Education and Obesity in Four OECD Countries

Franco Sassi,

Marion Devaux,

Jody Church,

Michele Cecchini,

Francesca Borgonovi

OECD

DIRECTORATE FOR EDUCATION

EDUCATION AND OBESITY IN FOUR OECD COUNTRIES

Education Working Papers No. 39

Franco SASSI, Marion DEVAUX, Jody CHURCH, Michele CECCHINI, Francesca BORGONOVI

Koji Miyamoto, Analyst, CERI/EDU; Email: koji.miyamoto@oecd.org

JT03276055

OECD DIRECTORATE FOR EDUCATION

OECD EDUCATION WORKING PAPERS SERIES

This series is designed to make available to a wider readership selected studies drawing on the work of the OECD Directorate for Education. Authorship is usually collective, but principal writers are named. The papers are generally available only in their original language (English or French)   with a short summary available in the other.

Comment on the series is welcome, and should be sent to either edu.contact@oecd.org or the Directorate for Education, 2, rue André Pascal, 75775 Paris CEDEX 16, France.

The opinions expressed in these papers are the sole responsibility of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the OECD or of the governments of its member countries.

Applications for permission to reproduce or translate all, or part of, this material should be sent to OECD Publishing, rights@oecd.org or by fax 33 1 45 24 99 30.

----

www.oecd.org/edu/workingpapers

Head of Publications Service
OECD
2, rue André-Pascal
75775 Paris, CEDEX 16
France

Copyright OECD 2009

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

Education and obesity in four OECD countries

An epidemic of obesity has been developing in virtually all OECD countries over the last 30 years. Existing evidence provides strong suggestions that such epidemic has affected certain social groups more than others. In particular, education appears to be associated with a lower likelihood of obesity, especially among women. A range of analyses of health survey data from Australia, Canada, England and Korea were undertaken with the aim of exploring the relationship between education and obesity. The findings of these analyses show a broadly linear relationship between the number of years spent in full-time education and the probability of obesity, with most educated individuals displaying lower rates of the condition (the only exception being men in Korea). This suggests that marginal returns to education, in terms of reduction in obesity rates, are approximately constant throughout the education spectrum. The findings obtained confirm that the education gradient in obesity is stronger in women than in men. Differences between genders are minor in Australia and Canada, more pronounced in England and major in Korea. The causal nature of the link between education and obesity has not yet been proven with certainty; however, using data from France we were able to ascertain that the direction of causality appears to run mostly from education to obesity, as the strength of the association is only minimally affected when accounting for reduced educational opportunities for those who are obese in young age. Most of the effect of education on obesity is direct. Small components of the overall effect of education on obesity are mediated by an improved socio-economic status linked to higher levels of education, and by a higher level of education of other family members, associated with an individual's own level of education. The positive effect of education on obesity is likely to be determined by at least three factors: (a) greater access to health-related information and improved ability to handle such information; (b) clearer perception of the risks associated with lifestyle choices; and, (c) improved self-control and consistency of preferences over time. However, it is not just the absolute level of education achieved by an individual that matters, but also how such level of education compares with that of the individual's peers. The higher the individual's education relative to his or her peers', the lower is the probability of the individual being obese.

JEL Classifications: I12, I21

Key words: Obesity, Education

RESUME

Éducation et obésité dans quatre pays de l'OCDE

Une épidémie d'obésité est en train de s'étendre dans presque tous les pays de l'OCDE depuis les 30 dernières années. Les preuves existantes suggèrent fortement qu'une telle épidémie a davantage affecté certains groupes sociaux que d'autres. En particulier, l'éducation paraît être associée à une plus faible probabilité d'obésité, notamment chez les femmes. Une série d'analyses de données d'enquête de santé concernant l'Australie, le Canada, l'Angleterre et la Corée a été menée dans le but d'explorer la relation entre l'éducation et l'obésité. Les résultats de ces analyses montrent une relation généralement linéaire entre le nombre d'années d'éducation à plein temps et la probabilité d'obésité, les individus les plus éduqués ayant de plus bas taux d'obésité (la seule exception étant les hommes en Corée). Ceci suggère que les rendements marginaux de l'éducation, en termes de réduction des taux d'obésité, sont approximativement constants quelque soit le nombre d'années d'éducation. Les résultats obtenus confirment que le gradient d'obésité selon le niveau d'éducation est plus fort chez les femmes que chez les hommes. Les différences entre les genres sont faibles en Australie et au Canada, plus prononcées en Angleterre et importantes en Corée. La nature causale du lien entre l'éducation et l'obésité n'a pas encore été prouvée avec certitude ; cependant, en utilisant des données françaises, nous avons pu établir que le sens de la causalité semble aller de l'éducation vers l'obésité, puisque la force de l'association est faiblement affectée quand on tient compte d'une moindre éducation pour ceux qui sont obèses aux jeunes âges. La plupart des effets de l'éducation sur l'obésité sont directs. De petites composantes de l'effet total de l'éducation sur l'obésité sont médiées par un meilleur statut socio-économique lié à des niveaux d'éducation plus élevés, et par un meilleur niveau d'éducation des autres membres de la famille, associé au niveau d'éducation propre à l'individu. Il est probable que l'effet positif de l'éducation sur l'obésité soit déterminé par au moins trois facteurs : (a) un meilleur accès à l'information liée à la santé et une meilleure capacité à utiliser une telle information ; (b) une perception plus claire des risques associés aux choix de vie ; et, (c) un meilleur contrôle de soi et une cohérence des préférences dans le temps. Cependant, ce n'est pas seulement le niveau absolu de l'éducation acquis par un individu qui importe, mais aussi comment un tel niveau d'éducation se place par rapport à celui de l'entourage de l'individu. Plus le niveau d'éducation relatif à son entourage est élevé, plus faible est la probabilité que l'individu soit obèse.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tables

Figures

SECTION 1 - BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

1.1   Introduction

1.   Overweight and obesity rates have been increasing sharply over recent decades in all industrialised countries, as well as in many lower income countries. The rise in obesity has reached epidemic proportions, with over one billion adults worldwide estimated to be overweight and at least three hundred million of those considered to be clinically obese (WHO, 2003). The circumstances in which people have been leading their lives over the past 20-30 years, including physical, social and economic environments, have exerted powerful influences on their overall calorie intake, on the composition of their diets and on the frequency and intensity of physical activity at work, at home and during leisure time. On the other hand, changing individual attitudes, reflecting the long-term influences of improved education and socio-economic conditions have countered to some extent environmental influences.

2.   Many OECD countries have been concerned not only about the pace of the increase in overweight and obesity, but also about inequalities in their distribution across social groups, particularly by level of education, socio-economic status and ethnic background. Inequalities across social groups appear to be particularly large in women (Wardle *et al*., 2002; Branca *et al*., 2007). Acting on the mechanisms that make individuals who are poorly educated and in disadvantaged socio-economic circumstances so vulnerable to obesity, and those at the other end of the socio-economic spectrum much more able to handle *obesogenic* environments, is of great importance not just as a way of redressing existing inequalities, but also because of its potential effect on overall social welfare. The current distribution of obesity appears particularly undesirable, as it is likely to perpetuate the vicious circle linking obesity and disadvantage by intergenerational transmission.

3.   As part of its Programme of Work and Budget 2007-08, the OECD undertook two separate projects within which the relationship between education and obesity was explored. One project focused on the economics of chronic disease prevention, and was based in the Employment, Labour and Social Affairs Directorate (Health Division), while the second focused on the social outcomes of learning, and was based in the Education Directorate (Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, CERI). The findings reported in this paper are the result of work jointly undertaken by the two Directorates as part of the above projects, aimed at the common goal of shedding light on some of the characteristics of the relationship between education and obesity, with a view to informing relevant health and education policies. The analyses discussed in this paper represent a development of broader work aimed at assessing the ways in which obesity has spread in recent decades across population groups and some of the social impacts of such growth. The findings of such work, mainly based on analyses of health survey data from 11 OECD countries, are reported in detail in a separate OECD Health Working Paper (Sassi *et al.*, 2009).

4.   Returns to education are generally assessed in terms of increased wages. However, there is a growing recognition that not all of the benefits of education and learning are generated through an improved socio-economic position. Education is directly linked to a broad range of social outcomes, including health, of which education has been shown to be a major determinant, particularly in poorer countries (Cutler and Lleras-Muney, 2006). However, the causal nature of the link between education and health is still subject to a certain degree of scrutiny, and the precise mechanisms through which education may affect health are not yet fully understood. Lifestyles may be one of the keys to understanding such

relationship, as they are often significantly influenced by education and, at the same time, they contribute to health and longevity by affecting the probability of developing a wide range of diseases. Obesity is a close marker of important aspects of individual lifestyles, such as diet and physical activity, and is also an important risk factor for major chronic diseases, such as diabetes, heart disease, stroke and certain cancers. Obesity is also associated with negative labour market outcomes, in term of both wages and employment, particularly for women (Cawley, 2004; Brunello *et al*., 2006).

1.2   Aims

5.   The overarching aim of the work reported in this paper is to provide new evidence concerning the relationship between education and obesity and contribute to understanding the nature of such relationship and its implications for health and education policy. The empirical analyses on education and obesity undertaken by the OECD focus on four countries: Australia, Canada, England and Korea. Data from health surveys regularly undertaken in the four countries were used in a range of analyses, in pursuit of the following specific objectives:

   a)   to explore the correlation between body mass index, and obesity, on one hand, and formal education, expressed in terms of years spent in full-time education, on the other, controlling for possible confounding factors. The main goal of this analysis is to determine whether the intensity of the relationship between education and obesity is constant, or whether it shows increasing or decreasing strength at either end of the education spectrum.

   b)   to assess the extent to which the correlations identified may reflect the influences of factors associated with individual education, such as socio-economic status and the level of education of household members.

   c)   to assess the extent to which the correlations identified may reflect causal links between education and obesity.

   d)   to explore what conceptual model of the role of education as a determinant of health is most consistently supported by the findings concerning the correlation between obesity and aspects of individual and group education.

1.3   Existing evidence on the relationship between education and obesity

6.   The existing evidence concerning the relationship between education and obesity is relatively limited, as the main focus of most research has been more broadly on the links between socio-economic factors and health status, or longevity, with a smaller number of studies focusing on lifestyles and on obesity in particular. The evidence available, covering a number of OECD countries, generally shows strong associations between education and obesity. However, there have been only few studies that have investigated the causal effects of education on obesity, and these studies have reported mixed results.

7.   Cutler and Lleras-Muney (2006) found that those with more years of schooling are less likely to smoke, drink a lot, to be overweight or obese or to use illegal drugs. Similarly, the better educated are more likely to exercise and to obtain preventive care such as flu shots, vaccines, mammograms, pap smears and colonoscopies. They also found the relationship between education and health appears to be non-linear for obesity, with increasing effects of additional years of schooling. A review by Grossman and Kaestner concluded that years of formal schooling is the most important correlate of good health (Grossman *et al.*, 1997). Cross-sectional estimates from a study of twins conducted by Webbink *et al*. (2008), also confirms the negative relationship between education and the probability of being overweight. By looking at differences between the sexes within a study of socio-economic factors and obesity, Yoon *et al*. (2006) found that income, rather than education, had a greater effect on BMI and waist circumference in men, whereas higher levels of education for women resulted in lower BMI and waist circumference.

8.   The correlation between education and health may reflect three possible types of relationships: (a) a causal link running from increased education to improved health, (b) a reverse causal link, indicating that better health leads to greater education; or (c) an absence of a causal relationship between education and health, which appear to be correlated because of possible unobserved factors affecting both health (or obesity) and education in the same direction. The three pathways are not mutually exclusive, of course, and some combination of the three is likely to provide the most plausible explanation of the strong correlations consistently found across countries between education and health, or obesity. Cutler and Lleras-Muney (2006) argue that children in poor health obtain less schooling and because of this they are also more likely to be unhealthy adults. Unobserved factors possibly contributing to the third pathway identified may include family background, genetic traits or other individual differences, such as ability to delay gratification. These factors may explain why the more educated are also healthier. Cutler and Lleras-Muney (2006) found that even controlling for some of these factors, the effect of education on health generally remains large and significant. Although there is evidence to support the hypothesis that the direction of causality is from more schooling to better health (Grossman, 2000), when overall health status or longevity are the outcomes of interest, there are few studies shedding light on the causal nature of the relationship between education and obesity specifically. Results from Lundborg (2008) suggest that a causal effect of education on health exists, but found no evidence that lifestyle factors such as smoking and obesity contribute to the health/education gradient. Natural experiments where policy changes are implemented that directly affect the number of years of mandatory schooling, can provide an indication of the causal nature of the link between education and obesity. Arendt (2005) used changes in compulsory education laws in Denmark and found inconclusive results regarding the effect of education on BMI. However, Spasojevic (2003), using a similar estimation strategy for Sweden, found that additional years of education have a causal effect on maintaining a healthy body mass index.

9.   Michael Grossman's demand for health model, developed in the 1980s, hypothesised that "schooling raises a person's knowledge about the production relationship and therefore increases his or her ability to select a healthy diet, avoid unhealthy habits and make efficient use of medical care" (Kemna, 1987). Educated individuals make better use of health related information than those who are less educated. Education provides individuals with better access to information and improved critical thinking skills. Speakman *et al*. (2005) hypothesised that the lack of education about energy contents of foods may contribute to the effects of social class on obesity. Results from their study show that on average, non-obese individuals in the lower social class group have better food knowledge than those who are obese in the same group. However non-obese subjects in all groups overestimate food energy in alcoholic beverages and snack foods indicating poorer knowledge of the energy content of these foods. Lack of information could also affect one's own perception about their body mass. Research has shown that over time more overweight individuals are under-perceiving their body mass compared to people with normal weight (Haas, 2008). It is possible that more highly educated people have the knowledge to develop healthy lifestyles and have more awareness of the health risks associated with being obese (Yoon, 2006). The more educated are more likely to choose healthy lifestyles; however, it has been shown that the highly educated choose healthier behaviours than individuals who are highly knowledgeable about the consequences of those behaviours (Kenkel, 1991). This could indicate that the effect of education on obesity is driven by different mechanisms, and not just by information and knowledge about healthy lifestyles.

10.   Exploring the link between education and obesity is important, as this may lead to the development of appropriate education-based policies to counteract recent trends in obesity and related chronic diseases. For example, if the findings reported by Cutler and Lleras-Muney (2006) showing increased effects of additional years of schooling for those who are better educated were confirmed by further analyses, these would provide support for education policies aimed at promoting higher education, as these would produce greater health returns.

1.4 Policy and institutional environment

11. Policies aimed at counteracting the negative effects of obesity through the education system can be of two main types: policies focusing on the educational environment, aimed at promoting healthier lifestyles by exposing children to healthier environments and by providing health education; and policies aimed at encouraging higher levels of general education. Although the relationship between years of schooling, or educational attainment, and health outcomes is well established, most of the policies encountered to improve health by promoting lifestyle changes have focused on educating the population about healthier lifestyles as opposed to providing more general education. Each of the four countries examined in this study have implemented policies to strengthen "healthy living" education within schools, with the aim of achieving better health outcomes.

12. Australia has developed National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-First Century, to which authorities across governmental jurisdictions refer to provide young Australians with the best possible educational outcomes and improve the quality of schooling nationally. The Active School Curriculum/ Building a Healthy Active Australia through the Department of Health and Ageing aims to provide young people with the skills to embrace an active lifestyle by introducing them to a range of physical activities. All state and territory governments and non-government education authorities have committed to providing in their curriculum at least two hours of physical activity each school week for primary and junior secondary school children under the Schools Assistance Act 2004. Also, the Australian Social Inclusion Agenda of the Australian Labor Party recommended that more young people from disadvantaged backgrounds complete twelve years of schooling and go on to further education and training.

13. In Canada, due to the vast geographical dispersion of the population, many policies relating to health and education are conducted at the Provincial/Territorial level. Nova Scotia, for example, implemented the Annapolis Valley Health Promoting Schools programme in seven elementary schools, with preliminary results indicating that those schools which implemented the programme had significantly lower rates of overweight and obese students. The British Columbia Children's Hospital and the University of British Columbia implemented a programme called "Healthy Buddies" to empower elementary school children to live healthier lives by providing them with knowledge about health and physical activity. Results from the programme have shown that students had an increase in their healthy-living knowledge and BMI and less weight gain than students who were not in the programme. In Quebec the "Take care of your health!" programme delivered by ACTI-MENU (a health promotion organization) aimed to provide employees with information and support risk factor reduction. Evaluation of the programme revealed that participants were more likely to report more frequent physical activity and better nutritional practices and absenteeism declined by 28% and turnover by 54%.

14. As part of the National Health Promotion Act, Korea established national policies aimed at enhancing people's health through health education, disease prevention, nutrition improvement and the practice of healthy lifestyles. The Health Plan 2010 aims at improving the nutritional status of the population and a part of this was the revision and dissemination of dietary guidelines, enforcing mandatory nutrition labelling and providing information to groups deemed vulnerable such as the elderly and young children. Part of this strategy is to develop the plan in line with educational, political, economic and organizational means. The Health Plan 2010 includes activities focusing on the development of nutritious diets, development of obesity prevention and management programmes and physical activity campaigns.

15. 'Healthy Weight, Healthy Lives: A Cross-Government Strategy for England' targets children for healthy growth and healthy weight. Funded through the Department of Health, this strategy aims to reduce the proportion of overweight and obese children back to the levels found in 2000 by 2020. The NHS (National Health Service) has strategies aimed at offering public advice and support to those who already have weight problems through weight management programmes, NHS websites, as well as by developing

the ability of health service staff to deal with issues of excess weight. Additionally, strategies exist in England to combat obesity through the promotion of healthier food choices, by limiting food advertising to children and working with the food industry to reduce salt, sugar and fat in foods; as well as strategies such as "Walking into Health" to build physical activity into the lives of the whole population and "Active England" aimed at promoting non-sport physical activity.

SECTION 2 - DATA AND METHODS

16.   The analyses reported in this paper are based on national health surveys undertaken in four countries: Australia, Canada, England and Korea. These include: the Australian National Health Survey (NHS) 1989-2005, the Canadian National Population Health Survey – cross-section (NPHS) and the Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) 1995 -2005, The Health Survey for England (HSE) 1991-2005 and the Korean National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (KNHANES) 1998-2005. Further descriptions of each of the health surveys are reported in Annex 1. Health surveys provide cross-sectional data about health status, health related behaviours, and individual characteristics such as age, gender, migrant status or ethnicity, level of education, and socio-economic status, for samples of individuals designed to be representative of the corresponding national populations. Since the focus of the analyses was the relationship between obesity and education, survey samples were restricted to individuals in the age range 25-64 who were supposed to have completed their full time education, and for whom the body mass index is a useful proxy for health risk.

17.   The analyses were conducted by applying the same models to all countries' data, in order to facilitate comparisons across countries. However, differences in data and survey methods sometimes make it difficult to achieve complete consistency. For instance, data on height and weight were measured by examination in England and Korea while they were self-reported in the other two countries. The education variable was obviously a critical one, and the format of this variable varied across countries. We created a variable reflecting the numbers of years spent by each individual in full-time education using all the information available in each dataset on years of schooling and educational attainment. For consistency, we grouped together individuals with no education and those with the lowest level of education, as these two groups were not always separated in the available datasets. A certain degree of heterogeneity was also present in relation to the socio-economic status variable, as occupation-based social class was reported in the English data, while equivalised household income was available in Australia, Canada and Korea. Individuals were allocated to income quintiles in Australia and Korea, and to income groups based on fixed income ranges in Canada. Finally, an ethnicity variable was available in England, while proxies were used in Canada (minority status) and Australia (migrant status). No such variable was available in Korea.

2.1   Assessing the relationship between education, BMI, and obesity

18.   Differences in obesity rates among population groups with different levels of education were first analyzed using logistic regression models controlling for a range of covariates. In particular, we controlled for gender, age, ethnicity and socio-economic condition. We also included in the regression model an interaction term between education and gender for the purpose of assessing differences between the two genders in the relationship between education and obesity. A further analysis focused on the relationship between education and obesity in different ethnic groups, and this was similarly undertaken by introducing an interaction term between years of education and ethnicity (minority status in Canada, migrant status in Australia). The relationship between BMI and education was analyzed using ordinary least squares regression models including the same covariates listed above. All analyses were conducted using Stata 10.

19.   Obesity rates, as well as BMI levels, by years of education were reported in separate graphs for different population groups. The linearity of the relationship between education and obesity and BMI was assessed visually, based on those graphs.

2.2   Assessing the potential influence of factors associated with individual education

20.   Several factors associated with individual education may potentially have an influence on the correlation observed between education and BMI/obesity. In particular, we studied the influence of individual socio-economic condition and of the education level of household members.

21.   In addition to its direct effect on the likelihood of obesity, individual education may also have an indirect effect, mediated by individual socio-economic condition. Figure 1 describes the hypothesised mediation effect. Individual education contributes to determining individual socio-economic status (*a*), which in turn has an influence on the likelihood of obesity (*b*). Such mediated effect adds to the direct effect of education on obesity (*c*). In order to test for the existence of the hypothesised mediation effect, a series of logistic regression models were developed with and without controlling for the socio-economic condition covariate, to assess possible variations in the coefficients of the individual education variable. However, it should be noted that this empirical strategy does not account for a potential reverse causality in the relationships outlined in Figure 1 (*a, b* and *c*).

Figure 1. Indirect effect of individual education through individual socio-economic condition

22.   In a further analysis, we focused on the education of household members, which might have a direct influence on the likelihood of an individual being obese, *i.e.* it may have a concurrent effect to that of individual education (relationships *e* and *f* in Figure 2). In principle, individual education may also act as a mediator of the household education effect on obesity (*d* and *e* in Figure 2). However, we chose to focus our analysis on the former (concurrent) effect of the education of household members.

Figure 2. Indirect effect of education of household members

23.   We hypothesised that the concurrent effect of household education could bias estimates of the effect of individual education on obesity. The education of household members could be, indeed, viewed as an omitted variable that would bias the model's coefficients. So, to test for this concurrent effect, a regression model including this covariable was computed. Multilevel logistic models were used to account for household structure. An indicator of the education of household members was constructed and introduced as a control variable in the model. The education of household members is defined as the years of education of the spouse of the head of household and, when the latter was not available, as the years of education of the head of household.[1]

24.   The effects of the clustering of individuals into households or geographical areas are best studied using multilevel statistical models, also known as hierarchical linear models, random effects models or nested models. These models are a generalization of regression methods developed in the '80s in order to treat hierarchical and clustered data. The seminal work of Aitkin *et al.* (1981) introduced multilevel modelling in the framework of educational sciences. Further developed in the work of Aitkin and Longford (1986), multilevel methods currently represent the method of choice to handle social data in which individual behaviours are assumed to be influenced by some group membership.

25.   Multilevel models consider base-level units (individuals) as organized into hierarchies of successive higher-levels units (groups), (*e.g.* households, towns, regions or countries), by allowing for residual components at any level of the hierarchy. One consequence of failing to recognize hierarchical structures is that the standards errors of the regression coefficients would be underestimated, and in particular those relative to higher level explanatory variables. Multilevel models allow decomposing the overall variance observed in a sample into a "within-variance" component, reflecting variation among individuals within higher-level groups, and a "between-variance" component, reflecting variation among higher-level groups.

26.   Multilevel analyses concerned England and Korea data which are based on household structure. Two-level random-intercept models, using households as higher-level units of aggregation, were tested on samples of people aged 25-64, living in household comprising at least two members. Data for Australia

---

[1] We tested whether this distinction in the construction of the variable had an effect on obesity status by introducing a control dummy variable, but it was not significant.

and Canada do not have a household structure but a regional structure (States in Australia, health regions in Canada) and they were not analyzed here.

2.3 Assessing the causal nature of the link between education and obesity

27.   When exploring the cross-sectional relationship between obesity and education, it may be difficult to interpret the direction of the causal link between the two variables. In addition, the correlations identified might be affected by the omission of relevant variables in the analysis.

28.   The existence of a reverse causal effect (obesity in young age determines the level of educational achievement of an individual) is supported by the findings of several studies. Sargent and Blanchflower (1994), using panel data, showed an inverse relationship between obesity at age 16 and earnings at 23 in young women. Gortmaker *et al*. (1993) found that women who were overweight in childhood completed fewer years of school. Crosnoe and Miller (2004) found that students at risk of obesity achieved worse outcomes in schools characterized by higher romantic activity, lower mean BMI or lower rate of athletic participation, than they did in schools lower in romantic activity, higher in mean BMI or higher in athletic participation.

29.   The potential of cross-sectional health survey data in assessing the causal nature of links between variables is generally limited. We used two distinct empirical strategies to make the most of the available data. In particular, we used data from the Health Survey for England and data from a French survey (Enquête Décennale Santé 2002-2003) not otherwise employed in the analyses presented in this paper. The latter is the only health survey that we could access which provides information on obesity in young age (age 20).

30.   The French survey was used to test for possible reverse causality in the link between education and obesity, by controlling for obesity at age 20 as a possible factor limiting educational opportunities and attainment. The analyses were restricted to individuals aged 25 and over, who were assumed to have completed their education. Two logistic regression models were developed. Model 1 aimed at estimating the likelihood of obesity as a function of a range of socio-economic variables as well as education level. Estimates of the effect of education on obesity based on this model may be biased in the presence of significant reverse causality. Model 2 completed the first model by further controlling for obesity in young age in order to account for possible reverse causal effects between education and obesity.

31.   The second empirical strategy involved the use of a natural experiment approach in testing the causal nature of the effect of education on obesity. In particular, we used a reform introduced in England in 1973, which changed the minimum compulsory schooling age from 15 to 16, as an exogenous change leading to an increase in the number of years spent in education, potentially affecting BMI and the likelihood of obesity. The strategy was based on the use of a traditional instrumental variables (IV) approach, as well as a regression discontinuity approach similar to that used by Clark and Royer (2008) in their analysis of the impact of the 1947 educational reform on health and longevity in England. The latter approach is structured as a set of two regression equations aimed at estimating, respectively, education and health (obesity in our case) as functions of a range of covariates including exposure to the educational reform (in the form of a binary dummy variable) and a smooth function of birth cohort. This latter approach leads to IV estimates of the causal effect of education on obesity, similar to those obtained with more traditional approaches.

2.4   Assessing what conceptual model of the relationship between education and health is empirically supported

32.   As a final step in our empirical analysis, we assessed which of the absolute, relative and cumulative conceptual models of the outcomes of education proposed by Campbell (2006) is empirically supported by the data. The **absolute model** implies that the probability that individuals will be obese depends on their level of education. According to this model, education may reduce the probability that an individual will be obese both by increasing the stock of information available to the individual concerning the health risks associated with unhealthy lifestyles, and by improving their ability to understand and handle such information. When the effects of education are in line with the predictions of the absolute model, policies which successfully promote education and learning and increase the average educational attainment of a population will have the effect of decreasing obesity rates. While our hypothesis is that the absolute model of education generally leads to lower rates of obesity through increased education, the absolute effect of education might also be negative. If education increases wages, and therefore increases the opportunity cost of leisure time, an educated individual's propensity to engage in leisure time physical activity or home meal preparation will likely be reduced.

33.   The **relative model** implies that education serves as a marker of social status and an individuals' level of education relative to their peers', or relative to the prevailing level of education in the relevant social environment, is what affects the probability that they will be obese. This model implies that a generalised increase in the level of education of an entire community may not alter individual outcomes, unless the relative position of individuals within that community changes as a result.

34.   The **cumulative model** rests on the idea that the impact of individual education on obesity is consistent with, and additive to, the impact of the level of education of other members of the same community. Therefore, the likelihood that an individual may become obese depends both on the individual's own level of education and on the level of education of other community members.

35.   To test the above models, regression analyses of the likelihood of obesity were run on the four countries' data using a similar approach to that proposed by Campbell (2006) in his analysis of civic and social engagement as an outcome of education. Regression models included, in addition to the control variables gender and age, two measures of education: the number of years of education completed by the individual respondent (education level) and the mean level of education completed by members of the same age cohort within the same country (educational environment). In order to calculate the educational environment variable, four 10-year birth cohort groups were devised: 1941-50, 1951-60, 1961-70, 1971-80. Mean education levels within each cohort were standardised using the 2005 national distributions of levels of education (lower secondary; upper secondary; tertiary education) by age group, available in *Education at a Glance 2007* (OECD, 2007). Findings of a statistically significant and strong negative effect of individual level education on obesity would provide support for the absolute model. A correlation between educational environment and obesity could be interpreted as evidence of a relative effect of education, especially if the correlation is stronger than that between individual education and obesity. Findings indicating that individual education is correlated with obesity and the educational environment variable is inversely correlated with obesity would lend support to the cumulative model, especially if the latter correlation were stronger than the former (Campbell, 2006).

36.   A further analysis was carried out to test for a possible effect of individual education on obesity, consistent with the *absolute* model discussed above. The analysis exploited age-period-cohort models of obesity developed in a separate component of the OECD Economics of Prevention project (see Sassi *et al.*, 2009) with the aim of disentangling the effects of the three time-related factors (individual age, period of observation and birth cohort) on the likelihood of obesity. The findings of the main analysis showed negatively sloped cohort effects, suggesting that individuals born in more recent cohorts, other things being

equal (including age), have a lower probability of being obese than individuals born in earlier cohorts, with a possible flattening of the cohort effect curve for the most recent cohorts. Here, these models were completed by adding a control for individual education, for the purpose of testing whether improvements in education over time may account for at least part of the negatively sloped cohort effects observed in the main analysis, *i.e.* whether a higher level of education may partly explain why individuals born in more recent cohorts have a lower probability of being obese. The age-period-cohort model used in the analyses is the one proposed by Yang, Fu and Land (2004), based on a robust estimator (intrinsic estimator) which does not require the identification of constraints on the parameter vector by using prior information. The intrinsic estimator method (Fu, 2000; Knight and Fu, 2000; Fu and Hall, 2004; Fu and Rohan, 2004) considers an orthogonal decomposition of the parameter space into a null space for the singular design matrix and a non-null space, where the intrinsic estimator is obtained by the Moore-Penrose generalized inverse. Analyses were carried out on data from Canada and England. Obesity rates in Korea are too low for this analysis to produce meaningful results, and Australian data were not directly accessible at the individual level.

SECTION 3 - RESULTS

3.1   Introduction. General trends in obesity in the four countries.

37.   The distribution of BMI in the four countries concerned has been shifting in a characteristic fashion over the past few decades, as illustrated in Annex 3 and in Sassi *et al.*, 2009. In particular, as in most OECD countries, a sizable share of the normal weight population has been progressively gaining weight, moving towards the pre-obese category first, then progressively towards obesity and, in some cases, morbid obesity (BMI>40). A visible increase in the percentage of the population that is obese was recorded for both men and women, across all four countries. However, a significant difference in trends between genders is observed in Korea, where the relative distribution of females over the BMI categories remained relatively stable between 1998 and 2005, while a 10% decrease in the normal weight category was observed in men, followed by a 9% increase in the pre-obese category and a 2% increase in the obese category. On the other hand, in 2005 Korea had only 4% of its population obese, on average, compared to 25% in England, 18% in Australia and 17% in Canada. In the latter three countries the percentage of overweight men is significantly higher than that of women. In Canada, the majority of men were overweight in all survey years, and the same has been true in England since 1995.

3.2   Is the strength of the correlation between education and obesity constant across the entire education spectrum, overall and in different population sub-groups?

38.   Figure 3 shows the relationship between education and obesity for each gender in the four countries. The relationship is negatively sloped in all cases except in Korean man, indicating that each additional year of education is consistently associated with a lower chance of being obese in Australia, Canada and England, as well as in Korean women. For Korean men, no conclusive results could be obtained as none of the coefficients for education were significant in the regression analysis, possibly due to the relatively small number of individuals who are obese in the country.

Figure 3. Relationship between obesity and years of education in men (left) and women (right)

39.   The patterns shown in Figure 3 suggest that the relationship between obesity and years of education may be considered broadly linear, *i.e.* of a constant strength across the entire education spectrum. However, results for England and Canada might suggest that the effect of further years of education tends to decrease progressively when approaching completion of upper secondary education (13-14 years of schooling), and then increase again sharply in individuals who complete tertiary education. A similar effect was also found for men in Australia, based on 2001 and 2005 data, which provided more detailed information on years of education relative to other editions of the same survey.

40.   When the relationship between average BMI and education is observed, as in Figure 4, the conclusions are similar to what was previously discussed. No clear and consistent deviation is observed from a linear pattern in the four countries examined. Again Korean men represent an exception, as they display a positively sloped relationship, which seems substantially more marked than in Figure 3, where the link between education and obesity was examined.

Figure 4. Relationship between BMI and years of education in men (left) and women (right)

41.   We explored the relationship between obesity and education in different sub-groups along dimensions reflecting ethnicity or minority status (Figure 5). Three ethnic groups were identified in England (White, Black, Asian), while binary variables were used in Canada and Australia to denote, respectively, ethnic minority status and migrant status. The slope of the correlation between education and obesity is broadly similar in women, across all ethnic groups, although Black women display significantly higher obesity rates than others. It is difficult to assess whether the different patterns observed in Black and Asian women, suggesting a concave relationship between education and obesity in the former and a convex relationship in the latter, reflects a true difference in the impact of education in the two groups. This finding demands a larger and more detailed investigation. Education appears to be much more weakly correlated with obesity in Black and Asian men, although the least educated among Black men are substantially more likely to be obese than their more educated counterparts.

Figure 5. Relationship between obesity and years of education by ethnicity groups in England (left panel: White; centre panel: Black; right panel: Asian)

42.   In Canada, individuals who belong to ethnic minority groups are less likely to be obese than White majority individuals. The relationship between obesity and education level is negatively sloped in both men and women, regardless of minority status, as illustrated in Figure 6.

Figure 6. Relationship between obesity and years of education by minority status in Canada (individuals reporting minority status in the left hand panel, others in the right panel)

43.   The analysis of the correlation between obesity and education in Australia does not show significant differences by migrant status, as illustrated in Figure 7.

Figure 7. Relationship between obesity and years of education by migrant groups in Australia (Migrant on left, Non migrant on right)

3.3   Does the relationship between education and obesity reflect the role of other factors associated with individual education?

44.   We tested for a possible mediation effect of socio-economic status in the relationship between education and obesity, assuming the direction of the causal link would be primarily from the former to the latter. (This aspect is further discussed later in the paper.) We introduced a covariate reflecting the socio-economic condition or income level of the household into a simple regression model aimed at estimating the likelihood of obesity. The tables in Annex 4 show estimates of such regression model before and after the inclusion of a socio-economic condition variable. A comparison of the corresponding estimates shows that the odds ratios of obesity according to education level change slightly, towards a unitary value, for both men and women and in all countries, when the role of socio-economic condition is accounted for. This is consistent with a slight mediation role played by socio-economic condition in the relationship between education and obesity.

45.   We also intended to test whether the correlation between individual education and obesity may reflect the influence of household level factors typically associated with individual education, such as the education of other household members. Table 1 shows estimates for the probability of being obese in England using both single-level and multilevel models, where the latter account for the aggregation of individuals into household in the English data. Model 1 is a single-level logistic regression model of the likelihood of obesity without controls for the level of education of household members. Model 2 is a multilevel logistic model with the same covariates as model 1. Odds ratios of obesity according to individual education vary slightly between model 1 and model 2, because the hierarchical structure accounts for differences between households, which are responsible for almost one fifth of the total variance in the likelihood of obesity. In model 3, a household level variable reflecting the education of household members is added. It should be noted that household education is negatively correlated to obesity status (odds ratio < 1) with significant values when years of education are above 11. A comparison of model 3 with models 1 and 2 shows that odds ratios of obesity according to individual education become smaller and closer to 1. This means the education effect is diminished when controlling for

household education level. Therefore, there seems to be a small concurrent effect of household education on obesity, which adds to the effect of individual education. When household education is not explicitly accounted for in the model, its effect tends to be reflected by the individual education coefficient.

Table 1. Odds ratios and significance for the probability of obesity with or without controls for education level of the household in England

	Model 1: Single-level logistic model without controls	Model 2: Multilevel logistic model without controls	Model 3: Multilevel logistic model with controls for household education
	Odds Ratios	Odds Ratios	Odds Ratios
Age	1.062 ***	1.070 ***	1.073 ***
Age squared	1.000 ***	0.999 ***	0.999 ***
Year of survey	1.058 ***	1.065 ***	1.067 ***
Women	1.365 ***	1.441 ***	1.381 ***
Years of education - Men			
8	ref.	ref.	ref.
9	0.938	0.937	0.967
10	0.865 ***	0.860 **	0.916
11	0.771 ***	0.767 ***	0.859 *
12	0.713 ***	0.703 ***	0.798 **
13	0.687 ***	0.671 ***	0.796 ***
15	0.545 ***	0.522 ***	0.636 ***
Years of education - Women			
8	ref.	ref.	ref.
9	0.772 ***	0.746 ***	0.784 ***
10	0.664 ***	0.630 ***	0.697 ***
11	0.588 ***	0.552 ***	0.664 ***
12	0.554 ***	0.514 ***	0.615 ***
13	0.545 ***	0.505 ***	0.648 ***
15	0.346 ***	0.304 ***	0.390 ***
Years of education of household			
8			ref.
9			0.951
10			0.893
11			0.812 **
12			0.819 **
13			0.752 ***
15			0.749 ***

Note: Models are controlled for ethnicity and socio-economic status but for clearness odds ratios are not presented in the table. (***) means significant at 1%, (**) at 5%, (*) at 10%.

46.   Table 2 shows the results of the corresponding analysis for Korea. In this case, differences among households explain about 7% of the total variance in the likelihood of obesity. In all three models, odds ratios for men are not significantly different from 1, although the strength of the correlation between obesity and individual education is somewhat diminished in model 3, similarly to what was observed in England. On the other hand, the correlation between individual education and obesity appears marginally strengthened when accounting for household education in women, contrary to expectations. However, the absence of a statistically significant correlation between household education and obesity prevents from drawing any conclusions on the role of the latter in Korea.

Table 2. Odds ratios and significance for the probability of obesity with or without controls for education level of the household in Korea

	Model 1: Single-level logistic model without controls	Model 2: Multilevel logistic model without controls	Model 3: Multilevel logistic model with controls for household education
	Odds Ratios	Odds Ratios	Odds Ratios
Age	0.960	0.961	0.965
Age squared	1.000	1.000	1.000
Year of survey	1.070 ***	1.070 ***	1.071 ***
Women	3.816 ***	3.871 ***	3.759 ***
Years of education - Men			
6	ref.	ref.	ref.
9	1.539	1.551	1.385
12	1.575	1.582	1.439
16	1.426	1.438	1.123
17	1.801	1.810	1.209
Years of education - Women			
6	ref.	ref.	ref.
9	0.959	0.959	0.795
12	0.412 ***	0.408 ***	0.394 ***
16	0.191 ***	0.189 ***	0.152 ***
Years of education of household			
6			ref.
9			1.181
12			1.053
16			1.320
17			2.281

Note: Models are controlled for socio-economic status but for clearness odds ratios are not presented in the table. (***) means significant at 1%, (**) at 5%, (*) at 10%.

3.4 Do the data provide evidence of the causal nature of the link between education and obesity?

47. We explored the relationship between education and obesity using cross-sectional data, which means that the correlation found may be affected by a reverse causality effect (obesity causing reduced levels of education). In order to assess the potential for such reverse causal effect, we used data from an additional country, France. The Enquête Décennale Santé 2002-2003 provides information on body weight at age 20, which was taken to reflect obesity status at school age.

48. Using the French Enquête Décennale Santé 2002-2003, which provides information on body weight at age 20 taken to reflect obesity status at school age, we found that the variable "obese at age 20" is positively and significantly correlated with obesity in adulthood (correlation 0.177) and is negatively and significantly correlated with the number of years spent in education (correlation -0.035). Figure 8 shows that those who were obese at age 20 have significantly lower levels of educational attainment than those who were not obese, suggesting a potential for reverse causality in the relationship between education and obesity.

Figure 8. Distribution of years of education according to obesity status at age 20

49.   To assess the size of such reverse causal effect, we compared the results of two regression analyses. Table 3 shows the odds ratios of obesity according to individual education before and after introducing the variable "obese at age 20" in the model to control for obesity in young age. Odds ratios for women are virtually identical in the two models, while small changes are observed in odds ratios for men. This comparison suggests that a reverse causal effect is likely to have a minimal influence on the strength of the correlation between education and obesity. However, there remains an issue of potential recall bias concerning body weight at age 20, as suggested by the fact that individuals tended to report round numbers (*e.g.* 60, or 65 kg).

Table 3. Odds ratios for likelihood of obesity with and without controlling for obesity at age 20 (age range 25-64)

	Model 1 without controls for obese at age 20	Model 2 with controls for obese at age 20
	Odds Ratios	Odds Ratios
Age	1.13 ***	1.14 ***
Age squared	1.00 ***	1.00 ***
Women	1.26 **	1.31 **
Years of education - Men		
0-5 years	ref.	ref.
6-8 years	0.93	0.98
9-11 years	0.75 **	0.79
over 12 years	0.85 *	0.90
Years of education - Women		
0-5 years	ref.	ref.
6-8 years	0.84 *	0.83 *
9-11 years	0.54 ***	0.54 ***
over 12 years	0.52 ***	0.53 ***
Obese at age 20		15.53 ***

Note: Models are controlled for socio-economic condition and working status but for clarity odds ratios are not reported in the table. (***) means significant at 1%, (**) at 5%, (*) at 10%.

50.   A second test for the causal nature of the link between education and obesity was carried out using data from the Health Survey for England in a sort of natural experiment, assessing the impact of the educational reform introduced in England in 1973, which increased the minimum compulsory schooling age from 15 to 16 years. Clark and Royer (2008) used this approach with reference to an earlier educational reform implemented in England in 1947, which also increased the minimum compulsory schooling age in the country, from 14 to 15. They found that cohorts affected by the law display only slightly improved long-run health outcomes and their findings did not support a causal link between education and obesity.

51.   We employed a similar approach to that used by Clark and Royer, using the 1973 reform as a way to assess whether the effect of education on obesity is causal. We tested models that included a cubic spline function of the birth cohort variable, as in Clark and Royer (2008), and models that did not, and in all cases we obtained results consistently indicating an absence of change in the likelihood of obesity in the cohorts affected by the educational reform, relative to previous cohorts. This finding does not necessarily indicate that the link between education and obesity is not of a causal nature. Rather, it may suggest that school reforms leading to small changes in minimum compulsory schooling age do not provide sufficiently strong means for implementing an instrumental variables approach.

3.5   What theoretical model of the influence of education on social outcomes (absolute, relative, cumulative, based on Campbell, 2006) is supported by the data?

52.   Table 4 indicates that better educated individuals are less likely to be obese than their less educated counterparts in all of the countries considered. This result can be viewed as evidence in support of the absolute effect of education model, mirroring evidence in the literature on the importance of individual level education for health status and health behaviours. However, after accounting for individual level education, those who are exposed to better educated environments in Australia, Canada and England are significantly more likely to be obese. This finding supports the relative model of the effects of education, which appears to play a larger role than the absolute model in explaining the distribution of obesity across social groups.

53.   The relative effect could operate through several pathways. One pathway that is consistent with both the absolute and the relative models is that linking social position to stress levels and eventually to health outcomes. Evidence has been gathered that individuals who have a lower social position are exposed to higher levels of perceived stress, because of a lower degree of control over their jobs and their life circumstances and because of a less satisfactory balance between efforts and rewards (Siegrist and Marmot, 2004). This is associated with a reduced ability to handle environmental pressures and often translates into less healthy lifestyles, obesity, chronic diseases and premature mortality (Brunner *et al*, 2007; Chandola *et al*., 2008). A second pathway which typically reflects features of the relative model of the effects of education is linked to a higher demand for health inputs that are associated with a healthy weight, e.g. gym and health club memberships, by those who have higher levels of education and occupy higher social positions. In communities where the average level of education is higher, demand for such inputs, and consequently the price of those inputs, are also likely to be higher, hindering access to the same resources for the less educated and less well-off.

54.   Regression results indicate that the association between educational environment and obesity is different in Korea relative to the other three countries. Findings for Korea support the absolute model of the effects of education on obesity to the same degree as in Australia, Canada and England, but not the relative model. In fact, the coefficient of the educational environment variable is negative (odds ratios lower than 1) and it is not statistically significant (Table 4).

Table 4. Odds ratios and significance for likelihood of obesity when controlling for cohort education level

	Australia	Canada	England	Korea
Age	1.060 ***	1.026 ***	1.157 ***	0.992
Age squared			0.999 ***	1.000
Women	0.859 ***	0.808 ***	1.138 ***	1.179
Individual education	0.912 ***	0.959 ***	0.913 ***	0.921 ***
Educational environment	3.347 ***	1.184 ***	2.015 ***	0.989

Note: In Australia and Canada age squared is not available as the age variable is categorical; we use mid-age of each category. Four models are controlled for socio-economic condition (and also for ethnicity for England) but for clarity odds ratios are not reported in the table. (***) means significant at 1%, (**) at 5%, (*) at 10%.

55.   An age-period-cohort analysis allowed to disentangle the impact of the three time-related effects on obesity. The findings of such analysis (reported in Sassi *et al.*, 2009) show declining cohort effects in Canada, England and, to a lesser degree, in Korea (no APC analysis could be undertaken on Australian data). After inclusion of individual education as a covariate in the regression models for the two countries with more pronounced cohort effects, trends in cohort effects become more flat (Figures 9 and 10). This means that part of the reduction in the likelihood of obesity in younger birth cohorts is explained by their higher degrees of educational attainment achieved by individuals in the same cohorts, which is consistent with the absolute model of the effects of education on obesity.

Figure 9. Negative cohort effect with/without controls for education level in England

Figure 10. Negative cohort effect with/without controls for education level in Canada

SECTION 4 - DISCUSSION

4.1 Discussion

56.   A range of analyses of health survey data from Australia, Canada, England and Korea were undertaken with the aim of exploring the relationship between education and obesity. The findings of these analyses show a broadly linear relationship between the number of years spent in full-time education and the probability of obesity, with most educated individuals displaying lower rates of the condition (the only exception being men in Korea). This suggests that the strength of the correlation between education and obesity is approximately constant throughout the education spectrum. Increasing education at any point along that spectrum would be expected to reduce obesity to a similar degree, if the causal nature of the link between education and obesity had been established.

57.   The education gradient in obesity is stronger in women than in men. Differences between genders are minor in Australia and Canada, more pronounced in England and major in Korea. The gradient has not meaningfully changed over the time periods covered by the health survey data available for our study. However, there is at least some evidence that over longer periods of time more educated individuals have been less likely to be become obese than their less educated counterparts, suggesting that education produces its influence on obesity only in the long term.

58.   The causal nature of the link between education and obesity has not yet been proven with certainty. Our own attempt to use a natural experiment, involving a school reform which increased the minimum compulsory schooling age in England by one year in 1973, failed to establish a causal link. However, using data from France we were able to ascertain that the direction of causality appears to run mostly from education to obesity, as the strength of the association is only minimally affected when accounting for reduced educational opportunities for those who are obese in young age. Most of the effect of education on obesity is direct. Small components of the overall effect of education on obesity are mediated by an improved socio-economic status linked to higher levels of education, and by a higher level of education of other family members, associated with an individual's own level of education.

59.   The positive effect of education on obesity is likely to be determined by at least three factors: (a) greater access to health-related information and improved ability to handle such information; (b) clearer perception of the risks associated with lifestyle choices; and, (c) improved self-control and consistency of preferences over time. However, it is not just the absolute level of education achieved by an individual that matters, but also how such level of education compares with that of the individual's peers. The higher the individual's education relative to his or her peers', the lower is the probability of the individual being obese. The latter effect may be due to different levels of perceived stress experienced by individuals in different social positions, and by different coping mechanisms. Access to resources required to maintain a healthy weight may also be driven by an individual's position in the social hierarchy.

60.   The findings reported in this paper concerning the relationship between education and obesity are consistent with those reported in a number of other studies, notably Spasojevic (2003), Arendt (2005), Kenkel *et al.* (2006), Cutler and Lleras-Muney (2006), Sánchez-Vaznaugh *et al.* (2009). Several of the above studies showed a strong education gradient in BMI or obesity, with the better educated, especially if women, less likely to be overweight or obese. We found similar evidence in all of the four countries examined, with the largest differences between sexes in Korea, the only country in which an inverse

gradient (more education associated with higher obesity rates) was observed in men. This used to be a common pattern in many countries early in the 20th century, and it is possible that some countries which still display relatively low obesity rates, like Korea, still retain that feature as a sign of the slower transition they have been experiencing in the weight distribution across population groups. Cutler and Lleras-Muney (2006) also found that the gradient in obesity was steeper in whites than in ethnic minorities. In our study, a detailed analysis by ethnic group could be undertaken using data from England, which showed substantially milder education gradients in obesity for minority men, relative to white men, but similar gradients in women of different ethnic backgrounds.

61.   It should be noted that BMI was measured in England and Korea, but self-reported in Canada and Australia. The use of self-reported data may potentially cause bias in the results, as a number of people tend to report incorrectly their height and weight. However, there is no clear evidence that self-report bias may vary among individuals with different levels of education. Therefore, the correlations reported in this paper may not be affected in a major way by this potential limitation. Also, BMI is not an accurate measure of body fat, or body composition. For instance, those with a substantial muscular mass because of intense physical activity may have a high BMI but a low risk for chronic diseases. However, BMI is a widely reported measure which has proven to be particularly useful in population-level analyses. There is evidence that the link between BMI and the associated health risks is different in Asian populations, suggesting that lower BMI thresholds should be used in the latter to identify individuals who are overweight or obese. In the present study we applied the same thresholds in all countries.

62.   The analyses presented in this paper were based on cross-sectional health survey data, which provide a very detailed source of information on the health and health-related behaviours of the respective populations, but at the same time present a number of limitations, especially in the assessment of the causal nature of the link between education and obesity. Individual education was defined as the number of years spent in full-time education, although this was available in a discrete form and interpolations were required. No information was available on the quality and contents of the education received, which are also likely to influence health and health-related behaviours in adult life.

4.2   Policy implications

63.   Establishing the causal nature of links between obesity and policy levers that could potentially be used to curb the current epidemic is essential for effective policies to be designed and implemented. If changes in education could be expected to influence health-related behaviours and obesity rates in a population, this might strengthen the case for educational policies aimed, for instance, at increasing compulsory schooling age or increasing enrolment in higher education. Cutler and Lleras-Muney (2006), with reference to the broader health effects of education, argued that if a causal link were proven, education subsidies might be desirable. These would promote higher levels of education for a larger share of the population and correspondingly improve population health. Grossman and Kaestner (1997) argued that education policies directed at disadvantaged groups might reduce some of the existing health disparities. Although the evidence currently available, including some of the findings of our study, provides strong suggestions that at least part of the correlation between education and obesity is of a causal nature, a conclusive proof of this does not yet exist.

64.   Health education programmes aimed at promoting healthy lifestyles might in principle generate similar effects to those associated with school education by providing relevant information. However, Speakman *et al*. (2005) argue that these campaigns are likely to be ineffective "if people in lower social strata already know what foods have high energy contents, but fail to act on this information", suggesting that health promotion would mostly help those who have a higher level of education. However, very limited empirical evidence exists concerning the effects of health education programmes, and virtually none is available on differences in effectiveness between socioeconomic groups. Haas (2008) suggested

that more funding should not be spent on public health education campaigns while clear evidence of the effectiveness of such programmes does not exist.

65.   Whether through formal schooling or health promotion campaigns, education may play a role in tackling overweight and obesity. Policy makers need to consider what levels of evidence should be deemed sufficient to prompt action, and how efficiency and equity objectives should be balanced in tackling obesity. Education policies aimed at increasing formal schooling include a flexible range of policies, which may be targeted at specific age and socioeconomic groups. We showed that the strength of the link between education and obesity is approximately constant throughout the education spectrum, which means that similar gains could be achieved in terms of reduction of obesity rates by increasing educational attainment for early school leavers as well as for those who spend the longest in full time education. However, policies targeting early school leavers would likely improve equity by focusing on individuals who are more likely to belong to disadvantaged socioeconomic groups. Similar results could be achieved by improving access to education, *e.g.* through financial incentives, for disadvantaged groups.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: DETAILS OF HEALTH SURVEY DATA

England – Health Survey for England (HSE) 1991-2005
The Health Survey for England (HSE) comprises a series of annual surveys beginning in 1991. The series is part of an overall programme of surveys commissioned the DH and designed to provide regular information on various aspects of the nation's health. All surveys have covered the adult population aged 16 and over living in private households in England. Children were included in every year since 1995. Each year the Health Survey for England focuses on a different demographic group and looks at such health indicators as cardio-vascular disease, physical activity, eating habits, oral health, accidents, and asthma.

Korea – National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (KNHANES) 1998-2005
A stratified multistage probability sampling design is used to ensure representation of the entire Korean population. Trained interviewers conducted surveys in households, administering a structured questionnaire to obtain the demographic, socio-economic, occupational, behavioural, and health characteristics of each respondent. KNHANES is a nationwide cross-sectional study using a stratified, multistage probability sampling design for the selection of household units. We analyze the data from the three surveys 1998, 2001 and 2005.

Canada – National Population Health Survey (1995) and Canadian Community Health Survey (2001-2005)
The NPHS and CCHS are designed to collect information on the health of the Canadian population and related socio-demographic information. The first cycle of data collection of NPHS began in 1994, and continues every second year thereafter. The survey is designed to produce both cross-sectional and longitudinal estimates. As NPHS became strictly longitudinal in 2001, CCHS took over in 2001. The questionnaires include content related to health status, use of health services, determinants of health, a health index, chronic conditions and activity restrictions. We focus on four surveys: NPHS 1994/95, CCHS 2001, 2003 and 2005.

Australia – National Health Survey (NHS) 1989-2005
The NHS contains a cross-section of survey results, including selected national statistics about long-term illnesses experienced; mental wellbeing; injuries; consultations with doctors and other health professionals; and health risk factors including alcohol consumption, smoking, exercise, body mass and dietary practices. The survey design enables information for all topics to be analysed in relation to other topics, and in relation to a range of demographic and socio-economic characteristics. The surveys were conducted in 1989, 1995, 2001 and 2005.

ANNEX 2: Sample Characteristics

Table 1: Sample characteristics (weighted percentages), Australia

		1989			1995			2001			2005		
		men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total
Total frequency		12,499	12,490	24,989	10,932	10,904	21,836	4,744	5,164	9,908	5,348	5,590	10,938
Age group	25-39	16.5%	16.7%	16.6%	15.3%	15.6%	15.4%	11.4%	12.8%	12.1%	12.4%	12.9%	12.7%
	30-34	16.2%	16.5%	16.4%	15.9%	16.1%	16.0%	13.9%	15.1%	14.4%	14.4%	15.0%	14.7%
	35-39	15.1%	15.4%	15.2%	15.2%	15.6%	15.4%	14.9%	15.4%	15.1%	13.9%	14.4%	14.1%
	40-44	14.6%	14.5%	14.5%	14.0%	14.0%	14.0%	15.2%	14.3%	14.8%	14.4%	14.6%	14.5%
	45-49	11.7%	11.1%	11.4%	12.9%	13.1%	13.0%	13.3%	13.2%	13.2%	13.2%	13.2%	13.2%
	50-54	9.4%	9.2%	9.3%	10.7%	10.1%	10.4%	13.1%	12.1%	12.6%	11.6%	11.3%	11.5%
	55-59	8.3%	8.2%	8.2%	8.7%	8.0%	8.4%	10.1%	9.3%	9.7%	11.3%	10.3%	10.8%
	60-64	8.2%	8.5%	8.3%	7.4%	7.4%	7.4%	8.2%	7.8%	8.0%	8.8%	8.2%	8.5%
Equivalized income	upper	31.6%	26.9%	29.3%	30.0%	26.0%	28.0%	31.3%	25.7%	28.6%	30.4%	24.4%	27.5%
	upper middle	25.6%	23.6%	24.6%	23.6%	22.3%	23.0%	22.5%	21.9%	22.2%	24.4%	21.0%	22.8%
	middle	20.0%	19.5%	19.8%	18.8%	18.5%	18.7%	19.4%	19.2%	19.3%	19.8%	21.1%	20.4%
	lower middle	13.9%	17.4%	15.6%	12.7%	16.5%	14.6%	12.9%	16.0%	14.4%	14.5%	17.1%	15.8%
	lower	8.9%	12.6%	10.7%	15.0%	16.6%	15.8%	13.9%	17.1%	15.5%	10.9%	16.4%	13.6%
Migrant	yes	31.2%	29.2%	30.2%	29.8%	29.2%	29.5%	29.2%	28.9%	29.1%	28.4%	28.9%	28.7%
	no	68.8%	70.8%	69.8%	70.2%	70.8%	70.5%	70.8%	71.1%	70.9%	71.6%	71.1%	71.3%
Obese	no	90.8%	89.6%	90.2%	86.4%	86.5%	86.4%	82.8%	81.8%	82.3%	78.1%	81.6%	79.8%
	yes	9.2%	10.4%	9.8%	13.6%	13.5%	13.6%	17.2%	18.2%	17.7%	21.9%	18.4%	20.2%
Over-weight	no	51.3%	67.0%	59.0%	43.8%	60.7%	52.0%	37.9%	55.7%	46.6%	32.2%	53.0%	42.3%
	yes	48.7%	33.0%	41.0%	56.2%	39.3%	48.0%	62.1%	44.3%	53.4%	67.8%	47.0%	57.7%
BMI classification	underweight	1.1%	5.1%	3.1%	0.9%	3.7%	2.3%	0.8%	3.4%	2.1%	0.5%	3.0%	1.7%
	normal	50.1%	61.9%	55.9%	42.9%	57.0%	49.8%	37.2%	52.2%	44.5%	31.7%	50.0%	40.6%
	overweight	39.5%	22.6%	31.2%	42.6%	25.7%	34.4%	44.8%	26.2%	35.7%	45.9%	28.6%	37.5%
	obese	9.2%	10.4%	9.8%	13.6%	13.5%	13.6%	17.2%	18.2%	17.7%	21.9%	18.4%	20.2%
Years of education	0-8	17.8%	17.9%	17.9%	13.8%	13.2%	13.5%	10.0%	8.3%	9.2%	6.7%	5.4%	6.1%
	9-11	65.8%	70.2%	68.0%	67.1%	71.2%	69.1%	67.6%	72.1%	69.8%	45.6%	44.0%	44.8%
	over 12	16.4%	11.9%	14.2%	19.2%	15.6%	17.4%	22.4%	19.6%	21.0%	47.7%	50.6%	49.1%

Table 2:   Sample characteristics (weighted percentages), Canada

		1995			2001			2003			2005		
		men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total
Total frequency		5,009	5,560	10,569	35,044	36,852	71,896	33,154	34,911	68,065	33,471	35,495	68,966
Age group	25-39	13.9%	12.6%	13.2%	12.0%	11.5%	11.8%	12.0%	11.4%	11.7%	11.8%	11.6%	11.7%
	30-34	16.3%	17.5%	16.9%	13.3%	12.5%	12.9%	11.9%	12.0%	12.0%	11.7%	11.8%	11.7%
	35-39	17.1%	16.4%	16.8%	15.6%	15.9%	15.7%	15.0%	14.8%	14.9%	13.3%	13.1%	13.2%
	40-44	14.8%	14.7%	14.7%	16.5%	16.5%	16.5%	16.6%	16.4%	16.5%	16.4%	16.0%	16.2%
	45-49	13.2%	12.0%	12.6%	14.0%	14.7%	14.4%	13.6%	14.2%	13.9%	14.3%	14.9%	14.6%
	50-54	10.2%	9.9%	10.0%	12.2%	12.4%	12.3%	12.4%	12.8%	12.6%	12.5%	13.3%	12.9%
	55-59	7.7%	8.8%	8.2%	9.4%	9.2%	9.3%	10.6%	10.6%	10.6%	11.2%	10.9%	11.1%
	60-64	7.0%	8.1%	7.5%	7.0%	7.4%	7.2%	7.8%	7.8%	7.8%	8.8%	8.4%	8.6%
Equivalized income	upper	19.9%	16.5%	18.2%	37.7%	31.8%	34.8%	45.0%	37.7%	41.5%	54.2%	47.6%	51.0%
	upper middle	41.1%	37.9%	39.5%	37.1%	36.6%	36.8%	34.2%	35.9%	35.0%	26.0%	27.1%	26.6%
	middle	25.6%	28.3%	26.9%	17.1%	20.2%	18.6%	14.6%	17.7%	16.1%	12.9%	15.9%	14.4%
	lower middle	8.8%	11.4%	10.1%	4.8%	7.3%	6.0%	3.8%	5.6%	4.7%	3.0%	4.1%	3.5%
	lower	4.7%	5.9%	5.3%	3.3%	4.1%	3.7%	2.4%	3.0%	2.7%	3.9%	5.3%	4.5%
Minority	no				86.0%	85.9%	86.0%	84.3%	85.3%	84.8%	83.6%	84.0%	83.8%
	yes				14.0%	14.1%	14.0%	15.7%	14.7%	15.2%	16.4%	16.0%	16.2%
Obese	no	85.9%	86.1%	86.0%	82.5%	84.8%	83.6%	82.1%	84.2%	83.1%	81.2%	83.8%	82.5%
	yes	14.1%	13.9%	14.0%	17.5%	15.2%	16.4%	17.9%	15.8%	16.9%	18.8%	16.2%	17.5%
Over-weight	no	39.0%	59.2%	49.0%	40.4%	57.4%	48.7%	38.5%	57.0%	47.5%	37.7%	56.4%	46.7%
	yes	61.0%	40.8%	51.0%	59.6%	42.6%	51.3%	61.5%	43.0%	52.5%	62.3%	43.6%	53.3%
BMI classification	underweight	0.5%	2.6%	1.5%	0.9%	3.4%	2.1%	0.7%	3.1%	1.9%	0.7%	3.5%	2.0%
	normal	38.5%	56.6%	47.4%	39.5%	53.9%	46.6%	37.8%	54.0%	45.6%	37.1%	52.9%	44.7%
	overweight	46.9%	27.0%	37.1%	42.1%	27.5%	34.9%	43.6%	27.1%	35.6%	43.5%	27.5%	35.7%
	obese	14.1%	13.9%	14.0%	17.5%	15.2%	16.4%	17.9%	15.8%	16.9%	18.8%	16.2%	17.5%
Years of education	8	21.6%	21.1%	21.4%	18.1%	16.8%	17.4%	14.1%	13.3%	13.7%	12.4%	10.7%	11.6%
	12	14.9%	18.4%	16.6%	18.2%	21.3%	19.7%	18.0%	19.6%	18.7%	14.8%	15.8%	15.3%
	14	23.7%	25.0%	24.3%	6.9%	7.3%	7.1%	6.3%	6.6%	6.5%	7.1%	6.7%	6.9%
	17	39.8%	35.5%	37.7%	56.9%	54.6%	55.8%	61.6%	60.5%	61.1%	65.7%	66.8%	66.3%

Table 3: Sample characteristics (unweighted percentages), England

		1991			1992			1993			1994			1995			1996			1997			1998		
		men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total
	Total Frequency	937	1046	1983	1162	1242	2404	5000	5364	10364	4557	5073	9630	4536	5108	9644	4734	5303	10037	2514	2867	5381	4484	5221	9705
Age group	25-39	14.8%	13.4%	14.1%	15.6%	15.3%	15.4%	14.2%	14.1%	14.2%	14.0%	14.3%	14.1%	12.1%	13.6%	12.9%	12.1%	12.7%	12.5%	13.1%	12.6%	12.8%	12.3%	12.4%	12.4%
	30-34	14.6%	15.5%	15.1%	12.0%	12.9%	12.5%	14.3%	14.6%	14.4%	15.3%	15.0%	15.1%	15.6%	15.2%	15.4%	14.3%	14.7%	14.6%	13.9%	14.9%	14.4%	14.6%	14.4%	14.5%
	35-39	13.1%	12.4%	12.8%	13.6%	14.1%	13.9%	13.1%	13.9%	13.5%	15.1%	14.7%	14.9%	15.1%	13.6%	14.3%	13.9%	14.7%	14.3%	13.9%	13.2%	13.5%	14.4%	14.7%	14.6%
	40-44	14.3%	15.2%	14.8%	14.3%	14.2%	14.2%	12.9%	13.2%	13.0%	12.4%	12.8%	12.6%	13.0%	12.9%	13.0%	13.9%	12.8%	13.4%	13.6%	13.5%	13.5%	12.3%	12.4%	12.4%
	45-49	12.3%	11.5%	11.9%	14.0%	12.0%	13.0%	14.3%	13.6%	13.9%	12.7%	13.5%	13.1%	12.4%	12.9%	12.7%	14.1%	13.7%	13.9%	13.6%	13.9%	13.8%	13.4%	12.6%	13.0%
	50-54	10.0%	10.5%	10.3%	10.8%	10.8%	10.8%	10.6%	10.8%	10.7%	10.4%	10.3%	10.3%	11.4%	11.6%	11.6%	12.0%	12.1%	12.0%	12.1%	12.6%	12.4%	12.8%	13.4%	13.1%
	55-59	10.1%	10.5%	10.3%	9.2%	9.4%	9.3%	10.7%	9.9%	10.3%	9.8%	9.5%	9.7%	10.2%	10.5%	10.4%	9.6%	9.4%	9.5%	10.1%	9.8%	10.0%	9.7%	9.8%	9.8%
	60-64	10.7%	11.0%	10.8%	10.5%	11.4%	10.9%	9.9%	10.0%	9.9%	10.4%	9.9%	10.1%	10.1%	9.6%	9.8%	10.1%	9.8%	9.9%	9.7%	9.5%	9.6%	10.4%	10.3%	10.3%
Socioeconomic status	upper	7.6%	1.8%	4.5%	8.6%	1.8%	5.1%	10.0%	2.4%	6.0%	8.3%	2.3%	5.1%	8.4%	1.9%	5.0%	7.5%	2.2%	4.7%	8.0%	2.3%	5.0%	7.2%	2.4%	4.7%
	upper middle	32.9%	26.6%	29.6%	30.3%	25.7%	27.9%	30.3%	26.6%	28.4%	29.6%	26.3%	27.9%	31.1%	25.6%	28.2%	32.3%	25.9%	29.0%	31.3%	25.3%	28.1%	31.8%	25.6%	28.5%
	middle	40.8%	42.9%	41.9%	43.3%	47.8%	45.6%	43.9%	44.1%	44.0%	43.2%	44.0%	43.6%	42.7%	46.4%	44.6%	42.8%	45.0%	43.9%	42.4%	45.3%	43.9%	42.6%	44.3%	43.5%
	lower middle	14.3%	18.5%	16.5%	13.3%	15.8%	14.6%	11.7%	18.8%	15.4%	13.8%	19.8%	17.0%	13.1%	19.0%	16.2%	12.7%	19.7%	16.4%	14.7%	19.9%	17.5%	13.6%	19.7%	16.9%
	lower	4.5%	10.2%	7.5%	4.5%	8.9%	6.8%	4.1%	8.1%	6.2%	5.0%	7.6%	6.4%	4.7%	7.2%	6.0%	4.7%	7.2%	6.0%	3.6%	7.2%	5.5%	4.7%	7.9%	6.4%
Ethnicity	White	95.8%	96.1%	96.0%	95.3%	96.1%	95.7%	95.2%	95.3%	95.3%	95.2%	95.4%	95.3%	95.4%	95.6%	95.5%	94.6%	94.8%	94.7%	94.3%	94.8%	94.6%	95.0%	95.4%	95.2%
	Black	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	1.2%	1.7%	1.5%	1.8%	2.0%	1.9%	1.4%	2.1%	1.7%	1.3%	1.6%	1.5%	1.8%	2.2%	2.0%	1.7%	1.9%	1.8%	2.1%	1.9%	2.0%
	Asian	2.1%	1.9%	2.0%	3.5%	2.2%	2.8%	3.0%	2.7%	2.9%	3.4%	2.5%	2.9%	3.3%	2.8%	3.0%	3.6%	3.0%	3.3%	4.1%	3.3%	3.6%	2.9%	2.7%	2.8%
Obese	no	85.5%	82.6%	84.0%	86.0%	82.0%	83.9%	85.3%	82.7%	83.9%	85.0%	82.3%	83.6%	83.1%	81.8%	82.4%	81.8%	80.9%	81.3%	81.0%	79.3%	80.1%	81.2%	78.3%	79.6%
	yes	14.5%	17.4%	16.0%	14.0%	18.0%	16.1%	14.7%	17.3%	16.1%	15.0%	17.7%	16.4%	16.9%	18.2%	17.6%	18.2%	19.1%	18.7%	19.0%	20.7%	19.9%	18.8%	21.7%	20.4%
Over-weight	no	42.7%	54.2%	48.8%	39.9%	53.5%	47.0%	38.3%	50.9%	44.8%	38.6%	51.2%	45.3%	36.8%	49.2%	43.4%	34.4%	47.0%	41.0%	33.4%	46.9%	40.6%	33.0%	45.5%	39.7%
	yes	57.3%	45.8%	51.2%	60.1%	46.5%	53.0%	61.7%	49.1%	55.2%	61.4%	48.8%	54.7%	63.2%	50.8%	56.6%	65.6%	53.0%	59.0%	66.6%	53.1%	59.4%	67.0%	54.5%	60.3%
BMI classification	underweight	1.2%	2.0%	1.6%	0.9%	2.0%	1.5%	0.7%	1.4%	1.1%	0.6%	1.6%	1.1%	0.7%	1.4%	1.0%	0.6%	1.2%	0.9%	0.3%	1.5%	0.9%	0.6%	1.2%	0.9%
	normal	41.5%	52.2%	47.2%	39.1%	51.5%	45.5%	37.5%	49.5%	43.7%	38.1%	49.6%	44.2%	36.2%	47.8%	42.3%	33.8%	45.9%	40.2%	33.1%	45.4%	39.6%	32.4%	44.3%	38.8%
	overweight	42.8%	28.4%	35.2%	46.0%	28.5%	37.0%	47.0%	31.8%	39.1%	46.4%	31.1%	38.3%	46.3%	32.6%	39.0%	47.4%	33.9%	40.3%	47.6%	32.4%	39.5%	48.2%	32.8%	39.9%
	obese	14.5%	17.4%	16.0%	14.0%	18.0%	16.1%	14.7%	17.3%	16.1%	15.0%	17.7%	16.4%	16.9%	18.2%	17.6%	18.2%	19.1%	18.7%	19.0%	20.7%	19.9%	18.8%	21.7%	20.4%
Years of education	8	11.4%	12.0%	11.7%	10.2%	9.3%	9.7%	8.5%	8.2%	8.3%	7.5%	6.8%	7.1%	6.7%	5.5%	6.1%	5.0%	5.2%	5.1%	3.7%	4.4%	4.1%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%
	9	30.6%	29.3%	29.9%	28.4%	29.9%	29.2%	27.7%	29.2%	28.5%	25.2%	27.8%	26.5%	27.3%	29.1%	28.2%	26.8%	26.7%	26.7%	26.0%	29.1%	27.6%	27.8%	27.1%	27.4%
	10	27.2%	26.9%	27.0%	28.8%	28.8%	28.8%	29.4%	27.7%	28.5%	31.6%	28.4%	29.9%	30.6%	29.3%	29.9%	31.8%	31.4%	31.6%	31.5%	30.1%	30.7%	32.2%	31.8%	32.0%
	11	7.7%	9.3%	8.5%	7.0%	9.2%	8.1%	7.5%	8.7%	8.1%	7.5%	10.0%	8.8%	8.1%	10.0%	9.1%	7.5%	10.1%	8.8%	7.9%	9.4%	8.7%	7.5%	9.4%	8.5%
	12	5.1%	10.0%	7.7%	6.7%	10.0%	8.4%	7.2%	9.4%	8.3%	7.5%	10.2%	8.9%	7.5%	10.0%	8.8%	7.3%	9.3%	8.3%	8.5%	10.1%	9.4%	7.1%	11.0%	9.2%
	13	5.7%	6.8%	6.3%	7.7%	6.0%	6.8%	6.9%	8.9%	8.0%	8.3%	8.2%	8.2%	19.8%	16.0%	17.8%	21.4%	17.3%	19.2%	8.5%	7.1%	7.7%	8.4%	8.0%	8.2%
	15	12.3%	5.8%	8.9%	11.3%	6.8%	8.9%	12.9%	7.8%	10.3%	12.5%	8.7%	10.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	14.0%	9.8%	11.8%	14.1%	9.8%	11.8%

Table 3 (continued):   Sample characteristics (unweighted percentages), England

		1999			2000			2001			2002			2003			2004			2005		
		men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total
Total Frequency		2190	2494	4684	2186	2520	4706	4261	4976	9237	1971	2531	4502	4025	4745	8770	3027	3689	6716	1950	2342	4292
Age group	25-39	11.4%	10.2%	10.7%	11.0%	11.5%	11.3%	10.4%	10.7%	10.6%	10.2%	11.7%	11.0%	9.6%	9.3%	9.4%	11.5%	12.4%	12.0%	8.8%	10.0%	9.5%
	30-34	13.8%	14.8%	14.3%	15.2%	14.4%	14.7%	13.4%	12.7%	13.0%	12.3%	14.0%	13.3%	12.8%	12.3%	12.6%	15.8%	13.6%	14.6%	13.5%	11.3%	12.3%
	35-39	15.2%	15.4%	15.3%	15.0%	15.8%	15.4%	14.8%	15.6%	15.2%	15.4%	17.8%	16.7%	13.9%	15.1%	14.5%	15.2%	15.3%	15.3%	12.9%	12.9%	12.9%
	40-44	12.4%	13.8%	13.2%	13.8%	14.1%	14.0%	13.3%	13.8%	13.6%	15.6%	13.4%	14.4%	14.3%	14.7%	14.5%	14.9%	15.7%	15.3%	11.9%	14.9%	13.6%
	45-49	12.9%	12.1%	12.4%	10.7%	11.9%	11.3%	12.1%	12.3%	12.2%	11.6%	11.1%	11.3%	11.9%	11.9%	11.9%	11.7%	12.4%	12.1%	13.6%	14.1%	13.9%
	50-54	13.2%	15.2%	14.2%	12.9%	12.7%	12.8%	13.8%	13.9%	13.8%	12.2%	11.8%	12.0%	12.6%	11.7%	12.1%	11.3%	10.8%	11.0%	13.4%	11.9%	12.6%
	55-59	11.5%	8.9%	10.1%	11.6%	10.7%	11.1%	12.1%	11.6%	11.8%	12.1%	11.6%	11.8%	13.9%	14.2%	14.1%	9.8%	9.8%	9.8%	13.6%	13.3%	13.4%
	60-64	9.7%	9.6%	9.7%	9.8%	9.0%	9.4%	10.1%	9.4%	9.7%	10.5%	8.7%	9.5%	10.9%	10.9%	10.9%	9.8%	10.0%	9.9%	12.2%	11.6%	11.8%
Socioeconomic status	upper	9.4%	2.1%	5.5%	7.8%	2.1%	4.8%	7.8%	2.7%	5.0%	9.1%	3.6%	6.0%	8.4%	3.3%	5.6%	7.4%	4.1%	5.6%	8.6%	3.5%	5.8%
	upper middle	31.6%	26.9%	29.1%	32.4%	30.1%	31.2%	33.2%	29.8%	31.4%	32.1%	30.6%	31.3%	33.6%	32.5%	33.0%	32.0%	31.6%	31.8%	35.5%	33.7%	34.6%
	middle	43.6%	45.9%	44.8%	42.6%	43.1%	42.9%	41.4%	42.1%	41.8%	41.7%	41.8%	41.8%	41.0%	39.7%	40.3%	40.2%	37.6%	38.8%	39.1%	40.3%	39.7%
	lower middle	12.4%	18.6%	15.7%	13.2%	17.9%	15.7%	13.4%	19.7%	16.8%	13.5%	19.0%	16.6%	13.3%	19.2%	16.5%	16.4%	21.6%	19.3%	12.4%	17.5%	15.2%
	lower	3.0%	6.5%	4.8%	4.0%	6.7%	5.5%	4.2%	5.7%	5.0%	3.5%	4.9%	4.3%	3.7%	5.2%	4.5%	4.0%	5.0%	4.5%	4.4%	5.0%	4.7%
Ethnicity	White	94.2%	94.9%	94.6%	94.2%	94.4%	94.3%	94.8%	95.0%	94.9%	94.1%	94.1%	94.1%	93.6%	94.0%	93.8%	58.3%	60.9%	59.8%	93.6%	93.9%	93.8%
	Black	1.6%	1.7%	1.7%	1.4%	1.7%	1.6%	1.4%	1.8%	1.6%	1.4%	2.1%	1.8%	1.9%	2.0%	2.0%	13.2%	14.3%	13.8%	1.1%	1.8%	1.5%
	Asian	4.1%	3.4%	3.8%	4.4%	3.9%	4.1%	3.8%	3.2%	3.5%	4.5%	3.9%	4.1%	4.5%	4.0%	4.2%	28.4%	24.8%	26.4%	5.2%	4.3%	4.7%
Obese	no	79.7%	78.2%	78.9%	77.3%	78.8%	78.1%	77.2%	75.2%	76.2%	76.0%	76.0%	76.0%	75.7%	76.2%	76.0%	78.4%	74.2%	76.1%	74.2%	74.5%	74.3%
	yes	20.3%	21.8%	21.1%	22.7%	21.2%	21.9%	22.8%	24.8%	23.8%	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%	24.3%	23.8%	24.0%	21.6%	25.8%	23.9%	25.8%	25.5%	25.7%
Over-weight	no	33.1%	44.8%	39.3%	29.2%	45.9%	38.1%	28.5%	42.7%	36.2%	29.5%	42.5%	36.8%	28.8%	42.6%	36.3%	33.3%	39.7%	36.8%	28.5%	41.8%	35.7%
	yes	66.9%	55.2%	60.7%	70.8%	54.1%	61.9%	71.5%	57.3%	63.8%	70.5%	57.5%	63.2%	71.2%	57.4%	63.7%	66.7%	60.3%	63.2%	71.5%	58.2%	64.3%
BMI classification	underweight	0.7%	1.1%	0.9%	0.5%	1.3%	0.9%	0.6%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%	1.1%	0.9%	0.6%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	1.2%	1.1%	0.3%	1.0%	0.7%
	normal	32.4%	43.7%	38.4%	28.6%	44.6%	37.2%	28.0%	41.6%	35.3%	28.8%	41.4%	35.9%	28.3%	41.5%	35.4%	32.4%	38.4%	35.7%	28.3%	40.7%	35.1%
	overweight	46.6%	33.4%	39.6%	48.1%	33.0%	40.0%	48.7%	32.5%	40.0%	46.5%	33.5%	39.2%	46.8%	33.6%	39.7%	45.1%	34.5%	39.3%	45.6%	32.7%	38.6%
	obese	20.3%	21.8%	21.1%	22.7%	21.2%	21.9%	22.8%	24.8%	23.8%	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%	24.3%	23.8%	24.0%	21.6%	25.8%	23.9%	25.8%	25.5%	25.7%
Years of education	8	3.2%	2.8%	3.0%	3.2%	2.3%	2.8%	2.6%	2.2%	2.4%	2.4%	1.8%	2.0%	2.4%	1.9%	2.1%	3.9%	5.4%	4.7%	2.2%	1.6%	1.9%
	9	26.2%	26.9%	26.6%	24.1%	21.1%	22.5%	23.2%	23.7%	23.4%	22.0%	22.0%	22.0%	21.4%	21.7%	21.6%	14.7%	15.7%	15.3%	20.0%	19.8%	19.9%
	10	32.3%	31.2%	31.7%	30.6%	32.4%	31.6%	31.9%	32.1%	32.0%	32.8%	29.7%	31.1%	32.4%	30.9%	31.6%	25.4%	25.0%	25.2%	30.6%	30.8%	30.7%
	11	6.7%	10.1%	8.5%	8.2%	9.4%	8.9%	7.8%	9.9%	9.0%	7.5%	9.7%	8.7%	7.2%	9.7%	8.5%	7.8%	9.8%	8.9%	7.6%	10.7%	9.3%
	12	7.7%	10.0%	8.9%	7.2%	11.7%	9.6%	8.1%	11.3%	9.8%	8.7%	11.8%	10.4%	8.8%	11.4%	10.2%	9.1%	11.6%	10.5%	8.9%	11.6%	10.3%
	13	8.6%	8.3%	8.5%	10.7%	10.6%	10.6%	10.0%	9.7%	9.8%	10.1%	11.2%	10.7%	10.1%	10.5%	10.3%	16.4%	14.8%	15.5%	11.2%	9.1%	10.0%
	15	15.2%	10.7%	12.8%	15.9%	12.4%	14.0%	16.4%	11.2%	13.6%	16.5%	13.8%	15.0%	17.7%	13.9%	15.6%	22.7%	17.7%	20.0%	19.6%	16.5%	17.9%

Table 4:   Sample characteristics (unweighted percentages), Korea

		1998			2001			2005		
		men	women	total	men	women	total	men	women	total
Total frequency		2941	3396	6337	2179	2706	4885	1822	2398	4220
Age group	25-39	13.6%	14.4%	14.0%	11.7%	12.7%	12.3%	8.3%	9.0%	8.7%
	30-34	15.4%	15.4%	15.4%	15.4%	16.0%	15.7%	13.7%	15.1%	14.5%
	35-39	16.0%	15.3%	15.6%	16.3%	16.6%	16.5%	13.3%	14.9%	14.2%
	40-44	15.3%	14.3%	14.7%	16.4%	16.6%	16.5%	15.3%	16.3%	15.9%
	45-49	11.1%	10.9%	11.0%	13.3%	11.7%	12.4%	17.0%	14.3%	15.5%
	50-54	9.9%	9.6%	9.7%	8.6%	9.4%	9.0%	10.4%	11.2%	10.8%
	55-59	9.6%	10.6%	10.1%	10.1%	8.4%	9.1%	11.9%	9.7%	10.6%
	60-64	9.1%	9.6%	9.4%	8.2%	8.6%	8.4%	10.2%	9.4%	9.7%
Equivalized income	upper	20.5%	25.6%	23.3%	22.7%	28.7%	26.0%	22.7%	27.4%	25.4%
	upper middle	21.8%	21.6%	21.7%	19.4%	18.7%	19.0%	21.5%	19.9%	20.6%
	middle	21.9%	19.1%	20.4%	22.9%	19.7%	21.1%	20.9%	18.6%	19.6%
	lower middle	20.4%	18.6%	19.4%	20.3%	18.7%	19.4%	20.4%	18.7%	19.5%
	lower	15.4%	15.0%	15.2%	14.7%	14.3%	14.5%	14.4%	15.4%	15.0%
Obese	no	98.2%	96.7%	97.4%	97.4%	96.5%	96.9%	96.8%	96.1%	96.4%
	yes	1.8%	3.3%	2.6%	2.6%	3.5%	3.1%	3.2%	3.9%	3.6%
Over-weight	no	72.2%	70.8%	71.4%	65.5%	70.9%	68.5%	61.6%	70.4%	66.6%
	yes	27.8%	29.2%	28.6%	34.5%	29.1%	31.5%	38.4%	29.6%	33.4%
BMI classification	underweight	3.2%	3.8%	3.5%	2.2%	4.7%	3.6%	2.7%	4.1%	3.5%
	normal	68.9%	67.0%	67.9%	63.3%	66.1%	64.9%	58.9%	66.2%	63.1%
	overweight	26.1%	25.9%	26.0%	31.9%	25.6%	28.4%	35.2%	25.8%	29.8%
	obese	1.8%	3.3%	2.6%	2.6%	3.5%	3.1%	3.2%	3.9%	3.6%
Years of education	6	16.8%	31.5%	24.7%	10.5%	21.0%	16.3%	9.9%	20.3%	15.8%
	9	15.5%	17.5%	16.6%	14.0%	15.4%	14.8%	12.6%	14.1%	13.4%
	12	40.2%	35.5%	37.7%	39.0%	41.9%	40.6%	37.7%	39.8%	38.9%
	16	24.2%	14.7%	19.1%	31.3%	20.7%	25.4%	35.0%	24.1%	28.8%
	17	3.2%	0.8%	1.9%	5.2%	1.1%	2.9%	4.8%	1.8%	3.1%

ANNEX 3: BMI Classifications for men and women aged 25-64 years old

ANNEX 4: Odds ratios and significance for estimation of probability of obesity

Table 1: Results for Australia

	Model 1 without controls	Model 2 controlled for income level
	Odds ratios	Odds ratios
Age		
25-29	ref.	ref.
30-34	1.299 ***	1.286 ***
35-39	1.350 ***	1.328 ***
40-44	1.460 ***	1.449 ***
45-49	1.700 ***	1.717 ***
50-54	1.722 ***	1.750 ***
55-59	1.630 ***	1.606 ***
60-64	1.646 ***	1.544 ***
Year of survey	1.064 ***	1.062 ***
Women	1.063	1.034
Years of education - Men		
8	ref.	ref.
12	0.698 ***	0.739 ***
14	0.519 ***	0.570 ***
Years of education - Women		
8	ref.	ref.
12	0.658 ***	0.700 ***
14	0.417 ***	0.462 ***
SEC		
highest		ref.
middle-high		1.156 ***
middle		1.133 ***
middle-low		1.513 ***
lowest		1.379 ***

Table 2:   Results for Canada

	Model 1 without controls	Model 2 controlled for income level
	Odds ratios	Odds ratios
Age		
25-29	ref.	ref.
30-34	1.089 *	1.091 *
35-39	1.136 ***	1.140 ***
40-44	1.170 ***	1.180 ***
45-49	1.371 ***	1.391 ***
50-54	1.512 ***	1.538 ***
55-59	1.522 ***	1.543 ***
60-64	1.489 ***	1.490 ***
Year of survey	1.036 ***	1.039 ***
Women	0.967	0.956
Years of education - Men		
8	ref.	ref.
12	0.832 ***	0.848 ***
14	0.850 **	0.867 **
17	0.683 ***	0.709 ***
Years of education - Women		
8	ref.	ref.
12	0.737 ***	0.754 ***
14	0.874 *	0.896
17	0.575 ***	0.599 ***
SEC		
highest		ref.
middle-high		1.141 ***
middle		1.136 ***
middle-low		1.151 ***
lowest		1.207 ***

Table 3:   Results for England

	Model 1 without controls	Model 2 controlled for SEC
	Odds ratios	Odds ratios
Age	1.063 ***	1.062 ***
Age squared	0.999 ***	0.999 ***
Year of survey	1.058 ***	1.058 ***
Women	1.439 ***	1.365 ***
Years of education - Men		
8	ref.	ref.
9	0.935	0.938
10	0.853 ***	0.865 ***
11	0.754 ***	0.771 ***
12	0.694 ***	0.713 ***
13	0.655 ***	0.687 ***
15	0.502 ***	0.545 ***
Years of education - Women		
8	ref.	ref.
9	0.748 ***	0.772 ***
10	0.632 ***	0.664 ***
11	0.551 ***	0.588 ***
12	0.517 ***	0.554 ***
13	0.508 ***	0.545 ***
15	0.313 ***	0.346 ***
SEC		
highest		ref.
middle-high		1.225 ***
middle		1.188 ***
middle-low		1.337 ***
lowest		1.444 ***

Note: Models for England are adjusted for ethnicity status, odds ratios are not reported in the table.

40

Table 4:   Results for Korea

	Model 1 without controls	Model 2 controlled for income level
	Odds ratios	Odds ratios
Age	0.955	0.961
Age squared	0.999	0.999
Year of survey	1.071 ***	1.070 ***
Women	3.785 ***	3.814 ***
Years of education - Men		
6	ref.	ref.
9	1.511	1.539
12	1.520	1.575
16	1.349	1.426
17	1.707	1.800
Years of education - Women		
6	ref.	ref.
9	0.935	0.959
12	0.397 ***	0.412 ***
16	0.182 ***	0.191 ***
SEC		
highest		ref.
middle-high		0.969
middle		1.005
middle-low		1.037
lowest		1.201

REFERENCES

Arendt, J. N. (2004), "Does Education Cause Better Health? A Panel Data Analysis Using School Reforms for Identification", *Economics of Education Review,* vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 149–60.

Aitkin, M., D. Anderson and J. Hinde, (1981), "Statistical Modelling of Data on Teaching Styles (with Discussion)", *Journal of Royal Statistic Society,* A 144, pp. 148-61.

Aitkin M. and N.T. Longford (1986), "Statistical Modelling Issues in School Effectiveness Studies (with Discussion)", *Journal of Royal Statistic Society,* A 149, pp. 1-43.

Branca, F., H. Nikogosian and T. Lobstein (eds.) (2007), "The Challenge of Obesity in the WHO European Region and the Strategies for Response", WHO Regional Office for Europe, Copenhagen.

Brunello, G. and B. d'Hombres, (2006), "Does Body Weight affect Wages? Evidence from Europe," "Marco Fanno" Working Papers 0027, Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche "Marco Fanno".

Brunner E.J., T. Chandola and M. Marmot (2007), "Prospective Effect of Job Strain on General and Central Obesity in the Whitehall II Study", *American Journal of Epidemiology*, vol. 165(7), pp. 828-37.

Campbell, D. E. (2006), "What is Education's Impact on Civic and Social Engagement ? ", R. Desjardins and T. Schuller (eds.), *Measuring the Effects of Education on Health and Civic/social Engagement*, OECD/CERI, Paris, pp. 25–126.

Cawley, J. (2004), "The Impact of Obesity on Wages", *Journal of Human Resources*, vol. 39(2), pp. 451-474.

Chandola T., A. Britton, E. Brunner, H. Hemingway, M. Malik, M. Kumari, E. Badrick, M. Kivimaki and M. Marmot (2008), "Work Stress and Coronary Heart Disease: What are the Mechanisms?", *European Heart Journal*, vol. 29(5), pp. 640-8.

Clark, D. and H. Royer (2008), "The Effect of Education on Adult Mortality and Health: Evidence from the United Kingdom", www.frbsf.org/economics/conferences/0806/royer.pdf, accessed on 8 April 2009

Crosnoe, R. and C. Miller (2004), "Body Mass Index, Academic Achievement, and School Context: Examining the Educational Experiences of Adolescents at Risk of Obesity", *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, Vol. 45 (December), pp. 393–407.

Cutler, D. and A. Lleras-Muney (2006), "Education and Health: Evaluating Theories and Evidence", *NBER Working Paper 12352*, www.nber.org/papers/w12352

Fu, W.J. (2000), "Ridge Estimator in Singular Design with Application to Age-Period-Cohort Analysis of Disease Rates", *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Method,* vol. 29, pp. 263-278.

Fu, W. J. and P. Hall (2004), "Age-Period-Cohort Analysis: Structure of Estimators, Estimability, Sensitivity and Asymptotics", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, under review.

Fu, W.J. and T.E. Rohan (2004), "Age-Period-Cohort Analysis: Consistent Estimation by the Intrinsic Estimator", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, under review.

Gortmaker, S. L. *et al.* (1993), "Social and Economic Consequences of Overweight in Adolescence and Young Adulthood", *The New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 329(14), pp. 1008-12.

Grossman, M. and R. Kaestner (1997), "Effects of Education on Health", J.R. Behrman and N. Stacey (eds.), *The Social Benefits of Education*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI, pp. 69–123.

Grossman, M. (2000), "The Human Capital Model", A.J. Culyer and J.P. Newhouse (eds.), *Handbook of Health Economics*, vol. 1A, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 347–408.

Haas, M. (2008), "Weigh Too Fat", UTS Speaks, Public Lecture 22 May 2008. Available on: www.chere.uts.edu.au/pdf/utspeaks_haas.pdf

Kemna, H. (1987), "Working Conditions and the Relationship between Schooling and Health", *Journal of Health Economics,* vol. 6, pp. 189-210.

Kenkel, D. S. (1991), "Health Behavior, Health Knowledge, and Schooling", *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 99(2), pp. 287-305.

Kenkel, D. S., D. R. Lillard and A. D. Mathios (2006), "The Roles of High School Completion and GED Receipt in Smoking and Obesity", *NBER Working Papers 11990*, www.nber.org/papers/w11990

Knight, K. and W.J. Fu (2000), "Asymptotics for Lasso-type Estimators", *Annals of Statistics*, vol. 28, pp. 1356-1378.

Lundborg, P. (2008), "The Health Returns to Education - What Can We Learn from Twins?", *Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper No. TI 08-027/3*, Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1113685

OECD (2007), *Education at a Glance*, OECD, Paris

OECD/Sassi, Franco *et al.*, (2009), "The Obesity Epidemic: Analysis of Past and Projected Future Trends in Selected OECD Countries", *OECD Health Working Paper No. 45, Directorate for Employment, Labour, and Social Affairs*, OECD, www.oecd.org/els/health/workingpapers

Sánchez-Vaznaugh, E.V., I. Kawachi, S.V. Subramanian, B.N. Sánchez, D. Acevedo-Garcia (2009), "Do Socioeconomic Gradients in Body Mass Index Vary by Race/Ethnicity, Gender and Birthplace?", *American Journal of Epidemiology*, vol. 169(9), pp.1102-12.

Sargent, J. D. and D. G. Blanchflower (1994), "Obesity and Stature in Adolescence and Earnings in Young Adulthood", *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Med*icine, vol. 148, pp. 681-687.

Siegrist J., M. Marmot (2004), "Health Inequalities and the Psychosocial Environment - Two Scientific Challenges", *Social Science and Medicine*, vol. 58(8), pp. 1463-73.

Spasojevic, J. (2003), "Effects of Education on Adult Health in Sweden: Results from a Natural Experiment", PhD diss., Graduate Center, City University of New York.

Speakman, J. R. *et al.* (2005), "Associations between BMI, Social Strata and the Estimated Energy Content of Foods", *International Journal of Obesity*, vol. 29(10), pp. 1281-8.

Wardle, J., J. Waller and M.J. Jarvis (2002), "Sex Differences in the Association of Socioeconomic Status with Obesity", *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 92, pp. 1299-1304

Webbink, D., N. G. Martin and P. M. Visscher (2008), "Does Education Reduce the Probability of Being Overweight?", *CPB Discussion Papers 102*, CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis.

World Health Organization (2003), "Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Excess Weight Gain and Obesity", Report of a joint WHO/FAO expert consultation, Geneva.

Yang, Y., W. Fu and K. Land (2004), "A Methodological Comparison of Age-Period Cohort Models: the Intrinsic Estimator and Conventional Generalized Linear Models", *Sociological Methodology*, Volume 34, Issue 1, pp. 75-110.

Yoon, Y.S., S.W. Oh and H.S. Park (2006), "Socio-Economic Status in Relation to Obesity and Abdominal Obesity in Korean Adults: A Focus on Sex Differences", *Obesity (Silver Spring)*, vol. 14(5), pp. 909-19.

RECENT OECD PUBLICATIONS OF RELEVANCE TO THIS WORKING PAPER

OECD (2007) *Understanding the Social Outcomes of Learning*, Paris

OECD (2007), *Education at a Glance*, OECD, Paris

OECD (2009), *Education at a Glance*, OECD, Paris

EXISTING OECD EDUCATION WORKING PAPERS

No. 1   Teacher Demand and Supply: Improving Teaching Quality and Addressing Teacher Shortages (2002), Paulo Santiago.

No. 2   Teacher Education and the Teaching Career in an Era of Lifelong Learning (2002), John Coolahan.

No. 3   Towards an Understanding of the Mechanisms That Link Qualifications and Lifelong Learning (2003), Friederike Behringer and Mike Coles.

No. 4   Measuring Educational Productivity in Standards-Based Accountability Systems: Introducing the SES Return on Spending Index (2005), Martin Hampel.

No. 5   PISA 2000: Sample Weight Problems in Austria (2006), Erich Neuwirth.

No. 6   Funding Systems and their Effects on Higher Education Systems – International Report (2007), Franz Strehl, Sabine Reisinger and Michael Kalatschan.

No. 7   On the Edge: Securing a Sustainable Future for Higher Education (2007), OECD/IMHE-HEFCE.

No. 8   *Globalisation and Higher Education* (2007), Simon Marginson and Marijk van der Wende.

No. 9   Understanding the Regional Contribution of Higher Education Institutions: A Literature Review (2007), Peter Arbo and Paul Benneworth.

No. 10   Effects of Tertiary Expansion – Crowding-out Effects and Labour Market Matches for the Higher Educated (2007), Bo Hansson.

No. 11   Skilled Voices? Reflections on Political Participation and Education in Austria (2007), Florian Walter and Sieglinde K. Rosenberger.

No. 12   Education and Civic Engagement: Review of Research and a Study on Norwegian Youths (2007), Jon Lauglo and Tormod Oia.

No. 13   School Accountability, Autonomy, Choice, and the Level of Student Achievement: International Evidence from PISA 2003 (2007), Ludger Wössmann, Elke Lüdemann, Gabriela Schütz and Martin R. West.

No. 14   School Accountability, Autonomy, Choice, and the Equity of Student Achievement: International Evidence from PISA 2003 (2007), Gabriela Schütz, Martin R. West, Ludger Wössmann.

No. 15   Assessment of learning outcomes in higher education: a comparative review of selected practices (2008), Deborah Nusche.

No. 16   Approaches and Challenges to Capital Funding for Educational Facilities (2008), Ann Gorey.

No. 17   Recent Developments in Intellectual Capital Reporting and their Policy Implications (2008), W. Richard Frederick.

No. 18   Employers' Perspectives on the Roles of Human Capital Development and Management in Creating Value (2008), L. Bassi and D. McMurrer.

No. 19   Job-related Training and Benefits for Individuals: A Review of evidence and explanations (2008), Bo Hansson.

No. 20   A Framework for Monitoring Transition Systems (2008), Rolf van der Velden.

No. 21   Final Report of the Development of an International Adult Learning Module (OECD AL Module) (2008), Bo Hansson and Helmut Kuwan.

No. 22   What Works in Migrant Education? A Review of Evidence and Policy Options (2009), Deborah Nusche.

No. 23   Teacher Evaluation: Current Practices in OECD Countries and a Literature Review (2009), Marlène Isoré.

No. 24   Assessment and Innovation in Education (2009), Janet Looney.

No. 25   Do quasi-markets foster innovation in education? A comparative perspective (2009), Christopher Lubienksi.

No. 26   International Adult Literacy and Basic Skills Surveys in the OECD Area (2009), William Thorn.

No. 27   *Learning Organisations* (2009), Nathalie Greenan and Edward Lorenz.

No. 28   Les compétences bien sûr, mais pas seulement. L'influence des compétences cognitives en lecture sur la participation aux études postsecondaires chez les jeunes Canadiens (2009).

No. 29   Impact of proficiency on early entrants to the labour market: evidence from the YITS (2009).

No. 30   How does academic ability affect educational and labour market pathways in Canada? (2009).

No. 31   Does reading proficiency at age 15 affect pathways through learning and work? (2009).

No. 32   PISA and TIMSS: similarities and differences (2009).

No. 33   PIAAC Reading components: A conceptual Framework (2009)

No. 34   PIAAC Literacy: A Conceptual Framework (2009)

No. 35   PIAAC Numeracy: A Conceptual Framework (2009)

No. 36   PIAAC Problem Solving in Technology-rich Environments: A Conceptual Framework (2009)

No. 37   Literacy, Numeracy and Problem Solving in Technology-Rich Environments: What Skills will be Measured by the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC)?

No. 38   ICT in Initial Teacher Training: Research Review