



# **2005 Macomb County Behavioral Risk Factor Survey**

**Macomb County Health Department**

## **Executive Summary**

Conducted for the Macomb County Health Department and  
Southeastern Michigan Health Association  
by Clearwater Research

## Executive Summary

The Southeastern Michigan Health Association (SEMHA), on behalf of the Macomb County Health Department (MCHD) contracted with Clearwater Research, Inc. (Clearwater) to design and administer the Macomb County Behavioral Risk Factor Survey (Macomb BRFS) based on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) standards and protocols. Clearwater consulted with SEMHA and MCHD on instrument design and data collection of 1,116 adult residents of Macomb County aged 18 and older, as well as a proxy survey of 214 children aged 5-15 years. Data collection was from June 6, 2005 through September 12, 2005 with interviews lasting an average of 12.03 minutes.

The survey results will be used to monitor trends or changes in baseline behavioral risk factors, measure community health improvement indicators and guide the health department toward establishment of activities that will advance the health status of Macomb County residents. Data were compared to BRFSS data collected for the state of Michigan and the US. Each topical area of the study is summarized below.

### *General Health Status*

#### **Perceived General Health**

- Nearly one-fifth (19.1 percent) of respondents described their overall health as "excellent." A vast majority of Macomb County residents reported their general health status as "good" or better (87.2 percent) while just over one-in-ten (12.9 percent) reported their health as less than "good."
- A smaller percentage of Macomb County residents reported their health status as "fair" or "poor" (12.9 percent) in 2005 when compared with residents of the State of Michigan in 2004 (14.4 percent), however differences were not statistically significant. The percentage of the population reporting less than "good" general health was statistically smaller among residents of the state of Michigan as well as among residents of Macomb County than the 2004 national prevalence of 16.4 percent.

### *Healthy Days*

#### **Physical Health**

- Macomb County adults experienced a mean of 3.0 out of the previous thirty days when their physical health was not good. Among both Michigan residents and the US population, adults reported 3.6 days out of the past thirty when they felt their physical health was not good in 2004.
- Among Macomb County adults, 7.9 percent experienced at least fifteen days out of the past thirty when their physical health was not good. This percentage was slightly lower than the percentage of all Michigan residents with fifteen or more days of poor physical health in the past thirty days (9.6 percent) reported in 2004, but the difference was not statistically significant. Nationally, a significantly larger percentage of adults (9.9 percent) reported fifteen or more days of poor physical health out of the last thirty in 2004 when compared with Macomb County.

## **Mental Health**

- Macomb County adults experienced a mean of 2.8 out of the previous thirty days when their mental health was not good, including stress, depression, and problems with emotions. Macomb County's overall mean number of days of poor mental health was lower than the mean number among both Michigan residents (3.8 days) and the US (3.5 days) in 2004.
- The percentage of Macomb County adults reporting fifteen or more days of poor mental health (7.4 percent) was significantly lower than the overall US rate of 9.8 percent in 2004. The Macomb County rate was lower than Michigan's 2004 rate of 10.1 percent, but the difference was not significant.
- Generally, a higher percentage of the population in younger age groups experienced fifteen or more days of poor mental health in all geographic areas when compared to older age groups. Although adults aged 65 and older experienced significantly more days of poor physical health than younger age groups, these adults reported significantly less days of poor mental health than younger residents. This finding may indicate older adults face more physical challenges than those who are younger, but the impact of less than good physical health does not necessarily impact emotional health in the older population.

## *Health Care Access*

### **Health Care Coverage**

- The percentage of Macomb County residents between the ages of 18 and 64 without some form of health care coverage was 13.1 percent in 2005. The Macomb County rate was not significantly different than the percentage of Michigan residents in the same age group who had no health care coverage (14.2 percent) in 2004. Compared with the percentage of adults less than 65 in the US in 2004 (18.7 percent), Macomb County's percentage of uninsured 18-64 year olds was significantly lower.
- Residents between the ages of 18-64 who were more likely to reported no health care coverage were more likely to be less than 35 (18.8 percent), have incomes less than \$35,000 (11.8 percent), have less than a high school education (31.3 percent).

## *Chronic Disease Prevalence*

### **Diabetes**

- In Macomb County, 5.9 percent of adults had been told by a doctor that they have diabetes. The prevalence of diabetes in Macomb County was not statistically different than the prevalence in Michigan (7.6 percent) or the US (7.2 percent) in 2004.
- Residents who reported having been told by a doctor or other health care professional that they had diabetes were more likely to be 65 or older (15.2 percent), be Female (7.6 percent), have less than a high school education (14.9 percent), have an income less than \$15,000 per year (17.1 percent).

### **Hypertension**

- Over one-fourth (25.8 percent) of the Macomb County adult population had been told at some time in their life they had high blood pressure. Results were very similar to the

percentage of the 2003 Michigan population (26.8 percent) and 2004 US population who reported they had been told they had high blood pressure (27.8 percent).

- Residents who were more likely to report they had been told they had hypertension were over 55 (49.3 percent), male (27.9 percent), not educated beyond high school (36.9 percent), living with incomes less than \$15,000 per year (44.4 percent).

## **Cholesterol**

- Nearly one-third (31.3 percent) of Macomb County residents reported they had been told they have high blood cholesterol by a doctor, nurse or other health professional. The prevalence in Macomb County was lower than the US in 2004 (35.2 percent), but the difference was not statistically significant. Compared with Michigan in 2003 (37.6 percent), the difference was statistically significant.
- Residents who reported having been told by a doctor or other health care professional that they had high cholesterol were more likely to be 55 or older (53.6 percent), be Female (32.0 percent), have less than a high school education (50.6 percent), have an income less than \$15,000 per year (49.7 percent).

## **Asthma**

### **Lifetime Asthma**

- In Macomb County, 11.5 percent of adults had been diagnosed with asthma some time during their lifetime. While reported prevalence was slightly lower than in Michigan (13.5 percent) and the US (13.4 percent) in 2004, the differences were not statistically significant.
- Asthma prevalence was higher in younger and older age groups. In Macomb County, the prevalence of asthma was as high as 14.4 percent among those between the ages of 18 and 24, dropping to 7.7 percent between the ages of 45 and 54, then rose again to 9.8 percent among those 65 and older.
- Asthma prevalence does not appear to have a definitive relationship with socioeconomic factors such as education and income. While there were some variations in prevalence in Macomb County between education levels and income, there were no statistically significant differences. Variations are due to chance and not indicative of any systematic relationship.

### **Asthma Attacks**

- Among those diagnosed with asthma in Macomb County, 38.5 percent reported they had an episode of asthma or an asthma attack in the last 12 months. This percentage was significantly lower than Michigan (54.6 percent) and US residents (55.0 percent) reported in 2004.

## **Arthritis**

- In Macomb County, 28.9 percent of adults had been diagnosed with some form or variation of arthritis. The US prevalence of 29.2 percent and 2003 Michigan prevalence of 32.0 percent were not statistically significantly different.
- Residents who reported having been told by a doctor or other health care professional that they had arthritis were more likely to be 55 or older (57.3 percent), be Female (36.9 percent), have an income of less than \$25,000 per year (44.7 percent)

## **Osteoporosis**

- In Macomb County, 5.7 percent of all adults had been told they had osteoporosis. State and national data were unavailable for comparison.
- Residents who were more likely to report they had osteoporosis were more likely to be over 65 (18.6 percent), be female (9.9 percent), have less than a high school education (5.4 percent), have an income between \$15,000 and \$24,999 (12.2 percent).

## **Overweight and Obesity**

### **Obesity**

- In Macomb County, almost one-quarter (23.1 percent) of adults are categorized as obese (BMI equal to or greater than 30.0). The prevalence of obesity in Macomb County did not differ significantly from the prevalence in Michigan (25.5 percent) or the US (23.5 percent) in 2004. There were no significant gender differences in Macomb County.
- Characteristics of residents with a calculated BMI that categorized them as obese included being between 35 and 64 (26.0 percent), having less than a high school education (33.3 percent), having an income between \$25,000 and \$49,999 (27.5 percent).

### **Overweight**

- The prevalence of overweight (BMI between 25.1 and 29.9) adults in Macomb County was 40.0 percent in 2005. The prevalence was not statistically different than the overweight prevalence reported in Michigan (35.5 percent) or the US (36.7 percent) in 2004.
- Characteristics of residents more likely to have a calculated BMI that categorized them as overweight included being male (49.2 percent), being 35 or older (42.2 percent), having a college education (43.7 percent), having an income of \$50,000 or more (42.4 percent).

## *Immunizations*

### **Influenza Vaccination**

- In Macomb County, over one-quarter of all adults (26.5 percent) had received a flu shot in the past 12 months. The percentage of females receiving the vaccine was slightly higher (27.1 percent) than the percent of males (25.9 percent), but the differences were not significant.

### **Adults aged 65 and older**

- Among Macomb County adults aged 65 and older, nearly two-thirds (61.6 percent) had received a flu shot in the last 12 months. The percentage was slightly lower than the Michigan rate (66.6 percent) and the US rate (67.6 percent), but the difference was not significant. Males were slightly more likely to have received the vaccination (63.4 percent) than females (60.4 percent).

### **Pneumococcal Vaccination**

Among the Macomb County adult population, only one-quarter (25.1 percent) had been vaccinated against pneumococcal disease.

### **Adults aged 65 and older**

- Two-thirds (66.3 percent) of Macomb County adults over the age of 65 had received a pneumonia vaccine sometime in their life. The percentage of Macomb County seniors who had received the vaccination was slightly higher than percentages in the state (59.4 percent) and the nation (63.4 percent), but differences were not statistically significant.

## *Health Risk Behaviors*

### **Tobacco Use**

#### **Current Smokers**

- Nearly one-quarter (24.4 percent) of Macomb County residents are current cigarette smokers. While the Macomb County rate does not differ significantly from the Michigan prevalence of current smoking (23.4 percent), both of those smoking rates are significantly higher than the percentage of smokers in the US in 2004 (20.7 percent).
- Residents who more likely to be current smokers were female (26.7 percent), less than 55 (28.5 percent), not college educated (32.0 percent).

#### **Secondhand Smoke**

- Macomb County residents reported they spent an average of 39.3 minutes each day exposed to secondhand smoke. Female residents had slightly longer periods of exposure (46.2 minutes) than males (32.5 minutes) and residents between the ages of 18 and 24 reported they spent nearly an hour and a half a day (86.2 minutes) exposed to secondhand smoke.
- College graduates had significantly less secondhand smoke exposure on a daily basis (15.0 minutes) than those who had some college (49.8 minutes) or a high school education (59.1 minutes).

### **Alcohol Consumption**

#### **Mean Number of Drinks**

- Among all Macomb County residents, the average number of drinks consumed on days when alcohol was drunk was 1.9. The mean number of drinks consumed by males (2.3) was significantly higher than the number consumed by females (1.5).
- Residents who drank a significantly higher average number of drinks were more likely to be male (2.3 drinks), be between the ages of 35 and 44 (2.6 drinks), have less than a high school education (3.4 drinks), have an income of less than \$15,000 (2.1 drinks) or more than \$50,000 (2.0 drinks).

#### **Binge Drinking**

- Over one-in-five (21.9 percent) of Macomb County residents reported they binge drank (consumed more than five servings of alcoholic beverages on one occasion) in the last thirty days. While the Macomb County rate of binge drinking was not significantly different than the rate in Michigan (16.2 percent), it was significantly higher than among the US population (14.8 percent).

- While binge drinking was not associated with any specific socioeconomic indicators, residents who were more likely to have reported binge drinking on one or more occasions in the past thirty days were characterized as male (29.7 percent), less than 55 (28.6 percent).

## **Fruit Juice Consumption**

- Macomb County residents drank 0.6 servings of fruit juice each day. Males had a slightly higher average of fruit juice consumption (0.7) than females (0.5).

## **Physical Activity**

### **Leisure Time Physical Activity**

- Just under one-fifth (17.7 percent) of Macomb County residents had not participated in leisure time physical activity within the past month. Participation in leisure time physical activity was significantly lower among Michigan residents with 22.1 percent not participating in leisure time physical activity in 2004. Leisure time physical activity was also significantly lower in the US. In 2004, 24.0 percent of the US population had not participated in leisure time physical activity.
- Residents who reported no leisure time physical activity were more likely to be over 55 (28.5 percent), be female (19.4 percent), have less than a high school education (38.0 percent), have an income less than \$25,000 (27.6 percent).

### **Moderate Physical Activity**

- Among Macomb County residents, just under one-third (31.5 percent) met the recommendations for moderate physical activity. The percentage in Macomb County was slightly lower than among Michigan (35.8 percent) and US residents (33.9 percent), but the differences were not statistically significant.

### **Vigorous Physical Activity**

- Among Macomb County residents, just over one-fourth (24.7 percent) met recommendations for vigorous physical activity. The rate in Macomb County was slightly lower than among Michigan (26.6 percent) and US residents (26.0 percent), but the differences were not statistically significant.

## **HIV/AIDS**

### **Chances of acquiring HIV**

- When asked what their chances of becoming infected with HIV were, 81.7 percent of the Macomb County population indicated there was no chance they would become infected. An additional 16.3 percent indicated there was a low chance they would become infected. Only 0.7 percent responded they were at high risk for acquiring HIV. Overall, females, older adults and those with higher incomes were the most likely residents to indicate they had no chance of becoming infected with HIV.

### **Risk behaviors for acquiring HIV**

- Among Macomb County residents, 1.6 percent of the adult population reported having engaged in at-risk behaviors for HIV in the past year. At risk behaviors include having used intravenous drugs in the past year, been treated for a sexually transmitted or venereal disease in the past year, had given or received money or drugs in exchange for sex in the past year or had anal sex without a condom in the past year. The Macomb County rate was significantly lower than Michigan's (3.7 percent) or the rate among residents of the US (4.1 percent).

## *Women's Health*

### **Clinical Breast Exams**

- Among Macomb County females, 76.6 percent had a clinical breast exam (CBE) within the recommended time frame for their age group. The rate is slightly higher than the rate among female residents of Michigan (74.2 percent), but the differences were not statistically significantly different. Percentages of women receiving timely CBEs were significantly higher in Macomb County and Michigan when compared with the overall rate in the nation (71.7 percent).
- There were no significant differences among age groups in Macomb County with respect to receiving timely CBEs with the exception of women aged 30-39 (92.1 percent). Between the ages of 30 and 39, less than one out of ten women failed to receive a CBE within the recommended timeframe.

### **Mammograms**

- Among Macomb County females, 57.4 percent had received a mammogram within the past two years and 45.9 percent had received one within the past year. These rates were not statistically different than the rates for Michigan (53.9 percent within the past two years and 42.3 percent within the past year) or the US (51.4 percent in the past two years and 39.7 percent in the past year).

### **Women over the age of 40**

- Among Macomb County women over the age of 40, over two-thirds (64.9 percent) had received a mammogram within the past year. Eight out of every ten (80.1 percent) had received a mammogram within the past two years. The rates for both Macomb County and Michigan (78.9 percent within the past two years and 62.7 percent within the past year) were statistically significantly higher than the percentages among women in the nation. Over half (58.3 percent) of women in the US over the age of 40 had received a mammogram in the past year and just under one-quarter (24.6 percent) had received one within the past two years.

### **Pap Tests**

- Nearly nine out of ten (86.0 percent) Macomb County females had received a Pap test within the past three years. This rate was not significantly different than the rate for Michigan (82.6 percent), but was statistically significantly higher than the rate among all females in the US of 81.8 percent.
- Women between the ages of 35 and 44 were significantly more likely to have received a Pap in the past three years (96.3 percent).
- Those women who had education beyond high school (91.3 percent) were significantly more likely to have received a Pap test in the past three years than those without education beyond high school (78.7 percent).

### *Prostate Cancer Screening*

- Among Macomb County males aged 50 and older, 83.4 percent had received a PSA test sometime in their lifetime. This percentage was slightly higher than in Michigan males aged



50 and older (80.5 percent) and significantly higher than the percentage of men in the US who were 50 years old or older who had received a PSA during their lifetime (76.5 percent)

### ***Colorectal Cancer Screening***

- Among Macomb County adults aged 50 and older, 60.2 percent had received a sigmoidoscopy or colonoscopy sometime in their lifetime. The Macomb County rate was nearly identical to the Michigan rate (60.3 percent), but significantly higher than the national rate of 53.8 percent.

### ***Child Proxy Summary Results***

#### **Physical Fitness Level**

- Macomb County adults were asked to describe the child's physical condition and fitness level. In Macomb County, 61.2 percent of the children were described as being in "excellent" physical condition and fitness level. Only 3.2 percent of children were described as having less than "good" overall fitness.
- Among Macomb County children, children got at least 30 minutes or more of moderate exercise an average of 5.9 days per week.

#### **Child Weight**

- Among Macomb County children aged five to fifteen, 12.7 percent were described as overweight. Nearly the same percentage (11.2 percent) were described as underweight.
- One-in-twenty (5.3 percent) Macomb County children between the ages of five and fifteen had been described by a doctor as overweight or obese.

#### **Child Nutrition**

- Nearly one-in-ten (9.6 percent) of Macomb County children between the ages of five and fifteen eat fast food three or more times a week. The percentage of girls that ate fast food that often was double (13.0 percent) the percent of boys (5.9 percent). Children between the ages of ten and fifteen were also twice as likely (13.4 percent) to eat fast food three or more times a week than those aged five to nine (5.4 percent). A small proportion (2.8 percent) of the children never ate fast food.
- The average number of servings of fruits and vegetables for Macomb County children was 2.4 servings per day.
- Over two-thirds (69.1 percent) of Macomb County children ate snack foods high in sugar or fat such as candy, chips and baked goods at least once a day.
- Macomb County children drank sweetened beverages 1.4 times per day on average.
- Children drank juice an average of 4.9 times per day. Girls were twice as likely to consume juice than boys.
- Children in Macomb County between the ages of five and fifteen had 2.2 servings of dairy products per day, on average.

## Screen Time

- In Macomb County, children spent an average of two hours and 21 minutes engaging in screen-time activities on a daily basis. Children between the ages of ten and fifteen had more screen time on a daily basis (two hours and 25 minutes) than children between the ages of five to nine (two hours and 16 minutes).

## Physical Activities

- Macomb County children aged five to fifteen participated in organized physical activities 2.2 times per week on average. Children aged ten to fifteen participated in organized physical activities (2.5 times per week) more often than children between the ages of five and nine (1.9 times per week).
- Macomb County children aged five to fifteen attended physical education (PE or Gym) classes 2.3 days per week, on average. Children over the age of nine spent nearly twice (2.7) many days in gym than those aged five to nine (1.8).

## Child Safety

- Only 28.8 percent of children always wore a helmet when bike riding, using a skateboard or roller-blading. Over one-fourth (27.0 percent) never wore a helmet when engaging in these activities where helmets are recommended.

## Child Health Care Coverage

- Nearly all (96.8 percent) children in Macomb County had some kind of health care coverage. Children between the ages of five and nine were slightly more likely to be covered by health care coverage (99.2 percent) than children between the ages of ten and fifteen (94.5 percent)

## Child Health

- Nearly nine out of ten (87.0 percent) of all Macomb County children had received a blood pressure check. Among those who had received a blood pressure check, nearly all (98.7 percent) had normal blood pressure levels.
- A small proportion (18.0 percent) of Macomb County children had ever had their cholesterol checked. Among those children who had received a cholesterol check, nearly all (98.3 percent) had normal cholesterol levels.

## Family Activities

- Nearly half (49.1 percent) of all children aged five to fifteen always participated with their families in some activity such as biking, walking or swimming.



**2005**

# **Macomb County Behavioral Risk Factor Survey**

**Macomb County Health Department**

# Contents

<b>Finding and Interpretation</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Methodology</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Planning and Design.....	4
Survey Instrument.....	4
Instrument Design.....	4
Questionnaire Specifications.....	5
<b>Sampling</b> .....	5
Sample Production and Processing.....	6
<b>Data Collection</b> .....	7
Response Rates.....	8
<b>Data Preparation</b> .....	10
Cleaning and Labeling.....	10
Case Weighting.....	10
Data Limitations.....	11
<b>Data Analysis</b> .....	12
Data Reporting.....	12
Table 1: Percent distribution of Macomb County population and 2005 Macomb County BRFS weighted and un-weighted sample.....	13
Table 2: Percentage of respondents reporting general health as fair or poor.....	14
Table 3: Percentage of respondents reporting poor physical health on at least 15 days in the past month.....	15
Table 4: Percentage of respondents reporting poor mental health on at least 15 days in the past month.....	16
Table 5: Percentage of respondents who reported no health care coverage (among 18-64 year olds)....	17
Table 6: Percentage of respondents ever told they have diabetes.....	18
Table 7: Percentage of respondents ever told they have high blood pressure.....	19
Table 8: Percentage of respondents who have ever been told they have high blood cholesterol.....	20
Table 9: Percentage of respondents who have ever been told they have asthma.....	21
Table 10: Percentage of respondents who have ever been told they have arthritis.....	22
Table 11: Percentage of respondents who have ever been told they have Osteoporosis.....	23
Table 12: Percentage of respondents categorized as obese (BMI ≥ 30.0).....	25
Table 13: Percentage of respondents categorized as overweight (BMI = 25.1-30.0).....	26
Table 14: Percentage of respondents who reported they received a flu shot in the last 12 months (among residents aged 65 and older).....	27
Table 15: Percentage of respondents who reported they had received a pneumonia vaccine (among residents aged 65 and older).....	28
Table 16: Percentage of respondents who are current smokers.....	29
Table 17: Percentage of respondents who are binge drinkers.....	30
Table 18: Mean daily fruit juice consumption.....	31
Table 19: Percentage of respondents who do not participate in leisure time activity.....	32
Table 20: Percentage of respondents who meet recommendations for moderate physical activity.....	33
Table 21: Percentage of respondents who meet recommendations for vigorous physical activity.....	34
Table 22: Percentage of respondents aged 18-64 who engaged in at-risk behaviors for acquiring HIV in the past year.....	35
Table 23: Percentage of female respondents aged 20 and older who had a clinical breast exam within the past three years (women aged 20-39) / past year (women 40 and older).....	36
Table 24: Percentage of female respondents who had a mammogram within the past year.....	37
Table 25: Percentage of female respondents who had a mammogram within the past two years.....	38
Table 26: Percentage of female respondents who have had a Pap test within the past three years.....	39
Table 27: Percentage of male respondents who indicated they had a PSA test.....	40
Table 28: Percentage of respondents 50 and older who have had a sigmoidoscopy or colonoscopy.....	41

Child Proxy Summary.....	42
Physical Fitness Level.....	42
Child Weight.....	42
Child Nutrition.....	42
Screen Time.....	43
Physical Activity.....	43
Child Safety.....	44
Child Health Care Coverage.....	44
Child Health.....	44
Family Activities.....	44

# Findings and Interpretation

The Southeastern Michigan Health Association (SEMHA), on behalf of the Macomb County Health Department (MCHD) contracted with Clearwater Research, Inc. (Clearwater) to design and administer the Macomb County Behavioral Risk Factor Survey (Macomb BRFS) based on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) standards and protocols. Clearwater consulted with SEMHA and MCHD on instrument design and data collection of 1,116 adult residents of Macomb County aged 18 and older, as well as a proxy survey of 214 children aged 5-15 years. Data collection was from June 6, 2005 through September 12, 2005 with interviews lasting an average of 12.03 minutes.

The survey results will be used to monitor trends or changes in baseline behavioral risk factors, measure community health improvement indicators and guide the health department toward establishment of activities that will advance the health status of Macomb County residents. Data were compared to BRFSS data collected for the state of Michigan and the US.

## Methodology

Clearwater worked in partnership with the SEMHA and MCHD staff to conduct a county-specific survey utilizing the CDC's BRFSS standards and protocols. After assisting the SEMHA and the MCHD with final instrument design, Clearwater programmed the survey into a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) System using Sawtooth software's Ci3 WinCATI program designed specifically to implement this type of survey. Clearwater purchased a random sample of adult residents of Macomb County aged 18 and over from Marketing Systems Group/Genesys Sampling Systems (MSG/Genesys). The BRFSS random-digit-dialing (RDD) method was used to obtain a probability sample of the noninstitutionalized adult (18 years and older) population in Macomb County.

Experienced BRFSS-trained interviewers employed by Clearwater conducted the telephone interviews over a four-month period using the CATI system. They completed 1,116 adult interviews and 214 child proxy interviews. Clearwater analysts cleaned and weighted the survey data and performed descriptive analyses and tabulations to develop the study findings presented in this report.

## *Planning and Design*

At the start of the project, Clearwater staff discussed with SEMHA the project's data, analysis and reporting needs. Throughout the research process, Clearwater engaged in periodic discussions with the SEMHA staff to finalize the survey, sampling strategies and reporting formats appropriate to accomplish the study goals.

## *Survey Instrument*

The survey instrument was supplied to Clearwater by SEMHA. Clearwater reviewed all items on the questionnaire to ensure they did not violate the basic rules of wording and scale such as double-barreled questions, exhaustive and mutually exclusive response categories, etc. Special consideration was given to language due to the sensitive nature of the study and the questions asked of the respondents.

## *Instrument Design*

SEMHA developed the questionnaire based on the current BRFSS survey core, modules and state-added sections. A separate child proxy section developed by SEMHA was included at the conclusion of the adult portion of the questionnaire. The study was run concurrently with a St. Clair County health behavior survey.

## ***Questionnaire Specifications***

The questionnaire was conducted in English. Those respondents who indicated they had a child aged 5-15 years in the household responded to the child proxy section of the questionnaire. Overall, interviews with respondents averaged 12.03 minutes.

The questionnaire included 15 BRFSS core sections, four modules and one child-added section:

- Section 1: Health Status
- Section 2: Healthy Days/ Health Related Quality of Life
- Section 3: Health Care Access
- Section 4: Diabetes
- Section 5: Hypertension
- Section 6: Cholesterol Awareness
- Section 7: Asthma
- Section 8: Immunization
- Section 9: Tobacco Use
- Section 10: Alcohol Consumption
- Section 11: Arthritis
- Section 12: Fruits and Vegetables
- Section 13: Physical Activity
- Section 14: HIV/AIDS
- Section 15: Adult Demographics
- Module 12: Women's Health
- Module 13: Prostate Cancer Screening
- Module 14: Colorectal Cancer Screening
- Module 15: Osteoporosis
- Child Proxy 5-15 Yrs of Age

## ***Sampling***

A probability sample of the noninstitutionalized civilian adult population, aged 18 years and older residing in Macomb County was obtained using a two-stage cluster sampling method. During the first stage, a set of households was selected through the current BRFSS disproportionate stratified sample (DSS) design. The BRFSS DSS RDD method uses a sample frame that includes all telephone numbers serving households in the geographic target area. This method divides the telephone numbers that ring in the geographic target area into listed and unlisted telephone numbers. The listed number stratum is sampled at a rate of approximately 1.5 times the rate for unlisted numbers. This ratio improves the sample efficiency (ratio of sample records to completed interviews) compared with an unstratified RDD approach. In the second stage, one adult was randomly selected to participate in the survey.

The randomly generated telephone numbers used for interviewing were obtained from MSG/Genesys Sampling Systems. Following the current CDC BRFSS protocol, Clearwater utilized Genesys' service that marks identifiable business, non-working, and cellular telephone numbers in the sampled telephone numbers. Records identified as business, non-working, or cell phones were sequestered during the data collection process and assigned appropriate final disposition codes at the end of the data collection field period. The remaining telephone records served as the operational base from records that were randomly dialed. Each sample record loaded into the CATI system was resolved by calling it until a final disposition code had been assigned or until a minimum of fifteen call attempts were made.

Following the BRFSS protocols and using the CDC programming specifically designed for the BRFSS survey, after a household was selected via RDD, the selection of the respondent within the household was designed to ensure a representative distribution of respondents in the final sample. After introducing the survey to the person who answered the telephone call, the

interviewer asked for an adult 18 years or older in the household. The interviewer then asked the adult about the total number of adults in the household. Based on the response, the number of males and females was enumerated. The questionnaire was programmed to select a respondent at random from that inventory of adults and the survey continued with the selected person at that time, if available. If the person was not available, the interviewer scheduled another call attempt at a time when the selected respondent was most likely to be home.

Telephone numbers for the Macomb County Survey were generated from all *working banks* within Macomb County. A *bank* is defined here as a series of 100 telephone numbers specified by a three-digit area code, a three-digit exchange, and the first two digits of a four-digit telephone line number, ranging from XXX-XXX-XX00 to XXX-XXX-XX99. A *working bank* is defined here as a series of 100 telephone numbers from XXX-XXX-XX00 to XXX-XXX-XX99, at least one of which is listed in an up-to-date telephone directory as reaching a household.

During the data collection field period, replicates of sample records were loaded into our CATI system and distributed to interviewers for calling. All replicates were loaded in the beginning of the field period to achieve the desired number of interviews. Our interviewers used established CDC protocols when making call attempts on each sampled telephone number.

## *Sample Production and Processing*

### **Calling rules**

Clearwater utilized the CDC BRFSS-specific calling rules to ensure accurate and uniform use of disposition codes and to minimize the number of refusals. Calls were made during defined calling periods in accordance with the BRFSS protocol – evenings, days, and weekends. The survey was programmed to ensure each phone record was called during a weekday evening shift, a weekday afternoon shift, and a weekend shift. Before each shift, data collection supervisors performed in-house sample management tasks as well as the CDC-recommended sample management tasks. CATI sample management ensured 80 percent of call attempts were made on weeknight and weekend calling occasions. A minimum of five rings was required before a “ring, no-answer” disposition was assigned.

### **Callbacks**

Records were called a minimum of fifteen times over five different calling periods, including at least three weekday evening periods. A selected respondent who was not available was called back a minimum of three times. The CATI system allowed interviewers to designate a specific time to call back records that had previously been assigned *No Answer*, *Busy*, or *Answering Machine* disposition codes. This maximized the probability of reaching a respondent at home.

### **Treatment of Refusals**

Any time respondents refused to participate in the survey, either initially or during an interview, we followed the BRFSS guidelines and re-contacted respondents in an attempt to gain their cooperation. When making these follow-up contacts, the interviewers used special Refusal Recovery and Mid-Terminated Interview Recovery scripts. The scripts are sensitive to respondents’ reluctance and provided more information about the survey, its origin, use, and content to assure the respondent of its legitimacy.

To combat initial respondent reluctance, Clearwater developed scripts to answer questions frequently asked by respondents. These scripts were provided to all interviewers with information addressing respondent confidentiality, use of data, sponsorship of survey, and other similar frequently asked questions. Interviewers could refer to these scripts at any point in the interview to reassure respondents. Respondents who were still reluctant after they were read



the scripts were encouraged by interviewers to speak to a data collection supervisor. A Clearwater data collection supervisor who is familiar with the BRFSS protocols was available during all interviewing shifts should a respondent wish to speak to someone other than an interviewer regarding study-related questions. Additionally, we provided respondents who wanted to verify the legitimacy of the survey with the name and contact telephone number of a SEMHA representative who could answer specific questions about the project or verify the legitimacy of the survey.

### **Disposition Coding**

Because correct use of disposition codes is important for maximizing response rates and ensuring data quality, we carefully train interviewers on the proper use of dispositions and monitor disposition coding during the data collection process. This training is based on the current CDC BRFSS disposition coding system. Data collection supervisors monitored interviewers' assignment of disposition codes and provided continuous feedback to them throughout the data collection period.

Clearwater used Ci3 programming to assign the appropriate final disposition code to telephone records with fifteen attempts. Ci3 programming examines the history of all attempts made to a record and assigns the appropriate final disposition. The Production Manager ran queries at the end of the calling period, making certain every record was properly resolved in accordance with the BRFSS calling protocols.

### **Times for Interviewing**

The Macomb County BRFS used the BRFSS specified calling occasions and interviewing shifts. Weekday interviewing shifts were from 1:00 to 5:00 PM. Weeknight interviewing shifts were from 5:00 to 9:00 PM. Saturday interviewing took place from 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM. Sunday interviewing shifts were from 1:00 to 5:00 PM and 5:00 to 9:00 PM. Interviewing occurred outside these periods when respondents requested a specific callback time.

To ensure the majority of data collection occurred during weekday evenings and on weekends, the Production Manager scheduled interviewing staff so no more than twenty percent of the study's interviewing hours occurred on weekdays. Additionally, production supervisors performed daily CATI sample management tasks to identify records with three daytime attempts and set these records to be released to interviewers only during weeknight and weekend interviewing shifts.

### **Data Collection**

Clearwater collected data for the Macomb County BRFS during the fielding period from June 6, 2005 through September 12, 2005 using our in-house CATI system. The survey questionnaire was programmed for use with the CATI system. CATI allows interviewers to see and record responses to questions on a computer screen, leading to an easy, comfortable method of interviewing. The software managed the telephone calling, controlled distribution of sample records to interviewers, consolidated the collected data, and tracked interviewer activity and productivity. Experienced interviewers were thoroughly briefed prior to data collection and rehearsed the questionnaire before conducting actual interviews.

Processing an RDD sample to preserve its probabilistic nature and allow credible statements to be made about the target populations involved rigorous interviewer training utilizing experienced BRFSS trained interviewers and careful adherence to calling protocols. These efforts addressed the problem of non-response bias, which is a threat to the accuracy of the survey results. Non-response bias was mitigated through extensive, evenly applied efforts to make voice contact with sampled households, and once contacted, through the interviewers' politely persistent persuasion techniques to elicit participation in the study.

## Response Rates

The response rate is an indicator of sample quality. It measures the relative success with which households sampled for the survey participated. The higher the response rate, the lower the potential for non-response bias in the data. For RDD samples, this is typically calculated as the percentage of households assumed to be reachable via the sampled telephone numbers that completed interviews during the field period. The higher the response rate, the lower the potential will be for non-response bias in the data and the results of the analysis.

For this study the response rate was derived using the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO) equation taking into account the number of completes, partial completes, eligible households, ineligible households, and unknown records. The CASRO rate for the 2005 Macomb County BRFs was 36.9 percent.

The Cooperation Rate is an outcome rate derived by including the number of completes in the numerator and the number of eligible respondents who are capable of completing the survey in the denominator. The Cooperation Rate for the 2005 Macomb BRFs was 59.0 percent.

Tab 1 presents a summary of final call dispositions for the Macomb County BRFs. The final call dispositions were derived from the sequence of interim attempt dispositions in each sample record's call history. Tab 2 presents a more detailed version of the final disposition breakdown.

**Tab 1: 2005 Macomb BRFs disposition summary**

2005 Macomb County BRFs				
Final Disposition Summary				
	Disposition Definition	Disposition Code	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Summary</b>	Initial Refusals	505	2662	40.93%
	Final Refusals	210,220,310,330	2429	37.35%
	Conversions to completes	110	233	3.58%
	Conversions to partials	120	0	0.0%
	Total conversions	110,120	233	3.58%
	Completes	110	1115	17.14%
	Partial completes	120	1	0.02%
	Total of partials and completes	110,120	1116	17.16%
	Completes without a refusal		883	13.58%
	Partial completes without a refusal		1	0.02%
	Attempts		6504	100.0%

**Tab 2: Final disposition summary for the 2005 Macomb County BRFS**

<b>2005 Macomb County BRFS</b>				
<b>Final Dispositions Detail</b>				
	Disposition Definition	Dispositon Code	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Completed Interviews</b>	Complete	110	1115	17.14%
	Partial complete	120	1	0.02%
	<b>Completed Interviews</b>		1116	17.16%
<b>HH, Eligible Incomplete</b>	Termination within questionnaire	210	89	1.37%
	Refusal prior to resp selection	220	375	5.77%
	Resp did not start interview	230	35	0.54%
	Resp unavail during period	240	250	3.84%
	Language barrier - resp selected	250	21	0.32%
	Unable to complete - after selection	260	37	0.57%
	Hang up or term prior to selection	270	18	0.28%
	HH Contact prior to selection	280	0	0.0%
<b>HH, Eligible Incomplete</b>			825	12.68%
<b>HH, Eligible Unknown</b>	HH Away during interview period	305	165	2.54%
	Hang-up or term, eligible Unknown	310	143	2.2%
	HH Contact, eligibility undetermined	315	8	0.12%
	Language barrier prior to selection	320	51	0.78%
	Unable to complete prior to selection	325	29	0.45%
	Hang-up or term, unk if residence	330	1591	24.46%
	Contact, unk if private residence	332	76	1.17%
	Answering machine residential	335	339	5.21%
	Telecomm barrier residential	340	1	0.02%
	Answering machine unknown	345	147	2.26%
	Telecomm barrier unknown	350	4	0.06%
	Number no longer in service	355	116	1.78%
	No answer	360	297	4.57%
	Busy	365	36	0.55%
	On never call list	370	0	0.0%
<b>HH, Eligible Unknown</b>			3003	46.17%
<b>HH, Eligible None</b>	Out of state	405	85	1.31%
	Household, no eligible resp	410	6	0.09%
	Not a private residence	420	411	6.32%
	FAX / Modem	430	394	6.06%
	Cell Phone	435	6	0.09%
	Fast busy	440	60	0.92%
	Non-working/disconnected number	450	598	9.19%
	<b>HH, Eligible None</b>			1560
			<b>6504</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## Child Proxy Respondents

### Summary of child proxy interviews

Household Characteristics	Number
Total Households Interviewed	1,116
Total Households with Children aged less than 18	338
Total Households with Children aged 5-15	239
Total Households Answering Child Proxy Section*	214

\*Adult provided child's birth date to verify eligibility and child was between five and 15.

### **Data Preparation**

At the conclusion of the data collection period, Clearwater analysts followed a comprehensive routine of data preparation before analysis.

#### *Cleaning and Labeling*

First, interviewer errors documented on data change forms were corrected in the dataset using Ci3 data-editing capabilities. The resulting data file was then imported into an Access database and verified using a series of in-house developed processes to check accuracy of the data. Subsequent to the data verification in Access, the data were converted and formatted for review in SPSS (a statistical software package). The survey variables (i.e., questions) and response categories were labeled and additional variables were created for the analysis as needed. Open-ended responses were examined and edited to ensure correctness, consistency in spelling, capitalization and punctuation. Finally, frequency tables of every question were produced and inspected for missing data or skip pattern errors.

#### *Case Weighting*

##### **Adults**

The data for Macomb adults were weighted to account for the sample design and to reduce the effect of unit non-response. RDD sample design yields a complex probability sample. Probabilities vary by the number of phone lines that serve the household and by the number of adults that live in the household. Case weights were calculated using the number of adults in each household, but could not account for the number of phone lines because the total number of working residential lines in each household was unavailable. Clearwater used a post-stratification factor in the case weighting to help minimize bias due to non-response patterns (refusals and non-contacts). The population estimates used for post-stratification were county-level estimates by age and gender for 2000, published by the US Census Bureau.

Clearwater calculated two weights for adults. The first was an expansion weight (WTEXP) for projecting population counts and for correct variance estimation using specialized statistical analysis software for complex samples such as SUDAAN and SAS 9.1. The second was a relative weight (WTREL), which can be used for approximating correct variance estimates using standard statistical analysis software with simple random sample assumptions such as SPSS.

## **Child Proxies**

The Macomb child proxy data was also weighted to account for sample design and to reduce the effect of unit non-response. For children, case weights were calculated using the design weight of the survey as well as the number of households with children and the number of children in households aged 5-15. The population estimates used for post-stratification estimates were county-level by the age group 5-15, published by the US Census Bureau. For analysis purposes, one child weight was created "wtchild."

## ***Data Limitations***

Ideally, all adult residents of Macomb County aged 18 and older would be potential respondents for the survey. However, in order to be cost effective, the sample was limited to adults aged 18 and older who are non-institutionalized, live in a household with a telephone and can communicate in English. These constraints subject the statistics derived from the survey to errors. The errors are a result of the survey results not exactly reflecting the characteristics of the population being surveyed. Below is a description of the types of error that the Macomb County Survey is subject to and which could result in bias.

### **Coverage Error**

Coverage error occurs because not all residents of Macomb County have a non-zero chance of being included in the sample. The RDD sample for Macomb County excludes respondents who were residents of institutions such as nursing homes, hospitals, prisons, and military bases. Additionally, only households with telephones were included in the sample. Cellular telephones were also excluded, so persons who could only be reached by a cellular phone were not included in the sampling frame.

### **Sampling Error**

Sampling error occurs because estimates are based on only a sample of the population and not on the whole population. A sample that is randomly selected from a population is likely to produce results that are not exactly reflective of the population characteristics they estimate. Likewise, a set of random samples from the same population would likely not produce exactly the same results. Sampling error is the difference between the actual population results and the results from the random sample.

### **Non-response Error**

Non-response error occurs when a respondent cannot be reached during the interviewing period (unit non-response) or when a valid response was not collected for an item on the questionnaire (item non-response). Both types of non-response can contribute to bias (error) in the survey results if the patterns of non-response are correlated with a particular type or types of respondent. The response rate of 33.5 percent for the Macomb County Study indicates there is a likelihood of some degree of non-response bias in the survey results.

### **Measurement Error**

Measurement error is present when the data collected are not good indicators of the phenomena of interest to the survey. It can occur as a result of any of the following: ambiguous or complex question wording, question order, response-code precision, interview length, recall error, coding error, interviewer clarifications (either improper or the lack thereof), and interviewers' adherence to the question wording. The source of the error can be the questionnaire, the respondent, the interviewer, or in the processing of data.

One explanation for measurement errors in the Macomb County results is due to the type of data collected. BRFSS-like data are self-reported and certain behaviors may possibly be underreported (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2003).

## **Data Analysis**

Clearwater used SPSS, SAS and SUDDAN software to analyze the data. The initial phase of the analyses involved frequency tables and descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, median, standard deviation) to examine and characterize the distribution of responses for each variable. Several variables were recoded to account for scale differences and all variables were recoded to exclude “not sure” and “refused” responses from prevalence calculations.

The second phase of the analyses examined the patterns of relations between key demographic variables and all other survey variables to identify meaningful similarities and differences. These analyses employed stub and banner tables based on demographic breakouts including: gender, age, income, employment and education. Some breakouts produced small sample sizes ( $n < 50$ ) limiting interpretation of outcome measures due to relatively large confidence intervals.

In the final phase of the analyses some of the categorical survey questions were recoded to produce the BRFSS risk factor prevalence variables. These calculations were repeated using the 2004 BRFSS dataset available on the CDC website. Additional analyses were conducted using both national- and state-level data in order to produce confidence intervals for risk factors and perform tests of significance. Any notable differences between Macomb County and either the Michigan or national calculated health risk factor prevalence estimates are reported in the *Findings* section below.

In many instances throughout the *Findings* section, statistically significant differences were found between subgroups at the state and national level, but not at the county level. For a majority of these prevalence estimates, the reason statistical significance could not be determined at the county level was due to sample size and the relatively large standard errors resulting from the smaller  $n$  sizes. A footnote has been included on each table to ensure the audience understands the function of power relative to point estimates for each geographic category.

## **Data Reporting**

Categorical tables present the point estimates for response category, confidence intervals associated with the estimate and sample size by demographic breakouts. Means, confidence intervals and sample size are presented for quantitative questions. Several of the breakouts for both question types resulted in sample sizes smaller than thirty.

A summary of findings for every question is presented in the following *Findings* section. Adult data results are presented first, followed by child proxy data findings.

## Demographic Profile

**Table 1: Percent distribution of Macomb County population and 2005 Macomb County BRFs weighted and un-weighted sample**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County Census (2000)</b>	<b>Macomb County Weighted BRFs (2005)</b>	<b>Macomb County Un-weighted BRFs (2005)</b>
<b>Age</b>			
18-24	10.5	10.9	4.0
25-34	19.3	19.1	11.0
35-44	22.1	22.3	18.7
45-54	18.1	17.5	19.6
55-64	12.0	12.1	18.0
65+	18.0	18.1	28.7
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	48.2	48.2	37.3
Female	51.8	51.8	62.7
<b>Education*</b>			
< High School	17.0	4.7	5.8
High School / GED	32.8	33.8	36.0
Some College	24.8	29.8	30.2
College Graduate	25.4	31.7	28.0
<b>Income**</b>			
<\$15,000	10.0	5.5	8.3
\$15,000-\$24,999	10.2	12.4	16.3
\$25,000-\$34,999	11.3	10.0	11.2
\$35,000-\$49,999	15.7	15.3	16.5
\$50,000+	52.7	56.8	47.7

\* For Macomb County, educational attainment only includes adults over the age of 25.

\*\* For Macomb County, distribution of income is based on reported household income.

**Table 2: Percentage of respondents reporting general health as fair or poor**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>12.9</b>	10.7-15.0	<b>14.4</b>	13.4-15.5	<b>16.4</b>	16.2-16.7
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>9.4</b>	0.5-18.3	<b>6.4</b>	4.1-10.0	<b>9.2</b>	8.2-10.1
<b>25-34</b>	<b>4.0</b>	0.8-7.3	<b>8.4</b>	6.2-11.4	<b>9.1</b>	8.5-9.7
<b>35-44</b>	<b>6.1</b>	2.6-9.5	<b>9.8</b>	8.0-12.2	<b>12.3</b>	11.8-12.9
<b>45-54</b>	<b>11.1</b>	6.9-15.4	<b>15.6</b>	13.2-18.3	<b>17.3</b>	16.6-17.9
<b>55-64</b>	<b>15.7</b>	10.0-21.3	<b>18.3</b>	15.6-21.3	<b>22.7</b>	21.9-23.4
<b>65+</b>	<b>31.1</b>	25.4-36.9	<b>27.9</b>	25.0-30.7	<b>29.8</b>	29.1-30.5
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>10.1</b>	7.0-13.1	<b>13.0</b>	11.4-14.7	<b>15.2</b>	14.7-15.6
<b>Female</b>	<b>15.5</b>	12.5-18.4	<b>15.7</b>	14.3-17.3	<b>17.7</b>	17.3-18.0
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>39.9</b>	24.8-55.0	<b>28.7</b>	23.7-34.2	<b>39.0</b>	37.8-40.2
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>16.5</b>	12.5-20.4	<b>18.5</b>	16.5-20.8	<b>19.2</b>	18.7-19.7
<b>Some College</b>	<b>11.7</b>	8.1-15.3	<b>14.0</b>	12.1-16.1	<b>13.5</b>	13.0-13.9
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>5.5</b>	3.0-8.0	<b>6.2</b>	5.1-7.6	<b>7.3</b>	7.0-7.6
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>39.9</b>	25.6-54.3	<b>36.1</b>	30.7-41.5	<b>39.3</b>	38.1-40.6
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>22.5</b>	14.7-30.2	<b>23.1</b>	19.6-26.6	<b>26.1</b>	25.3-27.0
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>17.7</b>	10.4-25.1	<b>20.2</b>	16.5-23.8	<b>16.5</b>	15.8-17.3
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>14.6</b>	8.0-21.1	<b>11.0</b>	8.5-13.5	<b>11.5</b>	11.0-12.1
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>6.2</b>	3.8-8.6	<b>5.4</b>	4.3-6.5	<b>5.9</b>	5.7-6.2

A smaller percentage of Macomb County residents reported their health status as “fair” or “poor” (12.9 percent) in 2005 when compared with residents of the State of Michigan in 2004 (14.4 percent), however differences were not statistically significant. The percentage of the population reporting less than “good” general health was statistically smaller among residents of the state of Michigan as well as among residents of Macomb County than the 2004 national prevalence of 16.4 percent.

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who responded their general health was “fair” or “poor” when asked, “Would you say that in general your health is excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?”

- Sample sizes smaller than 50 in Macomb County.



**Table 3: Percentage of respondents reporting poor physical health on at least 15 days in the past month**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>6.3-9.5</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>8.7-10.6</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>9.7-10.1</b>
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>0.0-7.1</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>1.4-5.7</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.5-4.6</b>
<b>25-34</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>1.0-9.1</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>2.8-6.8</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.2-5.0</b>
<b>35-44</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>1.3-6.3</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>6.5-10.4</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>7.4-8.2</b>
<b>45-54</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>5.9-13.3</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>9.1-13.6</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>10.9-11.9</b>
<b>55-64</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>6.3-16.4</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>10.6-15.9</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>14.3-15.6</b>
<b>65+</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>12.1-20.9</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>15.4-20.3</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>17.0-18.1</b>
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>3.6-8.2</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>6.6-9.3</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>8.3-8.9</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>7.4-12.0</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>10.1-12.6</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>10.9-11.4</b>
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>7.8-26.3</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>14.0-22.7</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>17.6-19.4</b>
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>6.8-12.9</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>9.9-13.6</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>11.0-11.7</b>
<b>Some College</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>4.9-11.1</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>8.1-11.5</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>9.1-9.9</b>
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>2.0-6.3</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>4.1-6.3</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.2-5.8</b>
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>19.3</b>	<b>9.0-29.6</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>18.9-28.1</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>22.0-24.1</b>
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>9.4-22.9</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>12.1-18.0</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>13.3-14.5</b>
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>5.1-17.4</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>7.2-12.3</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>9.1-10.3</b>
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>3.5-12.6</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>4.8-9.2</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>7.0-7.9</b>
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>2.9-7.4</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>3.5-5.7</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>4.7-5.2</b>

Among Macomb County adults, 7.9 percent experienced at least fifteen days out of the past thirty when their physical health was not good. This percentage was slightly lower than the percentage of all Michigan residents with fifteen or more days of poor physical health in the past thirty days (9.6 percent) reported in 2004, but the difference was not statistically significant. Nationally, a significantly larger percentage of adults (9.9 percent) reported fifteen or more days of poor physical health out of the last thirty in 2004 when compared with Macomb County

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who reported they experienced fifteen or more days during the past thirty when their physical health was not good.

\* Sample sizes smaller than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 4: Percentage of respondents reporting poor mental health on at least 15 days in the past month**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>5.6-9.2</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>9.1-11.1</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>9.6-10.0</b>
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>0.0-10.3</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>9.0-17.0</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>10.4-12.2</b>
<b>25-34</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>4.5-15.4</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>8.5-14.0</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>9.6-10.7</b>
<b>35-44</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>2.6-9.4</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>9.9-14.4</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>9.8-10.7</b>
<b>45-54</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>6.6-15.7</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>7.7-11.6</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>10.5-11.4</b>
<b>55-64</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>2.0-9.5</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>7.6-12.1</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>9.1-10.1</b>
<b>65+</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>1.7-6.0</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>4.6-7.7</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>6.0-6.8</b>
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>2.9-7.9</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>7.1-10.0</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>7.8-8.4</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>6.7-11.9</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>10.3-13.0</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>11.1-11.7</b>
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>19.1</b>	<b>4.5-33.8</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>12.8-22.4</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>13.8-15.4</b>
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>4.4-10.2</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>9.1-12.7</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>10.8-11.6</b>
<b>Some College</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>5.8-13.2</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>9.7-13.6</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>10.1-11.0</b>
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>1.5-5.7</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>4.8-7.5</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>5.7-6.2</b>
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>5.9-24.4</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>18.7-28.9</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>18.5-20.4</b>
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>4.9-17.8</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>11.7-18.2</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>12.4-13.7</b>
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>4.6-19.8</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>8.2-14.5</b>	<b>10.3</b>	<b>9.6-11.0</b>
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>10.7</b>	<b>4.0-17.3</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>6.0-10.7</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>8.3-9.4</b>
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>2.1-6.3</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>4.9-7.3</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>5.8-6.3</b>

The percentage of Macomb County adults reporting fifteen or more days of poor mental health (7.4 percent) was significantly lower than the overall US rate of 9.8 percent in 2004. The Macomb County rate was lower than Michigan's 2004 rate of 10.1 percent, but the difference was not significant.

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who reported they experienced fifteen or more days during the past thirty when their mental health was not good.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 5: Percentage of respondents who reported no health care coverage (among 18-64 year olds)**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.1</b>	10.0-15.9	<b>14.2</b>	12.8-15.7	<b>18.7</b>	18.3-19.0
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>21.7</b>	8.8-34.5	<b>28.6</b>	23.2-34.6	<b>30.8</b>	29.5-32.1
<b>25-34</b>	<b>18.0</b>	10.2-25.1	<b>16.1</b>	12.9-20.0	<b>22.4</b>	21.6-23.2
<b>35-44</b>	<b>7.7</b>	3.4-11.6	<b>11.2</b>	9.0-13.8	<b>16.8</b>	16.1-17.4
<b>45-54</b>	<b>12.4</b>	7.4-17.8	<b>9.9</b>	8.1-12.0	<b>14.0</b>	13.4-14.6
<b>55-64</b>	<b>9.2</b>	4.9-14.0	<b>8.8</b>	6.7-11.4	<b>11.3</b>	10.8-11.9
<b>65+</b>	---	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>13.2</b>	8.7-17.6	<b>15.6</b>	13.4-18.0	<b>20.2</b>	19.7-20.8
<b>Female</b>	<b>13.0</b>	9.0-16.6	<b>12.8</b>	11.2-14.6	<b>17.2</b>	16.7-17.6
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School*</b>	<b>31.3</b>	8.2-54.3	<b>35.4</b>	27.8-43.8	<b>43.6</b>	42.1-45.1
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>16.7</b>	10.9-22.5	<b>17.9</b>	15.3-20.9	<b>23.5</b>	22.8-24.2
<b>Some College</b>	<b>9.8</b>	5.7-14.1	<b>13.0</b>	10.7-15.6	<b>15.8</b>	15.2-16.4
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>10.0</b>	5.2-14.6	<b>6.2</b>	4.8-8.1	<b>8.1</b>	7.7-8.5
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000*</b>	<b>35.6</b>	15.1-56.1	<b>26.9</b>	20.4-33.4	<b>42.0</b>	40.4-43.6
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>28.0</b>	14.5-39.1	<b>31.9</b>	26.1-37.8	<b>37.3</b>	36.2-38.4
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>31.3</b>	15.3-47.3	<b>23.5</b>	18.3-28.7	<b>24.2</b>	23.1-25.3
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>10.1</b>	3.2-18.0	<b>11.6</b>	8.2-14.9	<b>13.1</b>	12.4-13.8
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>5.7</b>	2.8-8.4	<b>4.7</b>	3.2-6.2	<b>5.2</b>	4.8-5.5

The percentage of Macomb County residents between the ages of 18 and 64 without some form of health care coverage was 13.1 percent in 2005. The Macomb County rate was not significantly different than the percentage of Michigan residents in the same age group who had no health care coverage (14.2 percent) in 2004. Compared with the percentage of adults less than 65 in the US in 2004 (18.7 percent), Macomb County's percentage of uninsured 18-64 year olds was significantly lower.

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who reported they had no health care coverage of any kind and excludes residents aged 65 and older from analysis.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 6: Percentage of respondents ever told they have diabetes**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.9</b>	4.6-7.2	<b>7.6</b>	6.9-8.5	<b>7.2</b>	7.1-7.4
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>0.0</b>	---	<b>0.9</b>	0.3-2.5	<b>0.8</b>	0.6-1.0
<b>25-34</b>	<b>3.0</b>	0.1-5.9	<b>0.9</b>	0.4-2.2	<b>1.5</b>	1.2-1.7
<b>35-44</b>	<b>2.1</b>	0.2-4.0	<b>4.6</b>	3.3-6.5	<b>3.9</b>	3.6-4.3
<b>45-54</b>	<b>4.2</b>	1.8-6.6	<b>8.6</b>	6.8-10.8	<b>7.7</b>	7.3-8.2
<b>55-64</b>	<b>11.6</b>	7.0-16.1	<b>15.7</b>	13.1-18.6	<b>14.1</b>	13.5-14.7
<b>65+</b>	<b>15.2</b>	11.1-19.3	<b>16.2</b>	13.8-18.6	<b>16.9</b>	16.3-17.5
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>4.0</b>	2.4-5.7	<b>7.3</b>	6.2-8.6	<b>7.5</b>	7.2-7.8
<b>Female</b>	<b>7.6</b>	5.6-9.5	<b>7.9</b>	7.0-9.0	<b>7.0</b>	6.7-7.2
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>14.9</b>	5.9-23.8	<b>12.9</b>	9.8-16.8	<b>11.9</b>	11.2-12.6
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>6.1</b>	4.1-8.2	<b>9.2</b>	7.8-10.8	<b>7.8</b>	7.5-8.1
<b>Some College</b>	<b>6.1</b>	3.8-8.5	<b>7.0</b>	5.7-8.6	<b>6.9</b>	6.5-7.2
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>3.7</b>	1.5-5.9	<b>5.1</b>	4.1-6.5	<b>5.1</b>	4.9-5.4
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>17.1</b>	7.8-26.3	<b>15.6</b>	11.9-19.3	<b>12.9</b>	12.1-13.7
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>6.3</b>	2.8-9.8	<b>12.6</b>	9.8-15.4	<b>9.3</b>	8.8-9.8
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>5.7</b>	1.6-9.8	<b>10.1</b>	7.5-12.7	<b>7.7</b>	7.2-8.2
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>7.0</b>	3.2-10.8	<b>6.3</b>	4.5-8.1	<b>6.6</b>	6.1-7.0
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>4.3</b>	2.5-6.2	<b>3.8</b>	2.9-4.7	<b>4.4</b>	4.2-4.7

In Macomb County, 5.9 percent of adults had been told by a doctor that they have diabetes. The prevalence of diabetes in Macomb County was not statistically different than the prevalence in Michigan (7.6 percent) or the US (7.2 percent) in 2004.

Residents who reported having been told by a doctor or other health care professional that they had diabetes were more likely to be 65 or older (15.2 percent), be Female (7.6 percent), have less than a high school education (14.9 percent), have an income less than \$15,000 per year (17.1 percent).

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who reported they had been told by a doctor that they have diabetes.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 7: Percentage of respondents ever told they have high blood pressure**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2003)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.8</b>	22.9-28.7	<b>26.8</b>	25.2-28.5	<b>27.8</b>	27.2-28.5
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>2.6</b>	0.0-6.7	<b>4.6</b>	1.7-7.5	<b>6.5</b>	5.1-8.0
<b>25-34</b>	<b>8.5</b>	0.0-6.7	<b>10.5</b>	7.1-13.9	<b>9.9</b>	8.8-10.9
<b>35-44</b>	<b>18.8</b>	12.5-25.1	<b>16.6</b>	13.4-19.8	<b>16.2</b>	14.9-17.4
<b>45-54</b>	<b>27.2</b>	20.4-34.0	<b>28.2</b>	24.6-31.8	<b>30.7</b>	29.2-32.2
<b>55-64</b>	<b>42.8</b>	35.1-50.5	<b>48.6</b>	44.1-53.1	<b>47.0</b>	45.2-48.8
<b>65+</b>	<b>53.7</b>	47.6-59.8	<b>54.6</b>	50.9-58.4	<b>58.6</b>	57.1-60.1
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>27.9</b>	23.2-32.7	<b>27.5</b>	24.9-30.1	<b>28.0</b>	26.9-29.0
<b>Female</b>	<b>23.8</b>	20.3-27.2	<b>26.1</b>	24.1-28.1	<b>27.7</b>	26.9-28.5
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>36.9</b>	23.5-50.2	<b>34.8</b>	29.1-40.5	<b>38.8</b>	36.5-41.0
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>27.9</b>	22.9-32.8	<b>29.7</b>	26.7-32.7	<b>31.2</b>	29.9-32.5
<b>Some College</b>	<b>26.6</b>	21.0-32.1	<b>25.7</b>	22.8-28.6	<b>26.5</b>	25.3-27.8
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>20.4</b>	15.6-25.2	<b>21.3</b>	18.6-24.0	<b>22.2</b>	21.2-23.2
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>44.4</b>	29.4-59.3	<b>41.3</b>	34.7-47.9	<b>39.5</b>	37.0-42.0
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>31.2</b>	23.0-39.5	<b>34.0</b>	29.3-38.7	<b>33.4</b>	31.5-35.2
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>24.5</b>	15.8-33.2	<b>28.3</b>	23.5-33.1	<b>31.0</b>	28.9-33.0
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>28.6</b>	20.4-36.8	<b>24.7</b>	20.9-28.5	<b>25.5</b>	23.8-27.1
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>19.7</b>	15.5-23.9	<b>21.1</b>	18.7-23.6	<b>21.8</b>	20.8-22.7

Over one-fourth (25.8 percent) of the Macomb County adult population had been told at some time in their life they had high blood pressure. Results were very similar to the percentage of the 2003 Michigan population (26.8 percent) and 2004 US population who reported they had been told they had high blood pressure (27.8 percent).

Residents who were more likely to report they had been told they had hypertension were over 55 (49.3 percent), male (27.9 percent), not educated beyond high school (36.9 percent), living with incomes less than \$15,000 per year (44.4 percent).

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who responded a doctor, nurse or other health care professional had told them they have high blood pressure.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 8: Percentage of respondents who have ever been told they have high blood cholesterol**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2003)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>31.3</b>	<b>28.2-34.4</b>	<b>37.6</b>	<b>35.6-39.6</b>	<b>35.2</b>	<b>34.2-36.2</b>
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>0.0-7.1</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>0.6-9.4</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>5.9-11.3</b>
<b>25-34</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>8.4-20.8</b>	<b>19.9</b>	<b>14.7-25.1</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>17.4-22.1</b>
<b>35-44</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>19.2-32.9</b>	<b>30.3</b>	<b>26.0-34.6</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>24.1-28.5</b>
<b>45-54</b>	<b>36.2</b>	<b>28.8-43.7</b>	<b>41.4</b>	<b>37.2-45.6</b>	<b>37.9</b>	<b>35.7-40.1</b>
<b>55-64</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>42.2-57.7</b>	<b>53.2</b>	<b>48.5-57.9</b>	<b>48.6</b>	<b>46.2-50.9</b>
<b>65+</b>	<b>56.1</b>	<b>50.0-62.1</b>	<b>53.4</b>	<b>49.4-57.3</b>	<b>49.8</b>	<b>47.7-51.8</b>
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>30.5</b>	<b>25.7-35.4</b>	<b>41.3</b>	<b>38.1-44.5</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>34.9-38.1</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>28.1-36.0</b>	<b>34.5</b>	<b>32.1-36.9</b>	<b>34.1</b>	<b>32.8-35.3</b>
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>50.6</b>	<b>35.4-65.9</b>	<b>39.7</b>	<b>33.0-46.4</b>	<b>43.2</b>	<b>40.0-46.4</b>
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>29.6</b>	<b>24.6-34.5</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>40.2-47.8</b>	<b>38.2</b>	<b>36.4-40.1</b>
<b>Some College</b>	<b>30.8</b>	<b>25.0-36.5</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>32.9-40.1</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>31.6-35.3</b>
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>30.7</b>	<b>24.8-36.6</b>	<b>32.2</b>	<b>28.9-35.5</b>	<b>31.7</b>	<b>30.1-33.4</b>
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>49.7</b>	<b>33.7-65.6</b>	<b>46.0</b>	<b>38.1-53.8</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>40.8-48.1</b>
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>38.4</b>	<b>29.4-47.5</b>	<b>41.6</b>	<b>36.2-47.1</b>	<b>35.3</b>	<b>32.7-37.8</b>
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>41.9</b>	<b>30.6-53.3</b>	<b>39.4</b>	<b>33.4-45.3</b>	<b>37.0</b>	<b>34.1-39.9</b>
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>27.2</b>	<b>19.8-34.6</b>	<b>36.8</b>	<b>31.9-41.6</b>	<b>34.4</b>	<b>31.9-36.9</b>
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>26.9</b>	<b>22.2-31.6</b>	<b>34.8</b>	<b>31.7-37.9</b>	<b>32.6</b>	<b>30.9-34.2</b>

Nearly one-third (31.3 percent) of Macomb County residents reported they had been told they have high blood cholesterol by a doctor, nurse or other health professional. The prevalence in Macomb County was lower than the US in 2004 (35.2 percent), but the difference was not statistically significant. Compared with Michigan in 2003 (37.6 percent), the difference was statistically significant.

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who responded that a doctor, nurse, or other health care professional had told them they have high blood cholesterol.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 9: Percentage of respondents who have ever been told they have asthma**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>9.2-13.8</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>12.4-14.7</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>13.1-13.6</b>
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>3.7-25.1</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>13.2-22.3</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>16.5-18.5</b>
<b>25-34</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>7.4-20.5</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>13.0-19.8</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>13.2-14.4</b>
<b>35-44</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>8.6-19.2</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>9.0-13.2</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>12.0-13.0</b>
<b>45-54</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>4.0-11.4</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>11.1-15.6</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>12.6-13.7</b>
<b>55-64</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>4.7-13.2</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>11.5-16.8</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>13.1-14.3</b>
<b>65+</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>5.9-13.6</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>9.2-13.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>10.5-11.5</b>
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>5.7-12.4</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>10.5-14.0</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>11.3-12.0</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>10.5-17.0</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>13.3-16.2</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>14.7-15.3</b>
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>8.5-35.5</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>13.0-22.0</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>13.5-15.1</b>
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>4.2-10.9</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>9.6-13.3</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>12.1-13.0</b>
<b>Some College</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>8.9-18.5</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>13.4-18.0</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>14.2-15.3</b>
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>8.1-16.5</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>10.7-14.6</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>12.4-13.2</b>
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>5.7-23.4</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>13.8-22.6</b>	<b>16.4</b>	<b>15.5-17.2</b>
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>10.5-25.4</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>14.1-21.2</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>13.6-14.9</b>
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>2.5-19.7</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>8.5-13.9</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>12.1-13.5</b>
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>1.9-15.3</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>8.8-14.5</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>12.4-13.7</b>
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>8.1-15.1</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>10.4-13.8</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>12.1-12.9</b>

In Macomb County, 11.5 percent of adults had been diagnosed with asthma some time during their lifetime. While reported prevalence was slightly lower than in Michigan (13.5 percent) and the US (13.4 percent) in 2004, the differences were not statistically significant. Asthma prevalence was higher in younger and older age groups. In Macomb County, the prevalence of asthma was as high as 14.4 percent among those between the ages of 18 and 24, dropping to 7.7 percent between the ages of 45 and 54, then rose again to 9.8 percent among those 65 and older.

Asthma prevalence does not appear to have a definitive relationship with socioeconomic factors such as education and income. While there were some variations in prevalence in Macomb County between education levels and income, there were no statistically significant differences.

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who responded that a doctor, nurse, or other health care professional had told them they have asthma.

**Table 10: Percentage of respondents who have ever been told they have arthritis**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2003)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>28.9</b>	25.9-31.9	<b>32.0</b>	30.3-33.7	<b>29.2</b>	28.6-29.9
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>4.9</b>	0.0-10.6	<b>6.5</b>	3.4-9.6	<b>4.8</b>	3.8-5.8
<b>25-34</b>	<b>9.1</b>	3.7-14.5	<b>12.6</b>	9.3-15.9	<b>10.5</b>	9.4-11.7
<b>35-44</b>	<b>19.6</b>	13.6-25.6	<b>19.0</b>	15.7-22.3	<b>20.1</b>	18.8-21.4
<b>45-54</b>	<b>31.2</b>	24.2-38.1	<b>38.9</b>	34.9-42.9	<b>32.7</b>	31.1-34.2
<b>55-64</b>	<b>53.2</b>	45.5-60.9	<b>55.7</b>	51.2-60.2	<b>48.7</b>	46.9-50.6
<b>65+</b>	<b>57.5</b>	51.5-63.5	<b>63.4</b>	59.8-67.1	<b>58.9</b>	57.4-60.4
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>20.4</b>	16.3-24.4	<b>29.1</b>	26.5-31.7	<b>24.7</b>	23.7-25.7
<b>Female</b>	<b>36.9</b>	32.7-41.0	<b>34.7</b>	32.5-36.9	<b>33.4</b>	32.5-34.3
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>38.8</b>	24.8-52.8	<b>39.7</b>	33.9-45.5	<b>34.7</b>	32.3-37.1
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>30.9</b>	25.7-36.0	<b>35.7</b>	32.5-38.9	<b>32.3</b>	31.1-33.6
<b>Some College</b>	<b>31.1</b>	25.4-36.9	<b>31.5</b>	28.3-34.7	<b>30.3</b>	29.0-31.6
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>22.5</b>	17.7-27.4	<b>25.5</b>	22.7-28.3	<b>23.8</b>	22.7-24.8
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>53.3</b>	37.3-69.3	<b>48.2</b>	41.4-54.9	<b>38.5</b>	36.0-40.9
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>40.9</b>	31.7-50.2	<b>41.6</b>	36.6-46.5	<b>33.2</b>	31.4-35.0
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>30.1</b>	19.7-40.5	<b>31.8</b>	26.9-36.8	<b>31.1</b>	29.2-33.0
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>33.6</b>	25.3-42.0	<b>33.1</b>	28.8-37.4	<b>27.9</b>	26.2-29.5
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>21.8</b>	17.6-26.0	<b>25.7</b>	23.1-28.3	<b>24.4</b>	23.4-25.4

In Macomb County, 28.9 percent of adults had been diagnosed with some form or variation of arthritis. The US prevalence of 29.2 percent and 2003 Michigan prevalence of 32.0 percent were not statistically significantly different.

Residents who reported having been told by a doctor or other health care professional that they had arthritis were more likely to be 55 or older (57.3 percent), be Female (36.9 percent), have an income of less than \$25,000 per year (44.7 percent)

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who responded that a doctor or other health professional had told them they have some form of arthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, gout, lupus, or fibromyalgia.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.



**Table 11: Percentage of respondents who have ever been told they have Osteoporosis**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>4.5-7.0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>25-34</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.0-3.6</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>35-44</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>0.1-4.1</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>45-54</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>1.1-5.6</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>55-64</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>4.4-13.9</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>65+</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>14.1-23.2</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.3-2.3</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>7.6-12.1</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>0.7-10.1</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>4.0-8.4</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Some College</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>3.8-9.3</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>2.6-6.3</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>3.2-16.4</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>7.1-17.4</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>3.1-12.4</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>1.3-7.7</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>2.3-5.8</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>

In Macomb County, 5.7 percent of all adults had been told they had osteoporosis. State and national data were unavailable for comparison.

Residents who were more likely to report they had osteoporosis were more likely to be over 65 (18.6 percent), be female (9.9 percent), have less than a high school education (5.4 percent), have an income between \$15,000 and \$24,999 (12.2 percent).

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who were told by a doctor, nurse, or other health professional that they have osteoporosis.

N/A Data were unavailable.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

## Overweight and Obesity

### Body Mass Index Calculation

Body Mass Index (BMI) is an index based on height and weight used to categorize an adult as not overweight or obese, overweight or obese. BMI is calculated using the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Weight in kilograms}}{(\text{Height in meters})^2}$$

To convert pounds and inches into the metric measurements used to calculate BMI, use the following conversion factors:

*Pounds:* Multiply weight in pounds by 0.45359 to obtain weight in kilograms

*Inches:* Convert height to inches and multiply the product by 0.0254

Example: A man who is 6'2" and weighs 195 pounds would calculate BMI the following way:

#### *Conversions*

195 pounds to kilograms:  $(195 \times 0.45359) = 88.45005$  kilograms

6'2" feet = 74 inches; 74 inches to meters =  $(74 \times 0.0254) = 33.56566$  meters

#### *BMI calculation*

$$88.45005 / (1.8796)^2 = 25.04$$

### Body Mass Index Categories

The following table illustrates common category breakouts based on BMI and used by the BRFSS.

BMI Category	BMI
Not Overweight or Obese*	<25.0
Overweight	25.1-29.9
Obese	30.0 +

\*Note: The category "Not Overweight or Obese" also includes adults who are underweight based on BMI (<18.0). Although being underweight is a recognized health risk, only 2.5 percent of Macomb's adult population fell into the underweight category.

**Table 12: Percentage of respondents categorized as obese (BMI ≥ 30.0)**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>23.1</b>	20.2-26.0	<b>25.5</b>	24.0-26.9	<b>23.5</b>	23.2-23.8
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>11.0</b>	1.6-20.5	<b>13.5</b>	9.8-18.3	<b>14.5</b>	13.5-15.5
<b>25-34</b>	<b>17.5</b>	10.5-24.6	<b>22.3</b>	18.7-26.4	<b>22.9</b>	22.1-23.6
<b>35-44</b>	<b>21.0</b>	14.7-27.2	<b>28.6</b>	25.3-32.0	<b>25.4</b>	24.7-26.1
<b>45-54</b>	<b>26.1</b>	19.4-32.8	<b>31.7</b>	28.5-35.1	<b>27.5</b>	26.8-28.3
<b>55-64</b>	<b>35.2</b>	27.9-42.6	<b>31.9</b>	28.5-35.6	<b>29.3</b>	28.5-30.1
<b>65+</b>	<b>25.4</b>	20.0-30.7	<b>22.0</b>	19.4-24.6	<b>20.2</b>	19.6-20.8
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>21.1</b>	16.6-25.6	<b>24.9</b>	22.8-27.3	<b>24.0</b>	23.5-24.5
<b>Female</b>	<b>25.0</b>	21.2-28.8	<b>26.0</b>	24.2-27.8	<b>23.0</b>	22.6-23.4
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>33.3</b>	19.2-47.4	<b>30.1</b>	24.9-35.8	<b>29.8</b>	28.7-31.0
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>22.0</b>	17.4-26.7	<b>30.3</b>	27.7-33.1	<b>26.0</b>	25.5-26.6
<b>Some College</b>	<b>21.2</b>	16.2-26.3	<b>27.6</b>	24.9-30.5	<b>24.9</b>	24.3-25.5
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>24.3</b>	18.4-30.1	<b>17.1</b>	15.0-19.3	<b>17.7</b>	17.2-18.1
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>25.7</b>	13.6-37.8	<b>31.1</b>	26.0-36.2	<b>29.2</b>	28.0-30.3
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>28.5</b>	19.7-37.3	<b>32.0</b>	27.9-36.2	<b>26.9</b>	26.1-27.7
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>21.2</b>	12.3-30.2	<b>29.8</b>	25.4-34.1	<b>25.6</b>	24.6-26.5
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>18.5</b>	11.9-25.0	<b>25.9</b>	22.0-29.7	<b>24.3</b>	23.6-25.1
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>21.8</b>	17.5-26.1	<b>22.8</b>	20.6-25.1	<b>20.8</b>	20.3-21.3

In Macomb County, almost one-quarter (23.1 percent) of adults are categorized as obese (BMI equal to or greater than 30.0). The prevalence of obesity in Macomb County did not differ significantly from the prevalence in Michigan (25.5 percent) or the US (23.5 percent) in 2004. There were no significant gender differences in Macomb County.

Characteristics of residents with a calculated BMI that categorized them as obese included being between 35 and 64 (26.0 percent), having less than a high school education (33.3 percent), having an income between \$25,000 and \$49,999 (27.5 percent).

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents with a BMI ≥ 30.0.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 13: Percentage of respondents categorized as overweight (BMI = 25.1- 29.9)**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>40.0</b>	36.3-43.6	<b>35.5</b>	33.9-37.1	<b>36.7</b>	36.4-37.1
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>20.5</b>	7.6-33.3	<b>26.9</b>	21.7-32.9	<b>26.7</b>	25.5-28.0
<b>25-34</b>	<b>41.8</b>	32.0-51.5	<b>33.4</b>	29.1-38.0	<b>34.9</b>	34.0-35.7
<b>35-44</b>	<b>43.8</b>	35.7-51.9	<b>35.1</b>	31.7-38.6	<b>37.9</b>	37.1-38.6
<b>45-54</b>	<b>43.2</b>	35.4-51.1	<b>36.2</b>	33.0-39.6	<b>38.7</b>	37.9-39.5
<b>55-64</b>	<b>39.4</b>	31.6-47.3	<b>41.8</b>	38.1-45.6	<b>40.8</b>	39.9-41.7
<b>65+</b>	<b>41.1</b>	35.0-47.2	<b>38.9</b>	35.8-42.0	<b>40.0</b>	39.2-40.7
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>49.2</b>	43.4-55.0	<b>42.2</b>	39.7-44.7	<b>44.1</b>	43.5-44.7
<b>Female</b>	<b>30.9</b>	26.7-35.0	<b>29.0</b>	27.1-30.9	<b>29.4</b>	29.0-29.8
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>12.7</b>	3.2-22.1	<b>34.0</b>	28.5-40.0	<b>36.1</b>	34.8-37.3
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>39.6</b>	33.3-45.9	<b>35.2</b>	32.3-38.1	<b>37.1</b>	36.4-37.7
<b>Some College</b>	<b>41.4</b>	34.8-48.1	<b>33.3</b>	30.4-36.3	<b>36.2</b>	35.5-36.9
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>43.7</b>	37.1-50.3	<b>38.6</b>	35.8-41.5	<b>37.1</b>	36.5-37.6
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>32.4</b>	18.4-46.4	<b>29.1</b>	23.4-34.9	<b>33.2</b>	31.9-34.5
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>31.6</b>	22.4-40.7	<b>34.1</b>	29.7-38.5	<b>35.2</b>	34.3-36.1
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>29.8</b>	19.2-40.4	<b>34.0</b>	29.4-38.6	<b>36.7</b>	35.6-37.7
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>47.5</b>	37.8-57.1	<b>36.6</b>	32.5-40.7	<b>37.6</b>	36.8-38.5
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>42.4</b>	36.7-48.1	<b>38.2</b>	35.6-40.8	<b>38.8</b>	38.3-39.4

The prevalence of overweight (BMI between 25.1 and 29.9) adults in Macomb County was 40.0 percent in 2005. The prevalence was not statistically different than the overweight prevalence reported in Michigan (35.5 percent) or the US (36.7 percent) in 2004.

Characteristics of residents more likely to have a calculated BMI that categorized them as overweight included being male (49.2 percent), being 35 or older (42.2 percent), having a college education (43.7 percent), having an income of \$50,000 or more (42.4 percent).

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents with a BMI between 25.1 and 29.9

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 14: Percentage of respondents who reported they received a flu shot in the last 12 months (among resident's aged 65 and older)**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>61.6</b>	55.6-67.6	<b>66.6</b>	63.6-69.5	<b>67.6</b>	66.9-68.3
<b>Age</b>						
<b>65-74</b>	<b>61.4</b>	53.4-69.4	<b>61.4</b>	57.1-65.4	<b>63.07</b>	62.1-64.0
<b>75+</b>	<b>61.8</b>	52.7-70.8	<b>71.8</b>	67.4-75.8	<b>72.4</b>	71.5-73.4
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>63.4</b>	53.2-73.6	<b>63.2</b>	58.1-68.0	<b>68.9</b>	67.8-70.0
<b>Female</b>	<b>60.4</b>	53.1-67.7	<b>69.0</b>	65.2-72.5	<b>66.7</b>	65.8-67.5
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School*</b>	<b>55.5</b>	37.4-73.5	<b>62.4</b>	54.3-69.9	<b>61.5</b>	59.7-63.2
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>61.5</b>	52.8-70.3	<b>67.9</b>	62.9-72.4	<b>67.1</b>	66.0-68.2
<b>Some College</b>	<b>68.9</b>	57.6-80.2	<b>67.8</b>	61.4-73.6	<b>69.5</b>	68.0-70.9
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>55.8</b>	40.5-71.1	<b>66.6</b>	60.3-72.4	<b>71.0</b>	69.6-72.4
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000*</b>	<b>49.6</b>	32.0-67.2	<b>70.1</b>	62.4-77.7	<b>63.9</b>	62.0-65.8
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>63.0</b>	50.5-75.5	<b>61.7</b>	55.4-68.0	<b>66.5</b>	65.0-67.9
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999*</b>	<b>71.1</b>	57.5-84.7	<b>68.1</b>	61.0-75.2	<b>69.6</b>	67.9-71.4
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999*</b>	<b>57.4</b>	41.2-73.5	<b>64.1</b>	55.8-72.5	<b>67.7</b>	65.6-69.7
<b>\$50,000+*</b>	<b>59.4</b>	42.3-76.5	<b>65.7</b>	57.4-74.0	<b>71.4</b>	69.7-73.2

Among Macomb County adults aged 65 and older, nearly two-thirds (61.6 percent) had received a flu shot in the last 12 months. The percentage was slightly lower than the Michigan rate (66.6 percent) and the US rate (67.6 percent), but the difference was not significant. Males were slightly more likely to have received the vaccination (63.4 percent) than females (60.4 percent).

Percentages represent the proportion of respondent's aged 65 and older who responded they had received a flu shot in the last 12 months.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 15: Percentage of respondents who reported they had received a pneumonia vaccine (among resident's aged 65 and older)**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>66.3</b>	60.4-72.2	<b>59.4</b>	56.1-62.5	<b>63.4</b>	62.7-64.1
<b>Age</b>						
<b>65-74</b>	<b>61.3</b>	53.1-69.4	<b>52.8</b>	48.5-57.1	<b>57.1</b>	56.0-58.1
<b>75+</b>	<b>73.1</b>	64.7-81.6	<b>65.8</b>	61.1-70.2	<b>70.2</b>	69.2-71.2
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>65.3</b>	55.1-75.5	<b>51.5</b>	46.3-56.7	<b>61.8</b>	60.6-63.0
<b>Female</b>	<b>67.0</b>	59.8-74.1	<b>64.8</b>	60.8-68.6	<b>64.5</b>	63.6-65.4
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School*</b>	<b>61.3</b>	43.7-78.8	<b>53.6</b>	45.3-61.8	<b>55.2</b>	53.3-57.1
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>66.8</b>	58.0-75.5	<b>63.0</b>	57.9-67.9	<b>63.4</b>	62.3-64.6
<b>Some College</b>	<b>68.3</b>	56.9-79.7	<b>61.7</b>	55.1-68.0	<b>67.6</b>	66.1-69.1
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>64.9</b>	50.0-79.8	<b>55.8</b>	49.0-62.3	<b>65.5</b>	64.1-66.9
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000*</b>	<b>65.9</b>	48.8-83.1	<b>63.9</b>	55.6-72.1	<b>58.7</b>	56.6-60.8
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>64.6</b>	51.7-77.5	<b>58.2</b>	51.6-64.7	<b>64.2</b>	62.7-65.8
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999*</b>	<b>74.7</b>	60.9-88.5	<b>61.0</b>	53.5-68.6	<b>65.9</b>	64.1-67.8
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999*</b>	<b>63.4</b>	47.9-78.8	<b>55.7</b>	46.8-64.5	<b>66.2</b>	64.2-68.2
<b>\$50,000+*</b>	<b>49.5</b>	42.3-76.6	<b>53.4</b>	44.6-62.1	<b>63.1</b>	61.3-65.0

Two-thirds (66.3 percent) of Macomb County adults over the age of 65 had received a pneumonia vaccine sometime in their life. The percentage of Macomb County seniors who had received the vaccination was slightly higher than percentages in the state (59.4 percent) and the nation (63.4 percent), but differences were not statistically significant.

Percentages represent the proportion of respondent's aged 65 and older who responded they had received a pneumonia vaccination sometime in their lifetime.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 16: Percentage of respondents who are current smokers**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>24.4</b>	21.2-27.5	<b>23.4</b>	22.0-24.9	<b>20.7</b>	20.4-21.0
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>26.3</b>	12.7-39.8	<b>40.8</b>	34.9-47.0	<b>26.6</b>	25.4-27.8
<b>25-34</b>	<b>37.2</b>	27.8-46.7	<b>24.5</b>	20.7-28.6	<b>24.2</b>	23.4-24.9
<b>35-44</b>	<b>21.6</b>	15.7-27.5	<b>25.6</b>	22.6-28.9	<b>23.7</b>	23.0-24.3
<b>45-54</b>	<b>28.3</b>	21.4-35.2	<b>24.1</b>	21.3-27.0	<b>22.8</b>	22.2-23.5
<b>55-64</b>	<b>19.1</b>	13.0-25.3	<b>20.1</b>	17.2-23.3	<b>17.6</b>	17.0-18.2
<b>65+</b>	<b>13.2</b>	8.3-16.3	<b>8.5</b>	6.8-10.2	<b>9.0</b>	8.6-9.4
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>21.8</b>	17.0-26.6	<b>25.0</b>	22.7-27.4	<b>23.1</b>	22.6-23.5
<b>Female</b>	<b>26.7</b>	22.6-30.9	<b>22.0</b>	20.2-23.8	<b>18.5</b>	18.2-18.8
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>44.0</b>	28.4-59.6	<b>41.5</b>	35.5-47.7	<b>29.1</b>	28.1-30.2
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>30.4</b>	24.7-36.1	<b>29.1</b>	26.5-31.9	<b>26.6</b>	26.0-27.2
<b>Some College</b>	<b>27.9</b>	21.7-34.0	<b>25.1</b>	22.5-27.9	<b>22.0</b>	21.4-22.6
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>10.5</b>	6.7-14.4	<b>10.4</b>	8.7-12.4	<b>10.8</b>	10.5-11.2
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>24.0</b>	11.8-36.2	<b>38.0</b>	31.9-44.1	<b>27.0</b>	25.9-28.1
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>32.1</b>	22.7-41.6	<b>30.8</b>	26.4-35.1	<b>27.3</b>	26.5-28.2
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>34.5</b>	23.1-45.8	<b>29.1</b>	24.5-33.7	<b>24.4</b>	23.5-25.3
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>33.7</b>	24.4-43.1	<b>25.0</b>	21.1-28.8	<b>22.5</b>	21.8-23.3
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>20.7</b>	16.0-25.5	<b>16.6</b>	14.6-18.7	<b>15.4</b>	15.0-15.8

Nearly one-quarter (24.4 percent) of Macomb County residents are current cigarette smokers. While the Macomb County rate does not differ significantly from the Michigan prevalence of current smoking (23.4 percent), both of those smoking rates are significantly higher than the percentage of smokers in the US in 2004 (20.7 percent).

Residents who more likely to be current smokers were female (26.7 percent), less than 55 (28.5 percent), not college educated (32.0 percent).

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who responded they have smoked at least 100 cigarettes in their lifetime and now smoke “every day” or “some days.”

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 17: Percentage of respondents who are binge drinkers**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>21.9</b>	18.6-25.3	<b>16.2</b>	14.9-17.6	<b>14.8</b>	14.5-15.1
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>46.9</b>	30.8-63.1	<b>31.7</b>	26.2-37.8	<b>27.5</b>	26.3-28.7
<b>25-34</b>	<b>25.7</b>	17.1-34.2	<b>22.4</b>	18.7-26.5	<b>22.4</b>	21.6-23.2
<b>35-44</b>	<b>29.1</b>	21.9-36.4	<b>18.4</b>	15.8-21.4	<b>16.6</b>	16.0-17.1
<b>45-54</b>	<b>21.0</b>	14.3-27.6	<b>14.1</b>	11.9-16.8	<b>12.2</b>	11.7-12.7
<b>55-64</b>	<b>9.8</b>	5.6-14.0	<b>9.2</b>	7.2-11.6	<b>7.4</b>	6.9-7.8
<b>65+</b>	<b>3.6</b>	1.3-6.0	<b>3.4</b>	2.4-4.5	<b>3.0</b>	2.8-3.3
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>29.7</b>	24.1-35.3	<b>24.3</b>	22.0-26.7	<b>22.6</b>	22.1-23.1
<b>Female</b>	<b>15.0</b>	11.1-18.8	<b>8.9</b>	7.6-10.3	<b>7.5</b>	7.2-7.7
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>23.9</b>	8.6-39.3	<b>19.2</b>	14.2-25.3	<b>13.4</b>	12.4-14.3
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>26.5</b>	20.4-32.5	<b>17.4</b>	15.2-20.0	<b>15.1</b>	14.5-15.6
<b>Some College</b>	<b>16.7</b>	11.1-22.3	<b>18.4</b>	16.0-21.2	<b>16.3</b>	15.7-16.9
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>21.8</b>	15.7-27.9	<b>11.8</b>	10.0-13.9	<b>13.8</b>	13.4-14.3
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>24.8</b>	6.9-42.7	<b>19.6</b>	13.5-25.8	<b>12.8</b>	11.8-13.8
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>17.8</b>	9.4-26.2	<b>13.5</b>	10.1-16.9	<b>13.7</b>	13.0-14.4
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>24.8</b>	13.5-36.2	<b>17.6</b>	13.4-21.9	<b>15.1</b>	14.2-15.9
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>22.4</b>	13.1-31.8	<b>19.2</b>	15.6-22.8	<b>15.9</b>	15.2-16.6
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>24.3</b>	19.2-29.5	<b>17.2</b>	15.1-19.3	<b>17.2</b>	16.7-17.7

Over one-in-five (21.9 percent) of Macomb County residents reported they binge drank (consumed more than five servings of alcoholic beverages on one occasion) in the last thirty days. While the Macomb County rate of binge drinking was not significantly different than the rate in Michigan (16.2 percent), it was significantly higher than among the US population (14.8 percent).

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who responded they had more than five drinks on one occasion in the last 30 days.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.



**Table 18: Mean daily fruit juice consumption**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.6-0.7</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.8-1.3</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>25-34</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.4-0.6</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>35-44</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.4-0.7</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>45-54</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.4-0.7</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>55-64</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.4-0.6</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>65+</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.7-0.8</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.5-0.6</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.6-0.7</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.4-0.8</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.5-0.7</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Some College</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.5-0.6</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.6-0.8</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.6-1.1</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.5-0.8</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.4-0.8</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.5-0.7</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.5-0.6</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>---</b>

Diets rich in fruits and vegetables may reduce the risk of cancer and other chronic diseases. Fruits and vegetables provide essential vitamins and minerals, fiber and other substances that are important for good health. Macomb County residents drank 0.6 servings of fruit juice each day. Males had a slightly higher average of fruit juice consumption (0.7) than female's (0.5).

N/A Data were unavailable.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 19: Percentage of respondents who do not participate in leisure time activity**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>17.7</b>	15.2-20.2	<b>22.1</b>	20.8-23.5	<b>24.0</b>	23.7-24.3
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>5.9</b>	0.0-12.0	<b>18.8</b>	14.4-24.0	<b>19.2</b>	18.1-20.2
<b>25-34</b>	<b>13.7</b>	7.2-20.2	<b>19.0</b>	15.6-23.0	<b>20.4</b>	19.7-21.1
<b>35-44</b>	<b>14.7</b>	9.0-20.4	<b>20.5</b>	17.7-23.7	<b>22.5</b>	21.9-23.2
<b>45-54</b>	<b>15.7</b>	10.9-20.5	<b>20.3</b>	17.7-23.2	<b>23.9</b>	23.2-24.6
<b>55-64</b>	<b>23.6</b>	17.1-30.0	<b>23.5</b>	20.4-26.9	<b>26.7</b>	25.9-27.5
<b>65+</b>	<b>31.8</b>	26.0-37.5	<b>31.6</b>	28.7-34.5	<b>31.9</b>	31.3-32.6
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>15.9</b>	12.3-19.7	<b>19.9</b>	17.8-22.0	<b>21.4</b>	21.0-21.9
<b>Female</b>	<b>19.4</b>	16.0-22.8	<b>24.2</b>	22.5-26.0	<b>26.5</b>	26.1-26.9
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>38.0</b>	23.9-52.2	<b>36.1</b>	30.7-41.9	<b>44.8</b>	43.6-46.0
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>20.8</b>	16.2-25.3	<b>31.2</b>	28.6-34.0	<b>30.0</b>	29.4-30.6
<b>Some College</b>	<b>14.6</b>	10.4-18.8	<b>19.7</b>	17.3-22.3	<b>20.2</b>	19.7-20.8
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>14.0</b>	9.7-18.2	<b>10.8</b>	9.2-12.7	<b>13.3</b>	12.9-13.7
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>21.1</b>	11.2-31.1	<b>40.9</b>	35.1-46.7	<b>40.9</b>	39.6-42.1
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>34.9</b>	25.9-44.0	<b>32.2</b>	27.9-36.4	<b>33.7</b>	32.8-34.6
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>22.0</b>	12.8-31.2	<b>27.0</b>	22.8-31.3	<b>25.9</b>	24.9-26.8
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>18.7</b>	11.7-25.7	<b>19.2</b>	15.9-22.6	<b>21.2</b>	20.5-22.0
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>10.0</b>	7.0-12.9	<b>13.4</b>	11.6-15.2	<b>13.6</b>	13.2-14.0

Just under one-fifth (17.7 percent) of Macomb County residents had not participated in leisure time physical activity within the past month. Participation in leisure time physical activity was significantly lower among Michigan residents with 22.1 percent not participating in leisure time physical activity in 2004. Leisure time physical activity was also significantly lower in the US. In 2004, 24.0 percent of the US population had not participated in leisure time physical activity.

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who reported not participating in leisure time physical activity.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 20: Percentage of respondents who meet recommendations for moderate physical activity**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2003)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>31.5</b>	7.9-35.0	<b>35.8</b>	33.9-37.7	<b>33.9</b>	33.5-34.2
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>31.4</b>	16.5-46.4	<b>41.3</b>	34.4-48.2	<b>42.3</b>	35.3-49.3
<b>25-34</b>	<b>33.2</b>	23.8-42.6	<b>35.0</b>	30.0-40.0	<b>32.9</b>	28.0-37.9
<b>35-44</b>	<b>38.0</b>	29.9-46.0	<b>36.8</b>	32.6-40.9	<b>30.3</b>	26.4-34.2
<b>45-54</b>	<b>27.9</b>	20.7-35.1	<b>31.9</b>	28.1-35.7	<b>21.2</b>	17.9-24.5
<b>55-64</b>	<b>25.7</b>	18.8-32.7	<b>35.1</b>	30.8-39.4	<b>19.6</b>	16.1-23.1
<b>65+</b>	<b>28.9</b>	23.2-34.6	<b>36.5</b>	32.6-40.3	<b>14.7</b>	11.8-17.6
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>33.7</b>	27.9-39.4	<b>33.3</b>	30.4-36.2	<b>33.6</b>	33.0-34.1
<b>Female</b>	<b>29.5</b>	25.3-33.7	<b>38.2</b>	35.7-40.6	<b>34.2</b>	33.7-34.6
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>25.9</b>	11.5-40.3	<b>31.6</b>	25.5-37.8	<b>23.9</b>	17.9-29.9
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>36.9</b>	30.4-43.3	<b>36.5</b>	33.0-39.9	<b>22.3</b>	19.1-25.5
<b>Some College</b>	<b>30.2</b>	24.0-36.5	<b>34.8</b>	31.3-38.2	<b>25.7</b>	22.5-28.9
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>26.8</b>	21.1-32.5	<b>37.7</b>	34.4-41.0	<b>33.5</b>	30.2-36.8
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>26.5</b>	10.3-42.8	<b>34.7</b>	28.0-41.5	<b>16.1</b>	10.7-21.5
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>32.9</b>	23.1-42.6	<b>35.5</b>	30.3-40.6	<b>23.3</b>	18.6-28.0
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>36.4</b>	24.6-48.3	<b>35.8</b>	30.4-41.2	<b>24.8</b>	19.7-29.9
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>30.5</b>	21.7-39.2	<b>40.4</b>	35.7-45.1	<b>30.6</b>	26.0-35.2
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>31.7</b>	26.2-37.1	<b>37.3</b>	34.3-40.3	<b>31.5</b>	28.6-34.4

Among Macomb County residents, just under one-third (31.5 percent) met the recommendations for moderate physical activity. The percentage in Macomb County was slightly lower than among Michigan (35.8 percent) and US residents (33.9 percent), but the differences were not statistically significant.

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who reported they participate in moderate physical activity five days a week for 30 minutes or more each day.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 21: Percentage of respondents who meet recommendations for vigorous physical activity**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2003)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>24.7</b>	21.4-28.0	<b>26.6</b>	24.8-28.4	<b>26.0</b>	25.3-26.0
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>37.9</b>	22.4-53.4	<b>42.3</b>	35.3-49.3	<b>40.4</b>	39.1-41.7
<b>25-34</b>	<b>28.8</b>	19.9-37.7	<b>32.9</b>	28.0-37.9	<b>32.1</b>	31.3-33.0
<b>35-44</b>	<b>26.5</b>	19.7-33.4	<b>30.3</b>	26.4-34.2	<b>28.6</b>	27.9-29.3
<b>45-54</b>	<b>26.1</b>	19.2-32.9	<b>21.2</b>	17.9-24.5	<b>23.1</b>	22.4-23.8
<b>55-64</b>	<b>16.9</b>	11.0-22.7	<b>19.6</b>	16.1-23.1	<b>18.2</b>	17.5-18.8
<b>65+</b>	<b>12.6</b>	8.5-16.8	<b>14.7</b>	11.8-17.6	<b>12.1</b>	11.6-12.6
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>27.1</b>	21.9-32.4	<b>29.5</b>	26.6-32.4	<b>30.6</b>	30.1-31.2
<b>Female</b>	<b>22.5</b>	18.3-26.6	<b>23.9</b>	21.8-26.1	<b>21.0</b>	20.6-21.4
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>24.2</b>	8.7-39.8	<b>23.9</b>	17.9-29.9	<b>15.7</b>	14.8-16.7
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>21.9</b>	16.5-27.4	<b>22.3</b>	19.1-25.5	<b>21.8</b>	21.2-22.4
<b>Some College</b>	<b>25.3</b>	19.0-31.5	<b>25.7</b>	22.5-28.9	<b>27.3</b>	26.6-27.9
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>27.2</b>	21.2-33.2	<b>33.5</b>	30.2-36.8	<b>31.9</b>	31.4-32.5
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>13.9</b>	2.9-24.9	<b>16.1</b>	10.7-21.5	<b>16.6</b>	15.6-17.6
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>20.9</b>	11.9-29.9	<b>23.3</b>	18.6-28.0	<b>20.2</b>	19.4-21.0
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>18.5</b>	8.3-28.7	<b>24.8</b>	19.7-29.9	<b>23.9</b>	23.0-24.9
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>23.1</b>	15.1-31.1	<b>30.6</b>	26.0-35.2	<b>26.5</b>	25.7-27.4
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>26.0</b>	20.9-31.0	<b>31.5</b>	28.6-34.4	<b>33.0</b>	32.4-33.6

Among Macomb County residents, just over one-fourth (24.7 percent) met recommendations for vigorous physical activity. The rate in Macomb County was slightly lower than among Michigan (26.6 percent) and US residents (26.0 percent), but the differences were not statistically significant.

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who reported they participate in vigorous activities at least three days a week for 20 minutes or more each day.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County

**Table 22: Percentage of respondents aged 18-64 who engaged in at-risk behaviors for acquiring HIV in the past year**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>0.5-2.8</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.0-4.6</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.9-4.3</b>
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>0.0-12.7</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>6.5-13.7</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>9.2-11.1</b>
<b>25-34</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>0.0-4.5</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>3.2-7.1</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.5-5.3</b>
<b>35-44</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.0-1.6</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>1.8-4.0</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.9-3.5</b>
<b>45-54</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.0-1.5</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>1.5-3.6</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.8-2.3</b>
<b>55-64</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0-0.0</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.2-1.5</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.0-1.5</b>
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.0-2.0</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>2.9-5.3</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.4-5.1</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>0.4-4.4</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>2.7-4.7</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.2-3.6</b>
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School*</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>0.0-31.2</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>7.0-18.1</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>6.5-8.3</b>
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>0.0-3.8</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>3.9-7.2</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.1-4.8</b>
<b>Some College</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.0-2.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.0-4.5</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.6-4.4</b>
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.0-2.5</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.7-2.1</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.5-3.0</b>
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000*</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>0.0-9.1</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>5.3-15.0</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>5.9-7.7</b>
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>0.0-6.7</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>3.0-8.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.6-6.9</b>
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>0.0-11.6</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>2.9-9.9</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.2-5.5</b>
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>0.0-8.3</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.4-5.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.3-4.2</b>
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.0-1.2</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.0-2.5</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.4-2.8</b>

Among Macomb County residents, 1.6 percent of the adult population reported having engaged in at-risk behaviors for HIV in the past year. At risk behaviors include having used intravenous drugs in the past year, been treated for a sexually transmitted or venereal disease in the past year, had given or received money or drugs in exchange for sex in the past year or had anal sex without a condom in the past year. The Macomb County rate was significantly lower than Michigan's (3.7 percent) or the rate among residents of the US (4.1 percent).

Percentages represent the proportion of respondent's aged 18-64 who indicated they had engaged in behaviors considered at-risk for acquiring HIV.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 23: Percentage of female respondents aged 20 and older who had a clinical breast exam within the past three years (women aged 20-39) / past year (women 40 and older)**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>76.6</b>	72.9-80.3	<b>74.2</b>	72.4-76.0	<b>71.7</b>	71.2-72.1
<b>Age</b>						
<b>20-29*</b>	<b>83.7</b>	70.3-97.0	<b>82.9</b>	76.7-87.7	<b>77.6</b>	75.9-79.3
<b>30-39</b>	<b>92.1</b>	85.9-98.2	<b>88.5</b>	85.1-91.2	<b>85.9</b>	85.1-86.8
<b>40-49</b>	<b>72.9</b>	64.5-81.2	<b>67.5</b>	63.4-71.4	<b>74.4</b>	73.6-75.3
<b>50-59</b>	<b>75.4</b>	67.0-83.8	<b>70.0</b>	65.5-74.2	<b>67.4</b>	66.5-68.4
<b>60-69</b>	<b>69.3</b>	59.9-78.7	<b>71.5</b>	66.5-76.0	<b>67.5</b>	66.4-68.5
<b>70+</b>	<b>58.5</b>	50.0-67.1	<b>62.2</b>	57.6-66.6	<b>59.2</b>	58.3-60.1
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School*</b>	<b>47.6</b>	27.5-66.9	<b>59.9</b>	51.8-67.5	<b>56.3</b>	54.8-57.8
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>71.6</b>	65.1-78.1	<b>57.1</b>	63.5-70.5	<b>67.2</b>	66.4-67.9
<b>Some College</b>	<b>79.7</b>	73.6-85.7	<b>76.7</b>	73.4-79.7	<b>73.6</b>	72.9-74.4
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>84.8</b>	77.7-91.9	<b>83.1</b>	80.3-85.6	<b>80.3</b>	79.6-80.9
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>55.4</b>	41.0-69.7	<b>60.6</b>	54.1-67.1	<b>57.4</b>	55.9-58.8
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>65.1</b>	54.3-75.9	<b>63.5</b>	58.4-68.6	<b>64.6</b>	63.6-65.7
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>84.9</b>	74.1-95.6	<b>68.6</b>	62.7-74.5	<b>70.7</b>	69.6-71.9
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>83.5</b>	75.8-91.1	<b>78.4</b>	73.9-82.9	<b>76.6</b>	75.6-77.6
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>79.3</b>	73.7-85.0	<b>82.3</b>	79.6-85.0	<b>81.2</b>	80.5-81.8

Among Macomb County females, 76.6 percent had a clinical breast exam (CBE) within the recommended time frame for their age group. The rate is slightly higher than the rate among female residents of Michigan (74.2 percent), but the differences were not statistically significantly different. Percentages of women receiving timely CBEs were significantly higher in Macomb County and Michigan when compared with the overall rate in the nation (71.7 percent).

Percentages represent the proportion of female's aged 20-39 who received a CBE within the previous three years and female's aged 40 and older who received a CBE within the previous year.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 24: Percentage of female respondents who had a mammogram within the past year**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>45.9</b>	41.5-50.3	<b>42.3</b>	40.3-44.3	<b>39.7</b>	39.2-40.1
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>7.5</b>	0.0-18.8	<b>10.7</b>	5.2-16.2	<b>9.7</b>	8.7-10.7
<b>25-34</b>	<b>11.1</b>	3.7-18.5	<b>4.2</b>	1.9-6.6	<b>7.3</b>	6.7-7.9
<b>35-44</b>	<b>49.7</b>	40.6-58.9	<b>36.7</b>	32.5-41.0	<b>32.7</b>	31.8-33.6
<b>45-54</b>	<b>61.0</b>	51.6-70.3	<b>62.3</b>	58.1-66.6	<b>58.0</b>	57.1-59.0
<b>55-64</b>	<b>71.4</b>	62.7-80.2	<b>69.1</b>	64.7-73.6	<b>64.4</b>	63.4-65.5
<b>65+</b>	<b>64.4</b>	57.4-71.4	<b>64.9</b>	61.2-68.6	<b>61.6</b>	60.7-62.5
<b>40+</b>	<b>64.9</b>	60.2-69.3	<b>62.7</b>	60.4-65.0	<b>58.3</b>	57.8-58.8
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School*</b>	<b>31.7</b>	16.3-47.1	<b>37.0</b>	29.8-44.3	<b>35.9</b>	34.5-37.3
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>46.7</b>	39.6-53.8	<b>44.3</b>	40.7-47.9	<b>41.2</b>	40.5-42.0
<b>Some College</b>	<b>48.1</b>	40.1-56.1	<b>39.9</b>	36.3-43.6	<b>38.3</b>	37.5-39.1
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>44.3</b>	35.6-53.1	<b>43.8</b>	40.2-47.4	<b>41.0</b>	40.2-41.7
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>46.6</b>	32.3-60.8	<b>32.8</b>	27.1-38.5	<b>33.5</b>	32.1-34.8
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>50.0</b>	38.3-61.7	<b>38.3</b>	33.2-43.3	<b>35.6</b>	34.6-36.6
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>46.2</b>	31.3-61.2	<b>39.9</b>	34.0-45.9	<b>38.5</b>	37.3-39.8
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>38.9</b>	27.7-50.1	<b>42.0</b>	36.6-47.3	<b>39.4</b>	38.4-40.5
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>43.3</b>	36.3-50.3	<b>44.2</b>	40.8-47.6	<b>42.3</b>	41.6-43.1

Among Macomb County females, 45.9 percent had received one within the past year. These rates were not statistically different than the rates for Michigan (53.9 percent within the past two years and 42.3 percent within the past year) or the US (51.4 percent in the past two years and 39.7 percent in the past year).

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who indicated they had a mammogram within the past year.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 25: Percentage of female respondents who had a mammogram within the past two years**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>57.4</b>	52.7-62.0	<b>53.9</b>	51.8-56.0	<b>51.4</b>	50.9-51.8
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>15.0</b>	0.0-32.3	<b>15.1</b>	8.9-21.2	<b>12.9</b>	11.8-14.1
<b>25-34</b>	<b>13.4</b>	5.5-21.4	<b>6.3</b>	3.6-9.1	<b>10.7</b>	10.0-11.4
<b>35-44</b>	<b>62.6</b>	53.8-71.5	<b>51.0</b>	46.5-55.4	<b>45.3</b>	44.3-46.2
<b>45-54</b>	<b>76.4</b>	68.2-84.6	<b>77.9</b>	74.3-81.6	<b>75.7</b>	74.8-76.5
<b>55-64</b>	<b>83.8</b>	76.4-91.1	<b>82.9</b>	79.2-86.6	<b>80.4</b>	79.5-81.3
<b>65+</b>	<b>79.8</b>	74.0-85.7	<b>81.3</b>	78.3-84.3	<b>77.2</b>	76.4-77.9
<b>40+</b>	<b>80.1</b>	76.0-83.6	<b>78.9</b>	76.9-80.8	<b>74.6</b>	74.1-75.0
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School*</b>	<b>48.8</b>	30.2-67.4	<b>48.5</b>	40.7-56.3	<b>47.9</b>	46.4-49.3
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>59.2</b>	51.8-66.6	<b>56.0</b>	52.2-59.8	<b>53.5</b>	52.7-54.4
<b>Some College</b>	<b>60.2</b>	51.9-68.5	<b>52.1</b>	48.2-55.9	<b>50.1</b>	49.2-50.9
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>52.7</b>	43.5-61.9	<b>54.6</b>	50.9-58.3	<b>51.9</b>	51.1-52.6
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>61.9</b>	47.6-76.1	<b>44.6</b>	38.1-51.0	<b>45.0</b>	43.6-46.5
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>62.5</b>	50.3-74.7	<b>50.3</b>	45.0-55.7	<b>47.5</b>	46.4-48.6
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>60.2</b>	44.2-76.2	<b>52.6</b>	46.4-58.9	<b>50.3</b>	49.0-51.6
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>51.0</b>	38.8-63.2	<b>55.5</b>	49.9-61.2	<b>50.4</b>	49.2-51.5
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>53.8</b>	46.5-61.0	<b>54.7</b>	51.1-58.2	<b>54.4</b>	53.6-55.1

Among Macomb County females, 57.4 percent had received a mammogram within the past two years and 45.9 percent had received one within the past year. These rates were not statistically different than the rates for Michigan (53.9 percent within the past two years and 42.3 percent within the past year) or the US (51.4 percent in the past two years and 39.7 percent in the past year).

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who indicated they had a mammogram within the past two years.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.



**Table 26: Percentage of female respondents who have had a Pap test within the past three years**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>86.0</b>	82.6-89.5	<b>82.6</b>	81.0-84.1	<b>81.8</b>	81.5-82.2
<b>Age</b>						
<b>18-24*</b>	<b>60.8</b>	35.3-86.2	<b>84.2</b>	78.7-88.4	<b>77.0</b>	75.4-78.5
<b>25-34</b>	<b>92.8</b>	85.8-99.8	<b>91.4</b>	88.3-93.8	<b>92.3</b>	91.7-92.9
<b>35-44</b>	<b>96.3</b>	93.1-99.6	<b>87.7</b>	84.4-90.3	<b>89.1</b>	88.5-89.8
<b>45-54</b>	<b>90.8</b>	85.2-96.5	<b>82.5</b>	78.7-85.7	<b>85.7</b>	85.0-86.4
<b>55-64</b>	<b>87.5</b>	81.1-93.8	<b>77.2</b>	72.6-81.3	<b>80.4</b>	79.5-81.3
<b>65+</b>	<b>71.3</b>	64.2-78.3	<b>66.9</b>	63.2-70.6	<b>64.3</b>	63.4-65.2
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School*</b>	<b>56.6</b>	37.5-75.6	<b>75.1</b>	68.2-81.0	<b>73.6</b>	72.3-74.8
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>81.4</b>	75.0-87.7	<b>76.5</b>	73.1-79.5	<b>77.7</b>	77.0-78.4
<b>Some College</b>	<b>92.5</b>	88.6-96.4	<b>85.4</b>	82.6-87.9	<b>82.7</b>	82.1-83.4
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>90.0</b>	82.5-97.5	<b>89.0</b>	86.5-91.0	<b>88.6</b>	88.1-89.1
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>76.4</b>	65.3-87.5	<b>70.2</b>	63.8-76.7	<b>71.9</b>	70.6-73.2
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>81.4</b>	72.9-89.9	<b>74.9</b>	70.4-79.3	<b>76.4</b>	75.5-77.4
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>79.1</b>	64.8-93.5	<b>80.2</b>	75.5-85.0	<b>81.3</b>	80.3-82.3
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>91.6</b>	85.5-97.8	<b>86.8</b>	83.2-90.5	<b>86.0</b>	85.2-86.8
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>92.1</b>	87.9-96.3	<b>89.4</b>	87.1-91.7	<b>90.0</b>	89.5-90.5

Nearly nine out of ten (86.0 percent) Macomb County females had received a Pap test within the past three years. This rate was not significantly different than the rate for Michigan (82.6 percent), but was statistically significantly higher than the rate among all females in the US of 81.8 percent.

Women between the ages of 35 and 44 were significantly more likely to have received a Pap in the past three years (96.3 percent).

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who indicated they had a Pap test within the past three years.

\* Sample sizes less than 50 in Macomb County.

**Table 27: Percentage of male respondents who indicated they had a PSA test**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Age</b>						
<b>40+</b>	<b>69.1</b>	62.6-75.0	<b>62.1</b>	59.0-65.1	<b>60.6</b>	60.0-61.3
<b>50+</b>	<b>83.4</b>	77.5-88.0	<b>80.5</b>	77.3-83.4	<b>76.5</b>	75.7-77.2
<b>50-59</b>	<b>78.4</b>	68.4-85.8	<b>73.6</b>	68.0-78.4	<b>65.9</b>	64.6-67.1
<b>60-69</b>	<b>92.2</b>	81.8-96.9	<b>89.6</b>	85.5-92.7	<b>83.6</b>	82.5-84.6
<b>70+</b>	<b>83.0</b>	70.0-91.0	<b>83.7</b>	77.8-88.3	<b>86.4</b>	85.5-87.4
<b>Education (50+)</b>						
<b>High school -</b>	<b>77.3</b>	65.9-85.6	<b>74.1</b>	68.4-79.1	<b>70.4</b>	69.1-71.6
<b>Some College +</b>	<b>88.1</b>	81.3-92.6	<b>84.5</b>	80.6-87.8	<b>80.5</b>	79.6-81.3
<b>Income (50+)</b>						
<b>&lt;\$35,000</b>	<b>73.9</b>	60.4-84.1	<b>71.7</b>	65.3-77.3	<b>70.9</b>	69.6-72.2
<b>\$35,000+</b>	<b>85.9</b>	78.1-91.2	<b>85.3</b>	81.5-88.5	<b>80.0</b>	79.1-80.8

Among Macomb County males aged 50 and older, 83.4 percent had received a PSA test sometime in their lifetime. This percentage was slightly higher than in Michigan males aged 50 and older (80.5 percent) and significantly higher than the percentage of men in the US who were 50 years old or older who had received a PSA during their lifetime (76.5 percent)

Percentages represent the proportion of males 40 and older who indicated they had a PSA test.

**Table 28: Percentage of respondents 50 and older who have had a sigmoidoscopy or colonoscopy**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Macomb County (2005)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>State of Michigan (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>National (2004)</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>60.2</b>	55.7-64.5	<b>60.3</b>	58.1-62.5	<b>53.8</b>	53.3-54.3
<b>Age</b>						
<b>50-59</b>	<b>48.9</b>	41.6-56.3	<b>47.8</b>	44.2-51.4	<b>42.7</b>	41.9-43.5
<b>60-69</b>	<b>68.8</b>	61.0-75.7	<b>67.8</b>	64.0-71.4	<b>59.2</b>	58.3-60.1
<b>70+</b>	<b>67.9</b>	60.6-74.4	<b>71.0</b>	67.4-74.2	<b>64.4</b>	63.5-65.2
<b>Gender</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>62.6</b>	55.2-69.4	<b>61.3</b>	57.8-64.7	<b>54.3</b>	53.5-55.1
<b>Female</b>	<b>58.3</b>	52.7-63.6	<b>59.4</b>	56.7-62.2	<b>53.4</b>	52.8-54.0
<b>Education</b>						
<b>&lt; High School</b>	<b>54.1</b>	38.1-69.3	<b>52.1</b>	45.1-59.1	<b>43.6</b>	42.1-45.2
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>60.6</b>	53.5-67.2	<b>60.1</b>	56.3-63.7	<b>51.0</b>	50.1-51.8
<b>Some College</b>	<b>59.7</b>	51.4-67.5	<b>60.1</b>	55.8-64.4	<b>54.3</b>	53.3-55.3
<b>College Graduate</b>	<b>62.6</b>	53.2-71.1	<b>63.4</b>	59.5-67.2	<b>60.7</b>	59.8-61.6
<b>Income</b>						
<b>&lt;\$15,000</b>	<b>44.1</b>	30.3-58.9	<b>56.8</b>	50.0-63.4	<b>44.1</b>	42.6-45.7
<b>\$15,000-\$24,999</b>	<b>56.7</b>	45.6-67.2	<b>58.1</b>	52.7-63.3	<b>50.8</b>	49.6-52.0
<b>\$25,000-\$34,999</b>	<b>63.9</b>	50.6-75.3	<b>61.2</b>	55.3-66.7	<b>52.8</b>	51.3-54.2
<b>\$35,000-\$49,999</b>	<b>63.0</b>	51.3-73.3	<b>60.4</b>	54.6-66.0	<b>55.1</b>	53.8-56.4
<b>\$50,000+</b>	<b>57.6</b>	49.3-65.5	<b>61.5</b>	57.5-65.4	<b>57.5</b>	56.6-58.5

Among Macomb County adults aged 50 and older, 60.2 percent had received a sigmoidoscopy or colonoscopy sometime in their lifetime. The Macomb County rate was nearly identical to the Michigan rate (60.3 percent), but significantly higher than the national rate of 53.8 percent.

Percentages represent the proportion of respondents who indicated they had a sigmoidoscopy or colonoscopy.

# Child Proxy Summary Results

## ***Physical Fitness Level***

Macomb County adults were asked to describe the child's physical condition and fitness level. In Macomb County, 61.2 percent of the children were described as being in "excellent" physical condition and fitness level. Only 3.2 percent of children were described as having less than "good" overall fitness.

Girls and boys were equally likely to have excellent fitness levels (boys – 61.0 percent; girls – 61.3 percent), but girls were slightly more likely to be categorized as either fair or poor (4.0 percent) than boys (2.4 percent). Children between ten and fifteen were slightly more likely to have excellent fitness levels (66.3 percent) than those between the ages of five and nine (55.6 percent), but when data were compared as a binary: good or better health vs. less than good health, the percentages were nearly identical with 96.3 percent of children between ten and fifteen having good or better health and 97.3 percent of those between the ages of five and nine having health described as good or better.

Adults were asked to estimate the number of days in a week the child gets at least 30 minutes or more of moderate exercise. Among Macomb County children, the average number of days was 5.9 per week. Boys tended to get a little more (6.2 days) than girls (5.6 days) and those between the ages of five and nine had slightly more active days (6.2 days) than children between the ages of ten and fifteen (5.5 days).

## ***Child Weight***

Overweight and obese children and teens are at greater risk for many co-morbid conditions, both immediate and long-term. Their risk is approximately ten times greater than that of normal weight children for hypertension in young adulthood, three to eight times greater for dyslipidemias, and more than twice as great for diabetes mellitus.<sup>1</sup>

Among Macomb County children aged five to fifteen, 12.7 percent were described as overweight. Nearly the same percentage (11.2 percent) was described as underweight. Males were slightly more likely to be classified as overweight (14.1 percent) or underweight (13.1 percent) than females (overweight – 11.5 percent; underweight – 9.5 percent). Children aged ten to fifteen were more likely to be described as overweight (15.5 percent) than children aged five to nine, although the difference was not statistically significant.

One-in-twenty (5.3 percent) Macomb County children between the ages of five and fifteen had been described by a doctor as overweight or obese. Males were slightly more likely (6.2 percent) to have received the diagnosis than females (4.5 percent). Children between the ages of ten and fifteen were more likely to have been described by a doctor as overweight or obese (7.7 percent) than those between the ages of five and nine (2.7 percent). All of the children (100 percent) who had doctors indicate they were overweight had, at sometime, told the adult interviewed they would like to lose weight.

## ***Child Nutrition***

Adults were asked to estimate how many times a week the child eats fast foods. Nearly one-in-ten (9.6 percent) of Macomb County children between the ages of five and fifteen eat fast food

---

<sup>1</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. September 2, 2005 / 54(34);848-849. Atlanta, GA. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services.  
Macomb County BRFS  
Final Report  
December 9, 2005

three or more times a week. The percentage of girls that ate fast food that often was double (13.0 percent) the percent of boys (5.9 percent). Children between the ages of ten and fifteen were also twice as likely (13.4 percent) to eat fast food three or more times a week than those aged five to nine (5.4 percent). A small proportion (2.8 percent) of the children never ate fast food.

The average number of servings of fruits and vegetables for Macomb County children was 2.4 servings per day. Over three-fourths (78.0 percent) of Macomb County children ate two meals a day that include a protein, a starch and a fruit or vegetable. There were no differences between genders and age groups.

Over two-thirds (69.1 percent) of Macomb County children ate snack foods high in sugar or fat such as candy, chips and baked goods at least once a day. Boys were slightly more likely to eat high sugar and fat-content foods at least once a day (72.0 percent) than girls (66.1 percent), but differences were not significant. Children between the ages of five and nine were slightly more likely to eat sugary or fatty snacks (72.1 percent) than children between the ages of ten and fifteen (66.3 percent).

Macomb County children drink sweetened beverages 1.4 times per day on average. Means did not differ between ages and genders. Children drank juice an average of 4.9 times per day. Girls were twice as likely to consume juice (mean: 6.7 times per day) than boys (mean: 2.9 times per day) and children aged five to nine drank juice an average of 5.7 times a day compared with 4.1 times a day among ten to fifteen year-olds.

Children in Macomb County between the ages of five and fifteen had 2.2 servings of dairy products per day, on average. There were very little differences in dairy consumption between genders and ages.

## ***Screen Time***

Screen time includes any time spent watching TV, using a computer and playing video games, including hand-held devices. In Macomb County, children spent an average of two hours and 21 minutes engaging in screen-time activities on a daily basis. Girls had a slightly higher average (two hours and 52 minutes) than boys (two hours and 18 minutes), but differences were not significant.

Children between the ages of ten and fifteen had more screen time on a daily basis (two hours and 43 minutes) than children between the ages of five and nine (two hours and 28 minutes). However, there were no significant differences regarding daily screen time and age.

## ***Physical Activities***

Insufficient physical activity is a risk factor for persons being overweight or obese and for having many related chronic diseases. Regular physical activity is associated with immediate and long-term health benefits such as weight control, lower blood pressure, improved cardiorespiratory function, and enhanced psychological well-being. Active children are more likely to become active adults.

Macomb County children participated in organized physical activities 2.2 times per week, on average. There was little difference between gender categories (boys – 2.3 times; girls – 2.1 times). However, there were differences between age groups with ten to fifteen year olds participating in organized physical activities an average of 2.5 times per week compared with 1.9 times per week for children between the ages of five and nine.

Macomb County children attended physical education (PE or Gym) classes 2.3 days per week, on average. Similar to results for organized activities, there were no differences in genders with boys spending an average of 2.5 days per week in gym and girls spending 2.1 days. However, children over the age of nine spent 2.7 days in gym while those aged five to nine spent only 1.8 days per week in gym class.

### ***Child Safety***

Only 28.8 percent of children always wore a helmet when bike riding, using a skateboard or roller-blading. Over one-fourth (27.0 percent) never wore a helmet when engaging in these activities where helmets are recommended.

Females were slightly more likely to always wear a helmet (32.2 percent) than males (25.2 percent), but differences were not significant. Children aged five to nine were significantly more likely to always wear a helmet (42.2 percent) when compared to children between the ages of ten and fifteen (16.4 percent).

### ***Child Health Care Coverage***

Nearly all (96.8 percent) children in Macomb County had some kind of health care coverage. While differences were not significant, children between the ages of five and nine were slightly more likely to be covered by health care coverage (99.2 percent) than children between the ages of ten and fifteen (94.5 percent).

### ***Child Health***

Nearly nine out of ten (87.0 percent) of all Macomb County children had received a blood pressure check. Among those who had received a blood pressure check, nearly all (98.7 percent) had normal blood pressure levels.

A small proportion (18.0 percent) of Macomb County children had ever had their cholesterol checked. Males were slightly more likely to have had a cholesterol check (23.5 percent) than females (13.4 percent), but there was almost no difference between age groups (five to nine year-olds: 17.1 percent; ten to fifteen year-olds: 18.8 percent). Among those children who had received a cholesterol check, nearly all (98.3 percent) had normal cholesterol levels.

### ***Family Activities***

Adults were asked how often the child participated with the family in physical activities such as biking, walking or swimming. Nearly half of all children in Macomb County (49.1 percent) always participated with their families in some activity such as biking, walking or swimming. There was very little difference between genders regarding family activity participation (boys – 46.4 percent; girls – 51.5 percent) or age (five to nine year-olds – 52.1 percent; ten to fifteen year-olds – 46.2 percent).

