any of the independent variables, as they are over six times ( $OR = 6.329$ ) more likely to drink than females. Non-Russians and non-Muslims were about 50 percent less likely to drink frequently than Russians and Muslims. For heavy vodka drinking, the second health lifestyle variable shown in Table 3, only male ( $p < 0.001$ ) is statistically significant. Kazakh males are nearly 18 times ( $OR = 17.695$ ) more likely to be heavy vodka drinkers than females in their country. At this point we should note that there is no clear consensus concerning the best measure of heavy drinking (Malyutina et al., 2002). However, our review of past studies in Russia and vodka's high alcoholic content (80 proof), suggests a

demarcation point of *more than 100 g* (approximately 3.5 oz) of vodka consumed per sitting as constituting heavy vodka drinking. Malyutina et al. (2002), for example, used 160 g consumed at one occasion to measure binge drinking, so more than 100 g appears to be a reasonable standard for heavy drinking and beyond. Vodka was selected as the unit of consumption because our data show that it is favored somewhat over wine and beer as the most popular alcoholic drink in the two countries.

Table 3 additionally shows that males are over 18 times ( $OR = 18.589$ ) more likely to smoke than females, along with males being nearly three times ( $OR = 2.888$ ) more likely to have heavy physical activity at work and 1.3 times ( $OR = 1.318$ ) more likely to eat meat daily. Significant physical activity at work is not necessarily a positive health lifestyle because of the stress associated with work demands and time schedules. The greatest health benefits are linked to relatively vigorous leisure-time exercise (Dunn et al., 1999). Unfortunately, a measure of leisure-time exercise was not included in these data, but physical activity at work is reported here as a less healthy form of exercise. Overall, gender shows itself to have the strongest predictive power of any of the Kazakh demographic variables on health lifestyle practices, with males demonstrating overwhelming negative health lifestyle practices with respect to drinking and smoking, as well as physical activity at work.

Table 3 shows that age is significant for drinking frequency, heavy vodka drinker, physical activity at work, and daily meat and fruit consumption, with older respondents less likely to participate in these practices. However, with the exception of fruit consumption, we know from the discussion above that males are most

Table 3  
Odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for health lifestyle variables—Kazakhstan ( $n = 2000$ )

	Frequent drinker		Heavy vodka drinker		Smoking	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Male	6.839	4.213–11.102***	17.695	4.050–77.318***	18.589	11.688–29.565***
Age	0.976	0.961–0.990***	0.938	0.891–0.986*	0.994	0.979–1.009
Married	0.780	0.500–1.219	0.575	0.140–2.372	1.942	1.141–3.304*
Education	1.030	0.888–1.195	1.259	0.751–2.109	1.138	0.943–1.374
Disp. income	1.007	0.986–1.029	0.952	0.705–1.286	0.991	0.972–1.010
Occupation	1.103	0.907–1.342	0.764	0.390–1.499	0.988	0.792–1.232
Russian	0.508	0.303–0.850**	0.733	0.141–3.801	0.676	0.352–1.298
Muslim	0.480	0.286–0.804**	0.681	0.125–3.693	0.444	0.229–0.860*
–2 log likelihood		730		83		567
Pseudo- $R^2$		0.152		0.266		0.353
Df		8		8		8
	Physical activity at work		Daily meat consumption		Daily vegetable consumption	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Male	2.888	2.221–3.755***	1.318	1.030–1.686*	0.798	0.640–0.996*
Age	0.964	0.954–0.973***	0.976	0.967–0.985***	0.999	0.992–1.007
Married	1.208	0.896–1.628	2.113	1.579–2.828***	1.327	1.046–1.684*
Education	1.105	0.980–1.246	1.002	0.973–1.031	0.998	0.972–1.025
Disp. income	1.005	0.992–1.018	0.997	0.987–1.007	1.008	0.996–1.020
Occupation	0.603	0.523–0.696***	1.363	1.222–1.521***	1.203	1.092–1.325***
Russian	1.140	0.794–1.635	0.783	0.552–1.111	1.721	1.259–2.353***
Muslim	0.704	0.485–1.022	1.319	0.938–1.855	1.263	0.917–1.740
–2 log likelihood		1454		1622		1965
Pseudo- $R^2$		0.208		0.115		0.036
Df		8		8		8
Daily fruit consumption						
	OR	95% CI				
Male	0.876	0.656–1.170				
Age	0.982	0.972–0.991***				
Married	1.066	0.785–1.450				
Education	0.993	0.966–1.021				
Disp. income	1.003	0.989–1.017				
Occupation	1.311	1.157–1.486***				
Russian	1.226	0.807–1.861				
Muslim	1.354	0.892–2.054				
–2 log likelihood		1316				
Pseudo- $R^2$		0.043				
Df		8				

\* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ .

responsible for these findings. The mean age of the males in the Kazakh sample is 39.95 yr and the median is 37 yr. The age distribution therefore suggests the results be largely due to the behavior of younger middle-age males. The females in the Kazakh sample are older on average, with a mean of 42.38 yr and a median of 41 yr.

Being married in Kazakhstan is significant only for greater smoking (OR = 1.942) and daily meat consumption (OR = 2.113). The socioeconomic variables of education and disposable income are not significant on any measure, but occupational status is significant for work activity and diet. Persons in lower-status occupa-

Table 4  
Odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for health lifestyle variables—Kyrgyzstan ( $n = 2000$ )

	Frequent drinker		Heavy vodka drinker		Smoking	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Male	5.444	2.420–12.246***	2.195	1.038–4.639*	20.461	10.460–40.024***
Age	0.990	0.966–1.013	0.979	0.949–1.010	0.997	0.979–1.015
Married	0.869	0.393–1.924	0.589	0.225–1.542	0.734	0.390–1.380
Education	1.012	0.888–1.153	1.169	0.842–1.624	1.003	0.854–1.179
Disp. income	0.989	0.967–1.011	0.947	0.723–1.242	1.000	0.978–1.023
Occupation	0.991	0.731–1.343	0.689	0.473–1.003	1.035	0.804–1.334
Russian	2.021	0.412–9.915	1.435	0.186–11.098	0.952	0.322–2.809
Muslim	0.883	0.188–4.157	1.251	0.183–8.555	0.163	0.055–0.483***
–2 log likelihood		307		193		397
Pseudo- $R^2$		0.085		0.091		0.300
Df		8		8		8
	Physical activity at work		Daily meat consumption		Daily vegetable consumption	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Male	1.850	1.274–2.688***	0.906	0.657–1.250	0.756	0.592–0.966*
Age	0.977	0.963–0.990***	0.987	0.975–0.999*	0.991	0.983–0.999*
Married	1.051	0.672–1.643	0.917	0.626–1.342	1.249	0.934–1.672
Education	0.985	0.959–1.012	1.215	1.042–1.416*	0.999	0.973–1.026
Disp. income	1.178	0.895–1.551	1.022	0.985–1.062	1.017	0.999–1.034
Occupation	0.876	0.744–1.031	0.979	0.822–1.166	1.079	0.971–1.199
Russian	1.109	0.457–2.690	0.797	0.345–1.843	1.329	0.747–2.363
Muslim	0.761	0.326–1.778	1.383	0.632–3.028	0.620	0.357–1.074
–2 log likelihood		798		999		1507
Pseudo- $R^2$		0.054		0.047		0.045
Df		8		8		8
	Daily fruit consumption					
	OR	95%CI				
Male	0.783	0.611–1.002				
Age	0.999	0.991–1.007				
Married	1.083	0.809–1.450				
Education	0.993	0.967–1.020				
Disp. income	1.024	0.998–1.049				
Occupation	1.066	0.958–1.185				
Russian	0.909	0.511–1.617				
Muslim	0.763	0.439–1.326				
–2 log likelihood		1492				
Pseudo- $R^2$		0.017				
Df		8				

\* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ .

tions report much greater physical activity at work, while those in higher-status occupations report the best overall diets with respect to daily meat, vegetable, and fruit consumption. As for ethnicity, the results show few differences except that non-Russians drink more frequently and ethnic Russians consume more vegetables

daily. With respect to religion, non-Muslims are significantly more likely to be frequent drinkers and smokers. Overall, the results in Table 3 suggest that younger middle age; non-Muslim males have the least healthy lifestyles in Kazakhstan.

Table 5  
Odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for health lifestyle variables—Central Asia ( $n = 4000$ )

	Frequent drinker		Heavy vodka drinker		Smoking	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Kazakhstan	2.191	1.459–3.289***	2.785	1.344–5.771**	1.610	1.596–2.567**
Male	6.329	4.182–9.579***	3.519	1.519–6.808***	18.088	12.399–26.387***
Age	0.980	0.967–0.992***	0.970	0.945–0.995*	0.997	0.986–1.009
Married	0.778	0.530–1.142	0.649	0.297–1.417	1.251	0.840–1.865
Education	1.024	0.917–1.144	1.206	0.916–1.588	1.107	0.958–1.279
Disp. income	1.002	0.986–1.017	0.952	0.793–1.144	0.996	0.981–1.010
Occupation	1.066	0.906–1.256	0.684	0.496–0.944*	0.976	0.822–1.159
Russian	0.604	0.374–0.977*	1.118	0.327–3.826	0.770	0.446–1.328
Muslim	0.477	0.295–0.773**	0.905	0.275–2.981	0.302	0.172–0.530***
–2 log likelihood		1045		285		988
Pseudo- $R^2$		0.143		0.184		0.314
Df		9		9		9
	Physical activity at work		Daily meat consumption		Daily vegetable consumption	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Kazakhstan	2.024	1.596–2.567***	2.132	1.724–2.637***	0.589	0.497–0.699***
Male	2.538	2.050–3.143***	1.145	0.943–1.389	0.770	0.654–0.907**
Age	0.966	0.959–0.974***	0.979	0.972–0.986***	0.996	0.991–1.002
Married	1.211	0.949–1.546	1.575	1.251–1.982**	1.258	1.049–1.510*
Education	1.002	0.976–1.028	1.015	0.981–1.050	0.999	0.981–1.018
Disp. income	1.007	0.995–1.019	1.002	0.993–1.011	1.011	1.001–1.021*
Occupation	0.713	0.647–0.786***	1.240	1.137–1.352***	1.145	1.066–1.229***
Russian	1.120	0.808–1.554	0.805	0.585–1.108	1.671	1.275–2.191***
Muslim	0.720	0.517–1.003	1.323	0.972–1.802	1.035	0.789–1.358
–2 log likelihood		2275		2650		3485
Pseudo- $R^2$		0.171		0.086		0.049
Df		9		9		9
	Daily fruit consumption					
	OR	95% CI				
Kazakhstan	0.288	0.237–0.350***				
Male	0.816	0.677–0.984*				
Age	0.993	0.986–0.999*				
Married	1.052	0.853–1.297				
Education	0.993	0.974–1.012				
Disp. income	1.012	0.999–1.024				
Occupation	1.159	1.069–1.256***				
Russian	1.128	0.813–1.479				
Muslim	1.069	0.773–1.479				
–2 log likelihood		2831				
Pseudo- $R^2$		0.119				
Df		9				

\* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ .

Table 6  
Odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for health status variable—Kazakhstan ( $n = 2000$ ), Kyrgyzstan ( $n = 2000$ ) and Central Asia ( $n = 4000$ )

	Kazakhstan health status		Kyrgyzstan health status	
	OR	95%CI	OR	95% CI
Male	2.352	1.824–3.032***	1.929	1.412–2.636***
Age	0.951	0.943–0.959***	0.963	0.953–0.972***
Married	1.336	1.030–1.733*	1.346	0.954–1.898
Education	1.007	0.980–1.035	1.019	0.992–1.047
Disp. income	1.000	0.989–1.012	0.979	0.947–1.013
Occupation	1.140	1.023–1.269*	0.992	0.871–1.130
Russian	0.953	0.681–1.332	1.947	1.013–3.742*
Muslim	1.237	0.873–1.752	3.068	1.642–5.732***
–2 log likelihood		1651		
Pseudo- $R^2$		0.214		
Df		8		
	Central Asia health status			
	OR	95%CI		
Kazakhstan	0.772	0.632–0.943*		
Male	2.152	1.770–2.617***		
Age	0.955	0.949–0.961***		
Married	1.347	1.097–1.654**		
Education	1.012	0.993–1.031		
Disp. income	0.997	0.987–1.007		
Occupation	1.071	0.986–1.162		
Russian	1.082	0.807–1.450		
Muslim	1.500	1.115–2.018**		
–2 log likelihood		2758		
Pseudo- $R^2$		0.201		
Df		9		

\* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ .

#### Kyrgyzstan

Table 4 shows the results for health lifestyle practices in Kyrgyzstan. Gender is once again the strongest overall predictor with males significantly more likely than females to be frequent drinkers, heavy vodka drinkers, smokers, and have heavy physical activity at work. Females, conversely, are significantly more likely to consume vegetables daily. Males are over 5 times (OR = 5.444) more likely to be frequent drinkers, over twice (OR = 2.195) as likely to be heavy vodka drinkers, and over 20 times (OR = 20.461) more likely to smoke. The mean (39.93 years) and median (38 years) ages for the Kyrgyz males in this sample as similar to that of the Kazakh males. Kyrgyz females are younger than the Kazakh females with a mean of 40.36 years and a median of 37 years. Once again, as in Kazakhstan, the finding of younger signifies younger middle-age, and this age group is significantly more likely to have heavy

physical activity at work and to consume meat and vegetables daily. Education is significant only with respect to more educated persons consuming meat daily, while disposable income, occupational status, and Russian ethnicity is not significant. Muslims are significantly ( $p < 0.001$ ) less likely to smoke. In Kyrgyzstan, males have the least healthy lifestyles, but otherwise there are few significant differences in this predominantly Muslim population.

#### Combined data set

Table 5 shows the outcomes for the pooled data set. The odds ratios show that Kazakhs are over two times (OR = 2.191) more likely to be frequent drinkers than Kyrgyzs, almost three times (OR = 2.785) more likely to be heavy vodka drinkers, over 1.5 times (OR = 1.610) more likely to be smokers, and twice (OR = 2.132) as likely to have heavy physical activity at work. These

1 data show that Kazakhs obviously have less healthy  
 3 lifestyle practices. The same is true for males in both  
 5 countries as compared to females. Table 5 shows that  
 7 males are over six times (OR = 6.329) more likely than  
 9 females to be frequent drinkers, over three times  
 (OR = 3.529) more likely to be heavy vodka drinkers,  
 over 18 times (OR = 18.088) more likely to be smokers,  
 and 2.5 (OR = 2.538) times more likely to have heavy  
 physical activity at work.

11 Table 5 also shows that older respondents are less  
 13 likely to be frequent drinkers, heavy vodka drinkers, and  
 15 have heavy physical exertion at work. Education and  
 17 disposable income were not significant with regard to  
 19 drinking, smoking, and physical demands at work, but  
 21 persons in lower-status occupations were significantly  
 23 more likely to be heavy vodka drinkers and have the  
 25 most physical work. Consequently, there is some  
 27 evidence in the pooled data set to suggest relatively less  
 29 healthy lifestyles among working class respondents on  
 31 the basis of occupational status. Furthermore, Table 5  
 33 indicates that ethnic Russians are about 40 percent less  
 35 likely to drink frequently than non-Russians. Finally,  
 37 Muslims are over 50 percent less likely to drink  
 39 frequently than non-Muslims and 70 percent less likely  
 41 to be smokers. Only six percent of the Muslim  
 43 respondents in the combined sample are smokers.

45 Table 5 additionally shows the results for the daily  
 47 consumption of meat, vegetables, and fruit. Kazakhs are  
 49 twice as likely (OR = 2.132) to eat meat daily, but  
 51 consume vegetables over 22 percent and fruit 19 percent  
 53 less often on a daily basis than Kyrgyzs. Neither gender  
 55 eats meat more often than the other; however, females  
 are more likely than males to eat vegetables and fruit  
 daily. People in higher status occupations are also more  
 likely than those with low status jobs to consume meat,  
 vegetables, and fruit daily. Thus, persons in higher  
 status jobs have the most balanced daily diets. Those  
 who are younger and married are also more likely to eat  
 meat daily. Daily vegetable consumption, in turn, is  
 more likely among married persons, those with more  
 disposable income, higher-status occupations, and Rus-  
 sians. Overall, the least healthy diets are those of males  
 and working class respondents, along with older people.

The final logistic regression outcome is shown in  
 Table 6 for self-rated health status. Despite their pattern  
 of higher mortality, males rank their health significantly  
 better than females in both Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan  
 and in the combined data set. This result is practically a  
 universal finding in studies of self-ranked health status.  
 Males tend to feel physically better than females on  
 average and consequently rate their health better, even  
 though they are more likely to die sooner. Younger  
 adults also rate their health significantly better than  
 older adults in the two countries and the pooled data set.  
 Occupational status is significant at the 0.05 level in both  
 Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, in that persons in higher-

status occupations rate their health much higher. This  
 result disappears when the two populations are combin-  
 ed.

Table 6 also shows that, in Kyrgyzstan, but not  
 Kazakhstan, Muslims rate their health significantly  
 higher than non-Muslims. Among the Kyrgyzs, who  
 are predominantly Muslim, Muslims are over three  
 times more likely than non-Muslims to rank their health  
 quite good or good. This result carries over to the  
 pooled data set where Muslims are 1.5 times more likely  
 than non-Muslims to rank their health highly. Table 5  
 also shows in the combined data set that Kyrgyzs rank  
 their health significantly better than Kazakhs and the  
 previous discussion comparing mortality in the two  
 countries supports this outcome.

## Conclusion

The most striking finding in our examination of health  
 lifestyles in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan is the healthier  
 lifestyle practices of the Kyrgyzs. The Kyrgyzs not only  
 rate their health significantly higher, but they also eat a  
 healthier diet, report less strenuous physical activity at  
 work, smoke less, consume less vodka, and are less  
 frequent drinkers. Even though Kyrgyzstan has a poor  
 economy, with nearly 90 percent of its population living  
 below a poverty line of \$4.15 income per capita per day,  
 the Kyrgyzs have a much healthier lifestyle than the  
 Kazakhs and this is reflected in their longer life  
 expectancy. As noted earlier, Kyrgyz men lived some  
 5.1 years longer on average in 2000 than Kazakh men  
 (64.9 yr versus 59.8 yr). As for women, Kyrgyz females  
 lived 1.1 years longer than Kazakh females in 2000  
 (72.4 yr versus 71.3 yr). Although life expectancy had  
 fallen in both countries in recent years, Kyrgyz longevity  
 has rebounded from the increased mortality observed in  
 the transition out of state socialism. Kazakh longevity  
 has not done likewise.

The extent to which Islamic teachings have influenced  
 health lifestyle practices in Central Asia was not part of  
 the present analysis. However, it can be inferred from  
 these data that the Muslim religion, which prohibits  
 alcohol use and promotes healthy practices generally has  
 played a major role in the more positive health lifestyles  
 of the Kyrgyz. In fact, Muslims in both countries were  
 significantly less likely to drink frequently and smoke.  
 The effects of Russian ethnicity were weak, as being a  
 resident of one or the other Central Asian country had  
 greater explanatory power.

The strongest predictor variable overall was male  
 gender, in that males had significantly more negative  
 health lifestyle practices than females on most measures.  
 Earlier in this paper, it was pointed out that the key  
 variables in the negative health lifestyles of the former  
 socialist countries in Russia and Eastern Europe were

1 gender (male), age (middle-age) and class (working-  
 3 group whose high mortality rates for heart disease and  
 5 alcohol-related causes were most responsible for the  
 7 sustained increases in premature deaths. Behind this  
 9 downturn in longevity were highly negative health  
 11 lifestyle practices, resulting from dispositions toward  
 13 behavior produced by a habitus specific to this  
 15 particular group. The question to be asked and  
 17 answered was whether or not such a group habitus  
 19 operated in Central Asia to produce and reproduce  
 21 harmful health behavior? These data suggest that it  
 23 does.

25 Not only is male gender the single most powerful  
 27 predictor of negative health practices, but age is  
 29 important as well, as younger middle-age respondents,  
 31 especially in Kazakhstan, drink and smoke more. In  
 33 both countries, they perform significantly more heavy  
 35 labor on the job. Neither education nor disposable  
 37 incomes were strong predictors of health lifestyle  
 39 patterns in two countries where the average level of  
 41 schooling is a secondary education and there is little  
 43 spending power in the general population. The majority  
 45 of the sample had just enough money for food and  
 47 clothes or less. However, occupation was a significant  
 49 variable in Kazakhstan in that persons in lower-status  
 51 jobs had the heaviest physical labor and worse diets.  
 These findings were also present in the pooled data set,  
 with the addition of lower-status occupations being  
 significantly related to heavy vodka drinking. SES  
 variables were not especially important in Kyrgyzstan,  
 where the economy is largely agrarian and the people  
 poor. Social stratification apparently makes some  
 difference in health lifestyles in Central Asia generally  
 as the pooled outcomes suggest, but perhaps not as  
 much as it does elsewhere.

53 Finally, it is interesting to note that the country with  
 55 the most poverty had the healthiest lifestyles. This is  
 consistent with developments in Russia where the steep  
 decrease in life expectancy in the early 1990s was not due  
 to impoverishment, since the greatest rises in mortality  
 were in the wealthiest regions of the country that  
 experienced the smallest declines in household income  
 (Walberg, McKee, Shkolnikov, Chenet, & Leon, 1998).  
 According to Medvedev (2000), the high mortality rate  
 in Russia cannot be explained by economic factors  
 alone; rather, he finds national peculiarities in diet and  
 lifestyle to be particularly significant. This appears to be  
 the case in Central Asia as well, as one country  
 (Kazakhstan) practices more negative health lifestyles  
 and the other (Kyrgyzstan) more positive.

## 8. Uncited reference

Interstate Statistical Committee of the Common-  
 wealth of Independent States (1995).

## References

- Abbott, P. (2003). *Living conditions, lifestyles, and health in Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia & Ukraine: Social trends 1990–2002*. Vienna: Institute for Social Research.
- Adevi, O., Chellaraj, G., Goldstein, E., Preker, A., & Ringold, D. (1997). Health status during the transition in Central and Eastern Europe: Development in reverse. *Health Policy and Planning, 12*, 132–145.
- Bobak, M., & Feachem, R. (1995). Air pollution and mortality in Central and Eastern Europe. *European Journal of Public Health, 5*, 82–86.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burke, T. (2000). *Population change in Russia*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Carlson, E. (1989). Concentration of rising Hungarian mortality among manual workers. *Sociology & Social Research, 73*, 119–127.
- Carlson, E., & Tsvetarsky, S. (1992). Concentration of rising Bulgarian mortality among manual workers. *Sociology & Social Research, 76*, 81–84.
- Carlson, P., & Vägerö, D. (1998). Alcohol abuse. The social pattern of heavy drinking in Russia during transition. Evidence from Taganrog 1993. *European Journal of Public Health, 8*, 280–285.
- Chenet, L., McKee, M., Leon, D., Shkolnikov, V., & Vassin, S. (1998). Alcohol and cardiovascular mortality in Moscow. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 52*, 772–774.
- Cockerham, W. (1997). The social determinants of the decline of life expectancy in Russia and Eastern Europe: A lifestyle explanation. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 38*, 117–130.
- Cockerham, W. (1999). *Health and social change in Russia and Eastern Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Cockerham, W. (2000a). Health lifestyles in Russia. *Social Science & Medicine, 51*, 1313–1324.
- Cockerham, W. (2000b). The sociology of health behavior and health lifestyles. In C. Bird, P. Conrad, & A. Fremont (Eds.), *Handbook of medical sociology* (5th ed.) (pp. 159–172). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Cockerham, W., Snead, M., & DeWaal, D. (2002). Health lifestyles in Russia and the socialist heritage. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 43*, 42–55.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1979). *Life chances*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Demographic Yearbook 1994. (1995). Moscow: Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

- 1 Dmitrieva, E. (2001). The Russian health care experiment:  
Transition of the health care system and rethinking the  
3 sociology of medicine. In W. Cockerham (Ed.), *Blackwell  
companion to medical sociology* (pp. 320–333). Oxford, UK:  
5 Blackwell.
- 6 Dunn, A., Marcus, B., Kampert, J., Garcia, M., Kohl, H., &  
7 Blair, S. (1999). Comparison of lifestyle and structured  
interventions to increase physical activity and cardiovascu-  
9 lar fitness. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *281*,  
327–334.
- 10 Field, M. (1994). Postcommunist medicine: Morbidity, mortal-  
11 ity, and the deteriorating health situation. In J. Millar, & S.  
Wollchik (Eds.), *The social legacy of communism* (pp. 178–  
13 195). New York and Cambridge, UK: Woodrow Wilson  
Center Press and Cambridge University Press.
- 14 Ginter, E. (1997). The influence of some factors on the non-  
15 homogeneity in adult male life expectancy in the Slovak  
Republic. *Central European Journal of Public Health*, *5*,  
17 133–135.
- 18 Hertzman, C. (1995). *Environment and health in central and  
19 Eastern Europe*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- 20 Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of  
21 Independent States. (1995). *Demographic yearbook 1994*,  
Moscow.
- 22 Janečková, H. (2001). Transformation of the health care system  
23 in the Czech Republic—a sociological perspective. In W.  
Cockerham (Ed.), *Blackwell companion to medical Sociology*  
25 (pp. 347–364). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- 26 Janečková, H., & Hnilíčová, H. (1992). The health status of the  
27 Czechoslovak population. Its social and ecological determi-  
nants. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, *3*, 143–156.
- 28 Kulín, H., & Skakkeback, N. (1995). Environmental effects on  
29 human reproduction: The basis for new efforts in Eastern  
Europe. *Social Science & Medicine*, *41*, 1479–1486.
- 30 Kulzhanov, M., & Healy, J. (2002). Kazakhstan. In M. McKee,  
31 J. Healy, & J. Falkingham (Eds.), *Health care in Central  
Asia*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- 32 Leon, D., Chenet, L., Shkolnikov, V., Zakharov, S., Rakhma-  
33 nova, G., Vassin, S., & McKee, M. (1997). Huge variation  
in Russian mortality rates 1984–94: Artefact, alcohol, or  
35 what? *Lancet*, *350*, 383–388.
- 36 Malyutina, S., Bobak, M., Kurilovitch, S., Gafarov, V.,  
37 Simonova, G., Nikitin, Y., & Marmot, M. (2002). Relation  
between heavy drinking and binge drinking and all-cause  
39 and cardiovascular mortality in Novosibirsk, Russia: A  
40 prospective cohort study. *Lancet*, *360*, 1448–1454.
- 41 McKee, M., & Chenet, L. (2002). Patterns of health. In M.  
McKee, J. Healy, & J. Falkingham (Eds.), *Health care in  
Central Asia*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press. 43
- 44 Medvedev, R. (2000). *Post-Soviet Russia: A journey through the  
Yeltsin era*. New York: Columbia University Press. 45
- 46 Mezentseva, E., & Rimachevskaya, N. (1990). The Soviet  
country profile: Health of the USSR population in the 70s  
47 and 80s—an approach to a comprehensive analysis. *Social  
Science & Medicine*, *31*, 867–877. 49
- 50 Notzon, F., Komarov, Y., Ermakov, S., Sempos, C., Marks, J.,  
& Sempos, E. (1998). Cause of the declining life expectancy  
51 in Russia. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *279*,  
793–800. 53
- 54 Ostrowska, N. (2001). In and Out of communism: The  
55 macrosocial context of health in Poland. In W. Cockerham  
(Ed.), *Blackwell companion to medical sociology* (pp. 334–  
57 346). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- 58 Palosuo, H. (2000). Health-related lifestyles and alienation in  
59 Moscow and Helsinki. *Social Science & Medicine*, *51*, 1325–  
1341. 61
- 62 Palosuo, H. (2003). *Health and well-being in Moscow and  
Helsinki*. STAKES Research Report No. 129. National  
63 Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health,  
Helsinki.
- 64 Palosuo, H., Uutele, A., Zhuravleva, I., & Lakomova, N.  
(1998). Social patterning of ill health in Helsinki and  
65 Moscow: Results from a comparative survey in 1991. *Social  
Science & Medicine*, *46*, 1121–1136. 67
- 68 Redmond, G. (2002). *Social monitor 2002: The MONEE  
project, CEE/CIS/Baltics*. Florence: UNICEF & Innocenti  
69 Research Centre.
- 70 Sargaldakova, A., Healy, J., Kutzin, J., & Gedik, G. (2002).  
71 Kyrgyzstan. In M. McKee, J. Healy, & J. Falkingham  
(Eds.), *Health care in Central Asia*. Buckingham, UK: Open  
73 University Press.
- 74 Shkolnikov, V., Nemtsov, A. (1994). *The anti-alcohol campaign  
and variations in Russian mortality*. Paper presented to the  
75 workshop on mortality and adult health priorities in the  
new independent states, November, Washington, DC. 77
- 78 Walberg, P., McKee, M., Shkolnikov, V., Chenet, L., & Leon,  
D. (1998). Economic change, crime, and mortality crisis in  
79 Russia. *British Medical Journal*, *317*, 312–318.
- 80 Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society*, 2 Vols. Berkeley:  
81 University of California Press.