No. 876

Differentials in the Demand for Health Cheek-up in Japan

by

Tadashi Yamada and Tetsuji Yamada

July 2000

Differentials in the Demand for Health Check-up

June 2000

Tadashi Yamada
Institute of Policy and Planning Sciences
University of Tsukuba
Tsukuba City, Ibaraki Prefecture 305-8573
Japan

and

Tetsuji Yamada
Department of Economics
Rutgers University, The State University of N.J.
Camden, N.J. 08102
U.S.A.

This research was originally a part of the report of "Studies on Natural Increases in the Medical Expenditures" by the Japanese Center for Economic Research (JCER) to the Institute for Health Economics and Policy. This paper is prepared for the Biwako Conference on Issues of Social Insurance of Japan held on the 13th through 15th of July 2000, and is an extension of the work presented at the joint meeting of JCER and the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) in Hawaii, U.S., 20-23 January 2000; as such, this study is similar in many aspects to the work presented in Hawaii and a part of this paper was presented at the 75th Annual W.E.A. International Conference in Vancouver, B.C., Canada, 29-June to 3-July 2000. This research is supported by the Japanese Center for Economic Research; the Nomura Foundation for Social Science; the Japan Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture (Grant #11630034); and the Research Council Grant of Rutgers University, USA. The views presented here are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the funding agencies nor those of the affiliated institutions.

Abstract

Good health enhances market earnings by increasing healthy days for work, and by increasing non-market productivity, which allows for more time available for household production. The health check-up is one good strategy to secure good health. This study aims to explain the behavior toward the demand for health check-up by the population ages 20-64 in Japan. We focus on the effects on the demand for health check-up of different types of health insurance with respect to gender-specific response. Using sample data from the *National Survey of Life* in 1995, we find a number of socio-economic and demographic factors to be the determinants of the health check-up. These determinants include: age, gender, earnings, type of health insurance cover, firm size, occupation, and objective evaluation measures of health conditions. These variables are shown to be mostly significant in our models. Our empirical study shows that differentials in the demand for health check-up rate among Japanese population ages 20-64 are mainly due to differences in costs in accessing the health check-up as well as the expected loss due to illness. Hence, government policy to mitigate the health check-up costs in various forms is highly recommended, which can be accomplished through the effective targeting of disadvantaged groups such as married women, National Health Insurance insurants and employees relatively smaller-sized firms.

Differentials in the Demand for Health Check-up in Japan

I. Introduction

Good health is by itself of great value. It enhances market earnings by increasing healthy days for work (Grossman 1972), and by increasing non-market productivity, it allows for more time available for household production (Becker 1976). Health check-up is a good strategy to secure and maintain good health. However, a survey by the Japanese government, the *National Survey of Life* in 1995 (Kokumin Seikatu Kiso Chosa, in Japanese), shows that not only about half of the population has the health check-up, but also the demand for health check-up substantially varies among the population. The reasons behind the low demand for health check-up as well as the differentials in the demand under the comprehensive Japanese medical health care system await clarification.

Health check-up has at least two aspects. First, under uncertainty, one can likely obtain more objective diagnostic health information over subjective self-evaluation of health. Second, the health check-up will lead to a further demand for preventive medical care when necessary. Consequently, early medical care often curtails serious illnesses. In general, individuals demand less health information when they are young, but their demand increases as age rises (Kenkel 1990). The individual's decision to have health check-up depends on accessibility to health check-up facilities. That is, costs of health check-up including both the coverage of medical costs by health insurance and time costs become the major determinants of the demand for health check-up and the latter have larger time-price elasticity in the demand for medical inputs (Phelps and Newhouse 1974, Coffey 1983). While income has a positive effect on the demand for preventive medical care (Kenkel 1994), and a better knowledge of one's own health information increases the demand for preventive medical care (Hsieh and Lin 1997), better health gives less incentive for individuals to collect health information. All these aspects of the individual's behavior toward the demand for health check-up are due to involved uncertainty (Arrow 1963).

This study focuses on differentials in the demand for the health check-up according to different types of health insurance and by gender. Its purpose lies in attempting to clarify the reasons behind the low demand for the health check-up among females more than males, and among persons covered by the National Health Insurance more than those covered by other types of health insurance in Japan. There had been few empirical studies, precedent to this study, which focused on this issue that uses micro-data from the *National Survey of Life* in 1995. Our study takes a sample of 449,051 people ages 20-64 from the entire 746,592 observations of all

ages 12 and over in the Survey.[1] Based on the empirical results, we find that the gender differential in the demand for health check-up exists after controlling other socio-economic and demographic variables. Age is one of the major factors that determine the demand for the health check up. Types of health insurance coverage as well as sizes of organizations the individual works for are also robust factors that affect individual demand for the health check-up.

This paper is organized as follows. The next section provides the aspects of the health check-up based on the aforementioned survey. Section III presents our theoretical model that shows comparative static analysis of the demand for health check-up, as well as the explanation of the variables of interest in this study. We then report our empirical results in Section IV and our summary in Section V.

II. Aspects of the Health Check-up

Japan's Medical Insurance System is a comprehensive system covering the entire population through the National Health Insurance, the Employees' Health Insurance, and the Seamen's Insurance.[2] Of the Employees' Health Insurance, there are three types: (1) the Society-managed Health Insurance, provided for by an employer with 700 employees or more,[3] (2) the Health Insurance managed by the Government, provided for by an employer with less than 700 employees, and (3) the Mutual Aid Associations Health Insurance covering public employees, and teachers and personnel of private schools. The medical care benefits under the Employees' Health Insurance cover 80% and 70% of medical costs for insured persons and their dependents, respectively. The National Health Insurance is a community-based insurance plan for local residents who are not covered by the Employees' Health Insurance. It pays for 70% of the medical costs incurred by all insured persons.[4]

---

[1] For the detailed description, see the *Japan Statistical Yearbook 1999* (Statistic Bureau, Management and Coordination Agency, 1998, p. 616). The total number of correspondents in the 1995 Survey is 746,592: N (aged 19 and less) = 177,430; N (aged 20-64) = 449,051; and N (aged 65 and more) = 120,111.

[2] In addition to these insurance systems, there is the health service system for the elderly aged 70 or more, who receive medical care services at minimum cost. The detailed outline of Japan's Medical Care Security System is described in the *Outline of Social Insurance in Japan 1998* (Social Insurance Agency, Government of Japan, 1999), which this section summarizes.

[3] The number of employees is not rigid in practice.

[4] The contribution rate levied on basic wages of employees varies among different types of health insurance: half of the contribution rate (8.5%) of the Health Insurance managed by Government is paid by the employers (4.25%); employees under the Society-managed Health Insurance are responsible for only 3.658% of their contribution rate (8.394%), the rest being paid for by their employers. National government employees, on the other hand, pay 9.195% of their contribution rate (18.39%). Source: *Outline of Social Insurance in Japan 1998* (Social Insurance Agency, Government of Japan, 1999), pp. 140-143.

Of the various health check-ups provided by firms, there are three classifications: the compulsory health check-up instituted by law, the recommended health check-up, and the discretionary ones in the firms. The general health check-up is usually compulsory prior to the commencement of employment, and then again once every year throughout the duration of employment. It includes the following items: (1) report of medical history, (2) self-evaluation and objective evaluation of medical symptoms, (3) height, weight, optesthesia, color vision (chromatopsia), and audiometry, (4) chest X-ray radiography, (5) blood pressure, (6) urine examination, (7) anemia, (8) liver function, (9) blood lipids, (10) blood sugar, and (11) electrocardiogram.

Besides these various health check-ups, firms often provide their employees another type of health check-up as a fringe benefit: half day, one-day or two-day thorough health check-up in hospital once a year in order to find the employee's sickness at an early stage as well as to promote the employees' health condition.[5] This type of medical service for employees, called "*Nin-gen* Dock (in Japanese)," is not covered by the Employees' Health Insurance. According to *The Situations of Fringe Benefits* (Fukuri Kosei Jizyo, in Japanese: Institute of Labor Administration, 1998), about 81 percent of the surveyed 5,000 firms, sampled from all over the industries, subsidize about 70 percent or more of the incurred medical costs of the comprehensive health check up in hospital.[6] The average amount of the coverage is about $350, within the range of $100 to $900.[7] About 89 percent of the firms with 3,000 employees or more provide this subsidy, about 84 percent of those with 1,000 - 2,999 employees, and about 74 percent of those with less than 1,000 employees.

In a similar way, the National Health Insurance also provides for various types of health check-up to local residents who are not covered by the Employees' Health Insurance and other types of health insurance.[8] Generally, the local government notifies their residents about the schedules for the health check-up. These health check-up periods are scattered throughout the year in order to avoid the busy periods for their residents, e.g., farmers. Residents usually go to one of the health centers within the vicinity for their health check-up but go to hospitals and

[5] This health check-up is often extended to the employee's spouse, parents and children.
[6] The Institute of Labor Administration (1998), *Situations of Fringe Benefits*, pp. 278-285 and pp. 334-347. The survey period was from October 19 to December 28 in 1995.
[7] All dollar values in this paper are calculated based on the exchange rate of $1 = 100 yen, for brevity. We note that, according to OECD HEALTH DATA 98, per capita health expenditures incorporate the purchasing power parity (PPP), $1 = 195.35 yen, in calculation. However, ours use $1 = 100 yen for two reasons: first, the dollar values in PPP seem to underestimate the reality in Japan; and second, our dollar values can be easily translated into the PPP values if those values are halved.
[8] Spouses of employees, covered under the Employees' Health Insurance as dependents, may receive this service upon their request to the corresponding local government.

clinics for certain types of medical check-ups. They pay the minimum fee according to the type of health check-up they take.

The types of health check-up provided by local governments are as follows: (1) group health check-up at local health centers and individual visits to hospitals or clinics,[9] and (2) comprehensive medical health check-up in hospitals, i.e., the "*Nin-gen* Dock". The former includes the basic health check-up items mentioned earlier for a fee of about $10, and tests for the following: gastric cancer ($8), carcinoma of the colon and rectum ($5), lung cancer (no fee; $5 for examination of sputum), tuberculosis (no fee), carcinoma cancer uteri ($6), osteoporosis ($5), breast cancer ($10), and other types of women's medical tests ($5). The latter is inclusive of the basic health check-up items plus other services depending on the length of hospital stay. The subsidies by local governments are, for example, $175 for general medical examination (own out-of-pocket expenses are about $190; that is, the total costs are about $365), $250 for brain examination (own expenses are about $274), and $375 for comprehensive examination, i.e., general plus brain examinations, (private expenses amount to about $410). The provisions for the above-mentioned health check-up have age restrictions, such as the general medical examination for people aged 30 or more, and the brain and comprehensive examinations for those aged 40 or more.

Now, we will report on how people aged 20 to 64 in Japan have the health check-up, based on the *National Survey of Life* in 1995 ("Kokumin Seikatsu Kiso Chosa" in Japanese; hereafter the Survey). Of people aged 20-64 in the Survey, the sample sizes are: overall N = 449,051, male N = 219,983, and female N = 229,068. The overall average of the health check-up is 0.557, that is, 55.7% of the population who had their health check-up. The proportion of males taking the health check-up is 0.607, which is about 10 percentage points above the 0.509 of females. Let us now refer to the sample means of the proportion of people having their health check-up by different types of health insurance and different age groups. We show the averages for each type of insurance cover for each age group in Table 1 and Figure 1. We note that the health check-up proportion is highest (0.692) for Mutual Aid Associations Health Insurance in almost all of the different age groups, and second highest (0.647) for Society-managed Health Insurance.[10] Meanwhile, NHI insurants have the lowest proportion of health check-up takers (0.419).

---

[9] The following items of health check-up and the corresponding fees vary with the locality involved, reflecting the budgetary constraints of their respective local governments.

[10] One of the possible reasons why persons covered by the Mutual Aid Associations Health Insurance have higher health check-up rates maybe due to the fact that those working at schools or universities have medical offices at the work place.

A reason for the high health check-up rate for both is that employees covered by either health insurance enjoy better and more fringe benefits, and with easier access to the health check-up, they incur lesser costs. In fact, firms with 1,000 or more employees, by law, must have their industrial doctor and medical assistance such as nurses in their work places. On the other hand, smaller firms may provide less medical facilities and services at their working sites, and sometimes they may not want employees to leave their jobs simply for the health check-up. In response to this problem, branches of the Supervision of Labor Standards often facilitate informing the employers, as well as providing on-site health check-up by parking medical vehicles with X-ray radiation equipment near or at their work sites. Also, people with the National Health Insurance have less accessibility to health check-up facilities than those working at large firms; although both groups are notified regarding the health check-up days and places by local governments. As observed in Table 1 and Figure 1, we notice that there are variations in the health check-up rates among different health insurance as well as among different age groups of each health insurance. The apparent reason that people of older age groups have higher health check-up rate is due to their higher risk of sickness as compared with younger age groups. Thus, these differences in health check-up rate by the type of health insurance and also by the age factor must be underlined.

Table 2 and Figure 2 provide the health check-up rates according to gender. We find males with Mutual Aid Associations Health Insurance (i.e., public employees, and teachers and personnel of private schools) and those with Society-managed Health Insurance (i.e., 700 employees or more in a firm) have very high health check-up rates. For example, the difference in the overall health check-up rate between males with the National Health Insurance and those with the Mutual Aid Associations Health Insurance is nearly 40 percentage points; the former is 0.409 and the latter 0.789 in Table 2. For females in the same two categories, the differential becomes somewhat smaller: 0.429 for females with the National Health Insurance, and 0.598 for their counterparts with Mutual Aid Associations Health Insurance.

Females, except those with the National Health Insurance, have a similar pattern of the health check-up rate, as shown in Figure 2. Their health check-up rates dip at the age of 30-34 years old.[11] This reduction in the health check-up rate probably reflects the timing of marriage and the delivery of a child. During pregnancy, these women meet doctors on a regular basis so

[11] We note a similar dip with Japanese female labor force participation rate: 73.4% (ages 20-24), 68.2% (25-29), 56.2 (30-34), 62.3 (35-39), 70.9 (40-44), and 72.2 (45-49), as of 1997: Government of Japan, Ministry of Labor (1999), *Whitepaper on Female Labor,* F11. This dip is a typical phenomenon of female labor force participation in Japan.

they are likely to be well informed regarding their health conditions. They do not need to take their health check-up. Furthermore, they are likely to be advised not to take X-ray during the period of maternity. Although we do not see any dip in the health check-up rate of females with the National Health Insurance, the average rate for those aged 30-39 is far lower (0.278) than those covered by other types of health insurance. Thus, we observe there exist variations in the opportunities for health check-up for different health insurance types and gender. The low health check-up rate of females aged 30-39 very likely reflects the risk of maternity.

Now, we examine more in detail the difference in health check-up rate between married and single women (see Table 3 and Figure 3). First, we note that the rate among women aged 20-29 and 30-39 is lower for married than for single women in all types of health insurance. Second, except for women insurants under the National Health Insurance, the health check-up rate of single women is generally higher than the rate of married women of all age groups from 20-29 to 50-60. Third, the difference in health check-up rate between married and single women under a given health insurance narrows at the ages of 61-64. An explanation for the higher health check-up rates among single women is probably due to a larger loss in income if they should become ill and have no one to ask for help.[12] On the other hand, the generally low health check-up rate for married women can be partially explained by the following reasons. First, as mentioned previously, married women ages 20 to 39 have a high risk of damaging the fetus by having X-ray during the pregnancy period. Second, married women with young children and those living with their parents face higher opportunity costs of having their health check-up unless they get supportive assistance for household work when they visit clinics and hospitals. Finally, the reason why the health check-up rates are similar among different types of health insurance, wherein the check-up rate lowers at the ages of 61-64, can be attributed to the retirement age. That is to say most women are already retired from employment. Concerning males, the health check-up rate is always higher for married than for single men (see Table 4 and Figure 4). The fear of losing their income due to illness seems to be giving strong incentives for married men to have their health check-up.

Finally, we will examine the attitude of people with National Health Insurance by employment status because these NHI insurants have the lowest rates of the health check-up. We have argued earlier that people having greater accessibility to health check-up facilities are more likely to take their health check-up than otherwise. If this hypothesis is correct, people with same

[12] Difference in rate of time preference between married and single women may be also another explanation. However, the health check-up rate is reversed between them at the late age of 61-64. Thus, a consistently low rate of time preference for single women may not be a good explanation.

National Health Insurance but have different employment settings will have different health check-up rates. For example, those with National Health Insurance but employed at large-sized firms (e.g. those with over 1,000 workers) should have higher health check-up rates compared to those working at a relatively small-sized firm with less than 30 workers.[13] Tables 5 and 6 provide the health check-up rates of females and males according to employment status, respectively. We see that the health check-up rate is highest (0.624) for female insurants of the National Health Insurance but working at a firm with over 1,000 workers in Table 5 and the rate is similarly higher for their counterpart within the male sample (0.784) in Table 6. On the other hand, household workers have one of the lowest health check-up rates (regardless of gender) among the various categories of employment.[14] Additional evidence is, however, provided by related household-categories, such as the self-employed, family workers, etc. The low rate of health check-up among people working at a firm with 1-4 workers reflects that smaller firms provide less medical facilities and services at their work sites than larger firms and sometime the former may not want employees to leave their jobs simply for the health check-up.

For this section, what we have learned from the sample of approximately 450,000 people, aged 20 to 64, obtained from the *National Survey of Life* in 1995 may be summarized as follows.

(1) As people grow older, they are more likely to take the health check-up.

(2) People with National Health Insurance are less likely to take the health check-up than those covered either by Society-managed Health Insurance or Mutual Aid Associations Health Insurance.

(3) Males and females have distinctly different attitudes toward the health check-up.

(4) Single women are more likely to take the health check-up than married ones; for the males, the opposite is true.

(5) Among people with National health Insurance, those employed by larger-sized firms have the health check-up more than those employed at home and in smaller-sized firms.

We shall try to incorporate these observations into our theoretical model and to clarify the factors that contribute to the low health check-up rate of insurants under the National Health Insurance, which is the lowest health check-up rate among the different health insurances.

[13] A firm with over 1,000 workers usually provides a Society-managed Health Insurance.
[14] We might need to take into account that both sample sizes are too small to be statistically valid.

III. Theoretical Model

3-1. Model

As was mentioned in the previous section, the average proportion of 20 to 64 year-old Japanese, who had the health check-up in 1995, is about 56%. Nearly half of the population did not take their health check-up despite the fact that the purpose of the health check-up is to provide information on the individual's health status by identifying symptoms and illnesses at their early stages.

There are a number of possible explanations as to why people do not take the health check-up. One of the possible reasons could be that most people are risk-lovers, but this is hardly an acceptable explanation. Or that, on the contrary, most people are risk-averse but they feel they have adequate knowledge of their health condition; thus, the marginal benefits of having the health check-up are too little relative to its costs. There are many other explanations that are possible but too many to be mentioned. However, irrespective of the reasons, people are faced with the uncertainty problem of the incidence of an illness. Generally, a person could prevent future financial losses and psychological burdens by having more and better information with regard to her present health condition. This kind of information could be provided by the health check-up.

In this section, we would like to show an application of the theory of insurance under uncertainty. This aims to explain the individual's choice on whether to have or not to have the health check-up in response to the exogenous changes the individual is faced with.

Let us assume that an individual's preferences can be represented by a utility function,

$$U = U(S_1, S_2; \pi_1, \pi_2). \quad \ldots\ldots (1)$$

Here, utility is defined over the contingent earning capacity (S_1, S_2).[15] The corresponding probabilities π_1, π_2 are parameters of the utility function, since the value of a state-contingent earning capacity depends on how likely the state is to occur.

Suppose there is an event S_1, where an individual is faced with probability π_1: she maintains her initial health-related endowment S_0 by incurring the cost $(P + C)$ per unit of health check-up h;[16] P is the price of health check-up per unit; and C is pecuniary as well as

[15] Normally in a text like Silberberg (1990), wealth rather than earning capacity is used in a typical uncertainty model. However, since we are applying the theory of household production to the model, we prefer the use of "earning capacity," which is assumed to be reflecting monetary units like wealth. This simple application of the theory of insurance under uncertainty is based on Pauly (1989), pp. 309-319, and Silberberg (1990), pp. 445-447.

[16] Here, we avoid putting subscript i to represent the individual, for brevity.

non-pecuniary costs other than P of health check-up. P differs according to the individual's health insurance. Then, S_1 is defined as,

$$S_1 = S_0 - (P + C)h. \quad \ldots\ldots (2)$$

In the second event S_2, the individual is now faced with the probability π_2: she suffers loss L of her earning capacity. We assume further that the value of loss increases as her age A progresses. That is, the individual's opportunity costs rise (at a diminishing rate) as age does.[17] Her stock of health eventually depreciates as age increases. Also, We assume an additional factor in the argument of loss L: the individual may take some health promoting activities H to increase her health stock HS. Loss L is defined as follows:

$$L = L(A, H), \quad \frac{\partial L}{\partial A} > 0 \text{ and } \frac{\partial L}{\partial H} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial HS}\frac{\partial HS}{\partial H} > 0. \quad \ldots\ldots (3)$$

In equation (3), the size of loss L depends on types of illnesses.[18] Different illnesses show different measurable symptoms (although some show similarities) such as high blood pressure, high cholesterol, proteinuria, and high white blood cell. Each symptom s_j is associated with a particular illness and, hence, with a particular loss L_j. Having the health check-up is influenced by subjective and/or objective symptoms such that,

$$h = h(s_j), \quad j = 1,\ldots,n. \quad \ldots\ldots (4)$$

If symptoms are subject to a probability distribution such as $\pi_j(s_j)$, we can assume that having the health check-up is an inverse function of symptoms,

$$\pi_j^{-1}(h) = (s_j). \quad \ldots\ldots (5)$$

Therefore, we can show the relationship between health check-up h and loss L_j as,

$$\pi_j{}^*(h)L_j, \quad \ldots\ldots (6)$$

where $\pi_j{}^*$ is probability associated with loss L_j. The expected loss due to illness can be expressed as,

$$\text{Expected Loss} = \pi^*(h)L(A,H) = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\pi_j{}^*(h)L_j(A,H). \quad \ldots\ldots (7)$$

[17] We implicitly assume here that there is an accumulation of health stock up to a certain age.

[18] For example, the major diseases among the fifty- and sixty-year old Japanese are diseases of the digestive system, circulatory system, musculoskeletal system and connective tissue, and nervous system and sense organs (*Japan Statistical Yearbook* 1999, pp.670-671).

Finally, if event 2 occurs, the individual receives medical care, which can be considered as earning-capacity-augmenting benefits M. However, the individual may not be able to receive benefits without some negative aspects. That is, during the interim when she is sick and is treated by a medical doctor, she visits the clinic or hospital; she awaits her turn with fatigue.[19] The psychological burden should be considered in the calculations of costs such that $-gM$, where $0 < g < 1$. Now, we define event 2 in terms of loss and benefits in money-equivalent units,

$$S_2 = S_0 - (P + C)h - \pi^*(h)L(A, H) + (1 - g)M, \quad \ldots\ldots (8)$$

Finally, concerning the probabilities attached to events 1 and 2, π_1 and π_2 are functions of an individual's age A. In other words, as she becomes older, say in her 50s as compared to her 20s or 30s, she becomes more contingent to illness. We express the individual's preference for an uncertain prospect in the form of expected utility function, a Von Neumann-Morgenstern utility function, as follows:[20]

$$EU = (1 - \pi(A))U(S_0 - (P + C)h) + \pi(A)U(S_0 - (P + C)h - \pi^*(h)L(A, H) + (1 - g)M)$$

$\ldots\ldots (9)$

The value of h that maximizes EU satisfies the following first-order condition:

$$(1 - \pi(A))U_x(x)(P + C) + \pi(A)U_y(y)[(P + C) + \pi_h^* L(A, H)] = 0, \text{ at } h > 0, \quad \ldots\ldots (10)$$

$$-\frac{(P + C) + \pi_h^* L(A, H)}{(P + C)} = \frac{(1 - \pi(A))U_x(x)}{\pi(A)U_y(y)}, \quad \ldots\ldots (11)$$

$$x \equiv S_0 - (P + C)h,$$

$$y \equiv S_0 - (P + C)h - \pi^*(h)L(A, H) + (1 - g)M,$$

$$U_x = \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} > 0,$$

$$U_y = \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} > 0, \text{ and}$$

$$\pi_h^* = \frac{\partial \pi^*(h)}{\partial h} < 0.$$

---

[19] About 49% of patients in large-sized hospitals wait for at least an hour and a half; and about 15% wait for more than 3 hours. In medium-sized hospitals, those who wait for more than an hour and a half account for about 44%, and account for 28% in small-sized hospitals. In both hospitals, the patient rates for those who wait for more than three hours are 17.2% and 15.6%, respectively (*Movements in National Sanitation*, 1999. p.84). However, medical examinations in hospitals last very short: almost 64% of patients in large-sized hospitals take only 10 minutes or less for their examinations, and 18% take less than 3 minutes. About 61% and 57% of patients, respectively in medium-sized and small-sized hospitals, take less than 10 minutes or less for their medical examinations.

[20] Here, we change our notations, such that $1 - \pi = \pi_1$ and $\pi = \pi_2$.

In equation (11), the left-side expression is interpreted as the marginal productivity of health check-up and the right-side one is the slope of the indifference curve (Ehrlich and Becker 1972, p. 634).[21] The equilibrium condition requires $(P+C)+\pi_h^* L(A,H)<0$. That is, an additional dollar spent on health check-up must reduce the expected loss by more than a dollar.[22] In other words, if an individual does not expect the benefits from the reduction of her expected loss to be greater than the health check-up cost, she will not take the health check-up. Putting it differently, based on equation (10), if the maximum of EU occurs when $h=0$, rather than $h>0$, then necessarily $EU'\leq 0$; hence, we will have a corner solution. Furthermore, even if $h>0$ to start with, there may be some range of EU, where $EU'\leq 0$. This may be the case when $-1\leq[\pi_h^* L(A,H)/(P+C)]\leq 0$. Then, the individual will not have her health check-up, hence, $h=0$ at which $EU(h=0)>EU(h>0)$. For example, when the individual already has adequately good information on her current health condition, it does not make any sense for her to see a medical doctor in hospital for a slight cough.

The second-order condition of equation (10) requires,

$$D=(1-\pi(A))U_{xx}(P+C)^2+\pi(A)U_{yy}\Phi^2<0, \quad \ldots\ldots (12)$$

$$U_{xx}=\frac{\partial U_x}{\partial x}<0,$$

$$U_{yy}=\frac{\partial U_y}{\partial y}<0,$$

$\frac{\partial \pi_h^*}{\partial h}\equiv\frac{\partial^2 \pi^*(h)}{\partial h^2}=0$ (assumed without loss), and

$$\Phi=[(P+C)+\pi_h^* L(A,H)]<0.$$

We can now find the effect of an individual's age A on the demand for the health check-up h by partially differentiating the first-order optimality condition, equation (10), with respect to A:

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial A}=\frac{1}{D}[\pi_A(-U_x(P+C)+U_y\Phi)+\pi(A)(U_y\pi_h^* L_A-U_{yy}\pi^*(h)\Phi)]>0 \quad \ldots(13)$$

where

---

[21] According to Ehrlich and Becker (1972), the left-side expression in equation (11) in our presentation is viewed as the slope of the production transformation curve; and the right side is the slope of the indifference curve of S_1, S_2. Hence, both sides must be equal in equilibrium for $h>0$.

[22] The reduction in this context might be due to "self-protection." In Ehrlich and Becker (1972), "... self-insurance [is] a reduction in the size of a loss, and self-protection [is] a reduction in the probability of a loss (p.633)."

$$\pi_A \equiv \frac{\partial \pi(A)}{\partial A} > 0, \text{ and}$$

$$L_A \equiv \frac{\partial L(A,H)}{\partial A} > 0.$$

The above positive sign shows that, as an individual grows older, she is more likely to have her health check-up.

Let us now consider the case of an increase in the price P of health check-up. That is, the coverage of medical costs by health insurance decreases in clinics and hospitals. The effect of an increase in P on the health check-up is negative as the following shows:

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial P} = \frac{1}{D}[(1-\pi(A))U_{xx}(-h)(P+C) + \pi(A)U_{yy}(-h)\Phi + (1-\pi(A))U_x + \pi(A)U_y]. \quad \ldots\ldots (14)$$

$\frac{\partial h}{\partial P} < 0$ is guaranteed if $[(1-\pi(A))U_{xx} / \pi(A)U_{yy}] > -\Phi]$.[23]

In other words, as the coverage of medical costs by health insurance increases, i.e., a decrease in P, an individual is more likely to have her health check-up. Then, if the above condition is satisfied, then we can also say that an increase in pecuniary and non-pecuniary costs, C, will give a disincentive for an individual to have her health check-up. For example, in a case of a pregnant woman, having chest x-ray radiography by her health check-up is likely to damage her fetus. Thus, she is very unlikely to have her health check-up during the period of pregnancy.

The effect of an increase in an individual's initial endowment S_0 may be found to be positive as,

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial S_0} = \frac{1}{D}[(1-\pi(A))U_{xx}(P+C) + \pi(A)U_{yy}\Phi] > 0 . \quad \ldots\ldots (15)$$

This result (15) shows that an individual with higher earning power, for instance, one with a larger stock of human capital, is willing to have the health check-up to secure her earnings loss.

Here, let us see whether an individual who is willing to have health stock augmenting activities will have her health check-up or not. By partially differentiating the first-order optimal condition, we have the following result:

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial H} = \frac{1}{D}[\pi(A)L_H(\pi_h^* U_y - \pi^*(h)U_{yy}\Phi)] > 0, \quad \ldots\ldots (16)$$

[23] Hereafter, we assume that this condition holds.

$$L_H = \frac{\partial L(A,H)}{\partial H} > 0.$$

Hence, an increase in health stock augmenting activities, which raises earning capacities through an increase in the individual's health stock, will tend to encourage the individual to have the health check-up in order to avoid the earnings loss due to sudden illness.

We can also evaluate the effect of the psychological burden g in terms of $(1-g)M$ in equation (9), which is a burden incurred by an individual due to her illness. When an individual is sick and has to wait many hours at a busy hospital, this creates for her psychological costs, e.g., fatigue. In case of heavy illness, she may have to be hospitalized for cure with medical treatments that may take several hours or days. The effect of an increase in g on h will be positive,

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial g} = \frac{1}{D}[\pi(A)U_{yy}\Phi(-M)] > 0. \quad \ldots\ldots (17)$$

The above result can be interpreted as: when an individual believes she may be more prone to some serious illness, say, through her job, she is more willing to have her health check-up in order to avoid greater psychological burden should she become ill. On the other hand, the effect of an increase in the medical benefits M on health check-up is negative,

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial M} = \frac{1}{D}[\pi(A)U_{yy}\Phi(1-g)] < 0. \quad \ldots\ldots (18)$$

Hence, the individual becomes less self-protective as benefits increase, which is an aspect of the moral hazard present.

Finally, we will discuss the effect of gender difference on the health check-up. In the formulation of equation (7), the expected loss, $\pi^{*}(h)L(A,H)$, can be defined as,

$$\overline{L^f} = \pi^f(h)L^f(A,H) \text{ or } \overline{L^m} = \pi^m(h)L^m(A,H), \quad \ldots\ldots (19)$$

where $\overline{L^i}$ is a gender-specific expected earning loss, $(i = f, m)$: f = *female*, and m = *male*. $\overline{L^i}$ is a positive function of both $\pi^i(h)$ and $L^i(A,H)$ such as,

$$\frac{\partial \overline{L^i}}{\partial \pi^i(h)} > 0, \text{ and } \frac{\partial \overline{L^i}}{\partial L^i(A,H)} > 0.$$

The effect of an increase (or a shift) in the probability distribution on the health checkup is found to be,

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial \pi^i(h)} = \frac{1}{D}[-\pi(A)U_{yy}(L^i(A,H))((P+C)+\pi_h^{*}L^i(A,H))] > 0, \quad \ldots\ldots (20)$$

following the assumption, $\frac{\partial \pi_h^*}{\partial \pi^i(h)} = 0$. This result indicates that individuals who are more prone to illness are more likely to have the health check-up than those who are not. This positive relationship can also be applied to $\overline{L^i}$; that is, $\frac{\partial h}{\partial \overline{L^i}} > 0$. That is, an individual with higher expected loss is more likely to have her health check-up than one with less. Therefore, when both female and male are in the labor market and the former earns less than the latter such as $L^f(A,H) < L^m(A,H)$, females are less likely to have the health check-up than males do since $\pi^f(h) < \pi^m(h)$ in general. The same applies to equally healthy females for a female who earns more. This indicates that a single woman in the labor market is more likely to have her health check-up than a married woman in the household when both are equally healthy. We may also say that if a married woman were to have some interruption in her career, that a single woman is more likely to have her health check-up than a married woman even although both are currently in the labor market and are equally healthy.

All these comparative static results must then be evaluated and be operational in an empirical study. For our empirical specifications, we suppose that the decision of an individual to have the health check-up or not depends on an unobservable utility index I_i, defined as,

$I_i = X\beta + u_i$, ... (21)

X : a $(1xk)$ row vector of explanatory variables which determines I_i,

β : a $(kx1)$ column vector of parameters to estimate, and

u_i : a normally distributed random term.

In equation (21), the larger the value of the index I_i, the greater the probability of the individual to have the health check-up. Here, we assume that for the individual there is a critical level of the index I_i^*, such that if I_i exceeds I_i^*, she will have health check-up, otherwise she will not. To put it differently, in terms of the notations in our comparative static analyses, $\Phi = [(P+C) + \pi_h^* L(A,H)] < 0$ and $\frac{\partial EU}{\partial h} = 0$ at $h > 0$ imply $I_i - I_i^* \geq 0$. Therefore, let $h = 1$ if the individual has the health check-up, and $h = 0$ if he does not. Since I_i, I_i^*, and Φ are not observable, if we assume I_i and I_i^* to be normally distributed with the same mean and variance, the probability that the individual has the health check-up may be expressed as,

$$\Pr ob(h=1) = \Pr ob(I_i^* \le I_i) = F(I_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{X\beta} e^{-t/2} dt, \quad \ldots\ldots (21)$$

where $F(\bullet)$ is the cumulative distribution function, and t is a standardized normal variable, i.e., $t \sim N(0,1)$.[24] We estimate a probit model of the demand for the health check-up and a tobit model for the length of hospital stay. The next section mentions variables of interest in this study.

3-2. Variables

We show the comparative static analyses of the effects of variables of interest on the demand for the health check-up with the previous theoretical model described. The dependent variable used in this study is whether individuals have the health check-up or not, thus, we use a dummy variable (= 1) if the individual has her health check-up, otherwise, the value is 0.[25]

One of the major explanatory variables to explain the variation in the demand for medical health check-up is the age of individuals. Its relationship is theoretically positive. The relationship between age and the medical health check-up observed from our sample as shown in Tables and Figures is slowly increasing at a diminishing rate until the age of 60 and then declines. The reason for this decline in the demand for medical health check-up is the retirement age at 60 years old for those working in relatively large-sized firms. It needs to be mentioned here that persons who retire are still eligible for a type of health insurance that is part Society-managed Insurance or Government-managed Insurance for the two years following the retirement. Otherwise, these individuals may choose the National Health Insurance cover.

Gender is another major explanatory variable in this analysis, such that the males' health check-up rate always exceeds the females' across the 20-64-age range. The differentials in their health check-up rates certainly result from their biological differences such that males are more prone to illness or have shorter longevity than females. We have theoretically shown that males are more likely to have their health check-ups than females due to the higher expected loss for the former than the latter. We will examine the effect of gender difference on the demand for health check-up, *ceteris paribus*.

Besides the effects of the above demographic variables, the explanatory variable that can be considered as a policy-implication variable is the health insurance coverage. This includes the National Health Insurance (NHI), Government-managed Insurance, Society-managed Insurance, and Mutual Aid Association Health Insurance. The NHI coverage rate is 70% for everyone,

[24] The presentation of this probit model is from Gujarati (1995, pp. 563-564).

[25] As we mentioned in III General Aspects of the Health Check-up, the variables pertaining to individuals in this study are from the *National Survey of Life* in 1995.

while the coverage rates of other three types of insurance are 80% (the coverage rate for spouse and family is 70%).

To examine the effect of an individual's initial endowment on health check-up, we use the dummy variable for the household's highest income earner (i.e., breadwinner). In addition, we include the household's monthly expenditures, which will have the income effect on the demand for the health check-up. When monthly expenditures is not reported, we use a dummy variable for the individual who did not report the values, since the regression results may be biased if we exclude all who did not report this for the study.

For the measurement of health stock augmenting activities by individuals, we use the frequency of daily practices such as eating regular meals, nutritiously balanced meals and not-too-salty meals, not eating excessively, having physical exercise, adequate hours of sleep, and time to refresh oneself during the activities of the day. We expect that the effect of this variable on the demand for health check-up is positive, shown previously to be theoretically positive.

To evaluate the effect of the psychological burden when the individual becomes ill and also to evaluate the behavior of individuals who are more prone to illness, the numbers of illnesses the individual has had is included as an explanatory variable. This variable is also shown to be theoretically positive. This number includes diseases of the circulatory system, respiratory system, digestive system, genitourinary system, and so forth. Although the illnesses of each system can be explanatory variables in our regression, we decided not to use this approach because of the difficulty in evaluating the differences of their effects, besides the numbers are too many to be meaningful for our interest. In addition to the illness variable, we also include the number of stressful events the individual has had to face. These three explanatory variables are considered as objective variables in evaluating the individual's health condition. To avoid specification errors, the subjective evaluation of an individual's health condition is also included in the regression analysis. In doing so, we use three dummies to represent this: excellent health if one feels his health to be excellent, good health when he considers it good, and fair health if he feels he possesses fair health conditions.

As for the effect of the medical benefits on the demand for health check-up, we use the variable on life insurance as proxy for benefits. The effect of this variable is expected to be negative on the health check-up. There are various types of life insurance sold these days. Some provide coverage only for costs incurred upon hospitalization and for injuries.

To examine the effect of a change in the likelihood of illness on health check-up, we use a dummy variable for the individual whether he has visited either clinics or hospitals for the past year. If the individual did not visit those institutions at all for one year, we consider the

individual healthy, *ceteris paribus*. Thus, her tendency to become ill is smaller than a counterpart's who had been to either a clinic or hospital more often.

Other than these explanatory variables mentioned above, we include the variables on education, sizes of firms, types of employment, sizes of population, and regional dummies. The definition and statistics of the variables used in this study are reported in Table 7.[26] In the next section, we will report our empirical results.

IV. Empirical Results

Results for the probit analyses regarding the demand for the health check-up are reported in Table 8 for both males and females of the 20-64 age range. Tables 9,10,11 show the results for populations grouped according to type of health insurance: Table 9 reports results for the overall non-gender specific sample, and Tables 10 and 11 shows those of the female and male samples, respectively. We next highlight the health check-up regression runs for National Health Insurance (NHI) insurants: Table 12 shows the results for the female sample, while Table 13 show their male counterparts'. We will discuss those factors of interest that contribute to the differentials in the demand for health check-up.

4-1. Health Check-up Results of Males and Females of the 20-64 Age Group

First, we consider the respective results of the males (N=214,948) and the females (N = 223,958) in Table 8. The age variable (AGE) is highly significant in both males (0.046) and females (0.032). The positive estimated coefficients on AGE and the negative estimated coefficients on AGESQ for both males and females indicate that the profile of their health check-up rate is concave as age increases.[27] The marginal effects of AGE on the demand for health check-up are 0.015 for males and 0.011 for females.[28] The age elasticity of health check-up without the AGESQ term is about 1.665 for males and about 1.204 for females at the sample means. After controlling for other socio-economic and demographic variables, we find that both males and females become more concerned with their health as age increases; this may be due to the individual's loss of health stock.

As mentioned earlier, we have hypothesized that individuals tend not to have the health check-up as pecuniary and non-pecuniary costs rise. Especially, women of the ages of 30-39 (MATERNITY) get married, expect a child, and raise their children. The costs of health check-

[26] In our regression analyses, we grouped the sample population ages 20-64 into different categories by health insurance and also by gender, since we focus our study mainly on differentials in the demand for health check-up.
[27] In Table 8 as well as other Tables, when the sign of t-statistic is negative and the estimated coefficient is 0.000, the estimated coefficient is in fact negative. The reported value is simply due to the text format used.
[28] These marginal effects are based on the values without the AGESQ term. The inclusion will give the following formulas: the marginal effect for males = 0.015-2x0.0001AGE, and that for females = 0.011-2x0.00005AGE.

up are not only the price of health check-up in clinics and hospitals, but also the opportunity costs. The women of this age group then are less likely to have the health check-up when the costs are not negligible. The sign of the MATERNITY variable is negative (-0.142) and highly significant. The marginal effect is -0.049, which indicates that the married women of this 30-39 age group will have a substantially lower probability of taking the health check-up by about 5 percentage points than females of other age groups.[29]

The health check-up is a time-consuming health input. An individual has to give up working hours or days for the sake of the health check-up, thus the wages (WAGE) can be considered a proxy for the opportunity costs to some extent. The sign of WAGE is negative for males (-0.099) and females (-0.042); both are significant. The marginal effects are -0.032 and -0.015 for males and females, respectively; the respective wage elasticities of the health check-up are -0.095 and -0.035. High opportunity costs, or higher wages, are a major deterrent in the demand for health check-up and the effect works much stronger against males than females. On the other hand, the estimated coefficient on the variable BREADWIN is significantly positive for males (0.105) and the robust effect shows, as previously hypothesized, that the highest earner of a household is more willing to have the health check-up to secure loss of earnings that would arise from becoming ill. The negative and significant coefficient is a little puzzling in the case of females (-0.028); since the marginal effect for males is about 0.034 while that for females is -0.010, this difference becomes another factor resulting in the male-female differentials with respect to the health check-up. From the estimated coefficient on monthly household expenditures (i.e., MONTHEXP), we see that the income elasticity of the demand for health check-up is positive. Although the estimated coefficients for both males and females are reported substantially small (0.000), both marginal effects are about 0.0001, but the income (or expenditure) elasticity of demand for health check-up is highly inelastic, such as 0.005 for males and 0.006 for females.

As a policy variable, we include the types of individual's health insurance coverage in the model: NHI, GOVTHI, SOCIHI, and MUTUHI. As expected, the estimated coefficient of the NHI (National Health Insurance) for males is negative (-0.130) and the other three variables are positive: 0.201 for GOVTHI, 0.309 for SOCIHI, and 0.335 for MUTUHI. Their respective marginal effects are -0.043, 0.064, 0.099, and 0.105. The marginal effects for females are,

---

[29] The marginal effect of discrete variable x_i in this paper is obtained by the followings:

respectively, 0.018 (NHI), 0.079 (GOVTHI), 0.112 (SOCIHI), and 0.112 (MUTUHI). All estimates are statistically highly significant. These large differences in the marginal effect between males (or females) with NHI and those with the other types of health insurance indicate that people with either SOCIHI or MUTUHI have advantages in accessing the health check-up by about 10 percentage points or more. Hence, the higher the coverage of the health check-up costs is, the more the individuals are likely to have the health check-up. We consider that the difference in the coverage is one of the major causes to differentiate the health check-up of people with NHI from those with other types of health insurance.

We evaluate next the effects of firm size on the demand for health check-up. Firms are legally bound to provide the health check-up to their employees. Firms with a larger number of employees are subject to more legal bindings or rules regarding employees' working conditions. In addition, the firms face their well-organized and stronger labor unions. Therefore, the firms usually provide more and better fringe benefits as compared to firms with smaller numbers of employees. In our study, we use various sizes of firms, such as SIZE1 for those with 1-5 employees, SIZE1000 for institutions with 1,000 employees or more, and PUBEMPLY for public employees.[30] In addition, we also include other employment-status variables: PROPRIET, FAMILYWK, PARTTIME, HUSWRKR and NOJOB. Among all these variables, the estimated coefficients on the variables SIZE30 to SIZE1000 and PUBEMPLY are positive and statistically highly significant for both males and females. For example, the marginal effects for males are 0.080 (SIZE30), 0.138 (SIZE100), 0.149 (SIZE500), 0.188 (SIZE1000) and 0.147 (PUBEMPLY); those for females are 0.119 (SIZE30), 0.188 (SIZE100), 0.210 (SIZE500), 0.266 (SIZE1000) and 0.223 (PUBEMPLY). In comparison to these large effects, one of the negative marginal effects of employment status, say HUSWRKR, is -0.062 for males and -0.060 for females. Furthermore, if an individual does not have a job (NOJOB), the marginal effects are -0.058 for males and -0.112 for females. We say that the difference in the demand for health check-up will be about 0.33 between females with SIZE1000 and female HUSWRKR. Instead of HUSWRKR, if NOJOB is used, then the difference is about 0.38 for females. These results are indicative of the provision of better working environments for employees in larger-sized firms and the firms' high degrees of compliance with the law. These provisions create the major

---

$\frac{\partial HCHECKUP}{\partial x_i} = F(x_i = 1, X_j) - F(x_i = 0, X_j)$, where $F(\bullet)$ is the cumulative distribution function and X_j is a vector of all other variables, $i \neq j$.

[30] The omitted dummy variable for firm size is company directors.

differences in the health check-up rates among females with different employment environments, and between females and males.

Regarding the effects of an individual's health conditions on the demand for health check-up, holding constant the subjective evaluation of an individual's health condition (HLTHEXCE, HLTHGOOD, and HLTHFAIR); these variables are highly significant for both males and females. The sign of the estimated coefficient on NOTVISIT (have not visit medical institutions for the past year) is negative, while the one on HLTHPRAC is positive: -0.142 and 0.078 for males and -0.178 and 0.086 for females.[31] The marginal values of NOTVISIT and HLTHPRAC are -0.046 and 0.026 for males, and -0.062 and 0.030 for females, respectively. That is, individuals with better health or more health stock (NOTVISIT), are less likely to have the health check-up. On the other hand, health conscious people, individuals who practice health stock augmenting activities (HLTHPRAC), are likely to have the health check-up than otherwise. For health conscious people, the health check-up is another means of preventing health deterioration.

We hypothesized in the previous discussion that the psychological burdens of being in queue in hospitals and of being ill will pressure the individual not to become ill. It is thus possible that the individual will tend toward having the health check-up so as to avoid becoming a patient. The variables of SICKNUMB (the number of injuries and illnesses) and STRESS (the number of stressful events encountered) are included as proxy for psychological burden. The estimated coefficients of SICKNUMB and STRESS are significantly robust and those are 0.145 and 0.060 for males, respectively; the respective values for females are 0.133 and 0.043. The marginal effects of SICKNUMB are about 0.047 for males and 0.046 for females; those of STRESS are about 0.019 for males and 0.015 for females. These marginal effects are very similar between males and females.

Finally, we discuss the estimated coefficients on education (EDU) and life insurance (LIFEINSU).[32] Both variables have negative signs on their estimated coefficients. The level of an individual's education is considered a factor in the increased efficiency of health production. Normally, the variable has a positive effect on the demand for preventive medical care (Coffey 1983, Kenkel 1994, and Hsieh and Lin 1997). However, the coefficient of education depends on the elasticity of the MEC schedule, or the demand for health stock. The sign of an individual's education level is negative if the elasticity is less than one in absolute values (Grossman 1972).

---

[31] The HLTHPRAC variable is the number of health-related daily practice (e.g., eating regular meals, nutritiously balance meals and not-too-salty meals, adequate having physical exercise, adequate hours of sleep, so on).
[32] These two variables are two of a few aggregate variables in the models.

In this respect, our estimated negative coefficient is not necessarily wrong.[33] The estimated effect of LIFEINSU on the demand for health check-up is negative, as theoretically predicted. That is, an individual with life insurance is less likely to have the health check-up. This result is like an old story about an individual who buys insurance but who gambles at the same time, as often discussed within the pages of a regular textbook regarding behavior under uncertainty (see Silberberg 1990, p. 453). From another perspective, it also may be viewed that the significantly negative coefficient reflects the moral hazard of an individual's behavior.

4-2. Health Check-up Results by Health Insurance Type

First, as Table 9 shows, the effect of AGE is significantly positive across the different types of health insurance; the respective marginal effects are 0.005 (NHI), 0.015 (GOVTHI), 0.016 (SOCIHI), and 0.020 (MUTUHI). Thus, the increments of NHI as age increases are one third or less of other types of health insurance. Again, the type of insurance, which shows the coverage degree of medical costs, is really an important factor in determining for an individual whether to have health check-up or not. Consequently, NHI insurants have lower health check-up rates as compared to those covered by the other health insurance schemes. FEMALE and MARRIED variables are some of the few variables that vary in the signs of estimated coefficients under the NHI. The effects of FEMALES (0.042) and MARRIED (0.087) are both significant and positive, while negative in the other health insurances; the corresponding marginal effects are 0.015 and 0.031. Under the NHI, married females are more likely to have the health check-up more than single females, married males, and single males. This last group, the single males, has the least demand for health checkup under the NHI scheme. On the other hand, the results are opposite for GOVTHI, SOCIHI and MUTUHI: married females have the least demand for the health check-up. Since firms are very unlikely to discriminate only against married women, the low rate of health check-up among married women covered by those health insurances are probably due to individual-decision making. Therefore, as long as these demographic factors are concerned, policy makers need to understand the basic needs that motivate married women to take the health check-up.

The employment status variables, PROPRIET, FAMILYWK, SIZE1, HUSWRKR and NOJOB are negative regardless of the type of health insurance. These workers are highly disadvantaged in terms of health check-up opportunities relative to those employed in large-sized firms or by public institutions. For example, in the NHI model, the marginal effects (not shown in Table 9) are -0.068 (PROPRIET), -0.071 (FAMILYWK), -0.065 (SIZE1), -0.064 (HUSWRKR) and -0.071 (NOJOB), in comparison with the 0.339 of SIZE1000. Naturally, people who have

[33] The definitive sign must await further study using micro data on education variable.

NHI but are employed in large-sized firms must be quite small in their number, while the majority of people with NHI are likely in either one of the other above-mentioned employment-status categories. Hence, the average health check-up rate must be low relative to those with GOVTHI, SOCIHI and MUTUHI. We also note among various occupations that those of SALES and SERVIC are faced with similar disadvantages in the health check-up. The estimated coefficients of SALES and SERVIC under NHI are -0.104 and -0.107 and the respective marginal effects are -0.036 and -0.037. .In comparison, their respective marginal effects are -0.024 and -0.029 for GOVTHI, 0.003 and -0.020 for SOCIHI and -0.055 and -0.024 for MUTUHI.

As previously observed from the results of males and females in Table 8, health related variables such as SICKNUMB, STRESS, HLTHPRAC, HLTHEXCE, HLTHGOOD and HLTHFAIR are all highly significant and their estimates are positive. That is, regardless of the type of health insurance cover, individuals who are prone to illness as well as those who are conscious about their health conditions demand more health check-up than otherwise. Both objective and subjective measures of own health awareness motivate individuals to have the health check-up. Subjective information on health conditions, HLTHEXCE, HLTHGOOD and HLTHFAIR, seems to be an important factor in determining whether one takes the health check-up or not. That is, an individual who is subjectively keen about her own health condition is more willing to collect objective health information as well.

Now, let us compare the behavioral difference in the health check-up demand by females with the four types of health insurances in Table10 and the males' results in Table 11. A quick comparison of the results in Tables 10 and 11 with those in Table 9 gives us an impression that many variables in the NHI and MUTUHI models decrease their sizes of significance, while those in the GOVTHI and SOCIHI models retain that significance. First, the variables on AGE and AGESQ are nearly all statistically significant in all types of health insurance in Tables 10 and 11. The marginal effects of AGE on the probability of having health check-up for females in Table 10 are 0.003 (NHI), 0.016 (GOVTHI), 0.020 (SOCIHI), and 0.021 (MUTUHI). The respective marginal effects for males in Table 11 are 0.002 (NHI), 0.018 (GOVTHI), 0.021 (SOCIHI), and 0.026 (MUTUHI). The sizes of marginal effects are nearly the same for both females and males within the same health insurance type except for MUTUHI results. But the size in female's NHI is about one fifth or less of those of other types of health insurance, while the male's result of NHI is one ninth or less. Thus, the participation of people with NHI in the health check-up increases very slowly as their age goes up relative to the participation rates of people with other types of health insurance.

Now, the variables of WAGE and BREADWIN are no longer one of the major deterrent factors for females with NHI as well as SOCIHI, while significant with respect to the GOVTHI. Instead, the MATERNITY and MARRIED variables seems dominant for females in Table 10. The estimated coefficients of MATERNITY are -0.168 (NHI), -0.137 (GOVTHI), -0.121 (SOCIHI), and -0.192 (MUTUHI); the respective marginal effects are -0.058 (NHI), -0.048 (GOVTHI), -0.042 (SOCIHI), and -0.063 (MUTUHI). Whether these sizes of reduction due to MATERNITY are large or not is arguable, yet these marginal effects show the dip in the average health check-up rates of females of the 30-39 age group. For the case of males in Table 11, the variables of MARRIED, WAGE, and BREADWIN have different results from those of the females'. The WAGE and BREADWIN are always significant, while the signs are negative and positive, respectively. The marginal effect of WAGE is -0.025 (NHI), -0.031 (GOVTHI), -0.018 (SOCIHI), and -0.033 (MUTUHI) for males in Table 11 and their respective wage elasticities are -1.095 (NHI), -0.085 (GOVTHI), -0.045 (SOCIHI), and -0.076 (MUTUHI) at the sample means. Thus, we note that males with NHI are more responsive to their wages than those with other types of health insurance.

Regarding the type of employment status, FAMILYWK (family worker) or HUSWRKR (house worker) under the GOVTHI, SOCIHI and MUTUHI in Tables 10 and 11 can be interpreted as those people who used to be employed who are now at home as either family worker or house-worker. The marginal effects of HUSWRKR for females in Table 10 are –0.028 (NHI), -0.057 (GOVTHI), -0.093 (SOCIHI) and -0.163 (MUTUHI). The changes in their employment status from working in a firm to household environments cause females to demand less health check-up. However, the marginal effects for males seem much smaller than those for females: -0.063 for NHI, -0.009 for GOVTHI, -0.040 for SOCIHI, and -0.051 for MUTUHI.

Another deterrent factor is not being in active employment (NOJOB). Both females and males are less likely to have the health check-up when they are unemployed regardless of their former health insurance types. The marginal effects of NOJOB on health check-up for males are -0.040 (NHI), -0.030 (GOVTHI), -0.090 (SOCIHI) and -0.108 (MUTUHI), while the effect for females is -0.053 (NHI), -0.116 (GOVTHI), -0.159 (SOCIHI) and -0.283 (MUTUHI). Females are generally more responsive to an incidence of losing their jobs than males, and among the former, those with the GOVTHI, SOCIHI and MUTUHI are highly responsive with respect to health check-up behavior.

The effect of place of residence on health check-up may seem puzzling at first. That is, POP1M (a resident of a city with a population of 1 million or more) and POP150 (a city with a population more than 150,000 but less than 1 million) both have generally negative sign on their

estimates, while the estimated coefficient of POPCUNTY (living in town or city with population of less than 50,000) is positive. The positive coefficient on POPCUNTY and the negative ones on POP1M and POP150 in Tables 10 and 11 indicate that people living in less populated areas are more likely to have the health check-up than those in big cities. One probable explanation is that people in a county have generally less access to medical facilities when needed in comparison with people in big cities and, hence, the former are probably more willing to take the opportunity of health check-up when local government or firms provide this service.

4-3. Health Check-up Results of National Health Insurance (NHI) by Age Group

In grouping females and males into several smaller age groups, the variable AGE seems to lose its significance except for the 20-29 female age group. This means that the age segmentation is too narrowed for evaluation. MARRIED is one of the major factors for females to have the health check-up, except those in the 30-39 age range; the sign is strongly negative for married females in 20-29 age group. This is certainly indicative of the high costs they incur in having the health check-up. MARRIED is not significant for those is 30-39 age group: there is no differential between single and married females, while both have lower health check-up rates than any other age groups. On the other hand, married males aged 30 and over are likely to have the health check-up more than their unmarried counterparts.

Again, it does matter what type of employment status is held, for both females and males. Those employed in firms with 100 workers or more (SIZE100, SIZE500, and SIZE1000) are more likely to have the health check-up than those with other types of employment status. These firm sizes are highly significant, as shown in both Tables 12 and 13. For example, the differences in the marginal effects between females in SIZE1000 and those in SIZE1 under the different age group categories are: 0.372 (20-29), 0.321 (30-39), 0.289 (40-49), 0.163 (50-60), and 0.195 (61-64).[34] The corresponding vales for the male counterparts are: 0.404 (20-29), 0.512 (30-39), 0.429 (40-49), 0.454 (50-60), and 0.265 (61-64). On the other hand, NOJOB becomes less significant than before: the variable is significant and negative only for those in the 30s and 40s groups. Types of employment status do matter in the individual decision to have health check-up.

According to occupation types, the coefficients of SALES and SERVIC are negative and significant for females in the 20-29, 30-39, and 40-49 age groups. The same job categories are also significant only for some of the male age groups. A reason why people in these occupations have less health check-up probably reflects the disadvantaged position they have in their working conditions with regard to accessing health check-up.

As often mentioned, the variables related to health conditions are highly significant across all age groups: SICKNUMB, STRESS, NOTVISIT, HLTHPRAC, HLTHEXCE, HLTHGOOD, and HLTHFAIR. Among these, the deterrent variable is consistently NOTVISIT. That is, if individuals are objectively in good health condition, they find it unnecessary to have her health check-up.[35] Other variables like EDU, LIFEINSU and POPCUNTY are statistically significant across the different age groups: the first two variables have negative effects on the health check-up, the last one has positive effects.

In sum, we find that the deterrent factors and motivating factors for the health check-up decision by females and males are largely common and are also similar across different types of health insurance and different age groups. Their behavior is subject to degree of accessibility, the amount of opportunity costs, and also subject to objective and subjective health conditions.

V. Summary

This study aims to explain the behavior toward the demand for health check-up of the 20-64-year-old population in Japan. More specifically, there exist large differentials in the demand by gender, by age and by types of health insurance. For example, according to the sampled micro data from the *National Survey of Life* in 1995, the overall average health check-up rate is 56: 61 percent for males and 51 percent for females. Furthermore, the difference in the health check-up rate is more than 20 percentage points between people with National Health Insurance (NHI) and those with Society-managed Health Insurance (SOCIHI).

In our analyses, we focused first on the impact of gender difference in the demand for health check-up behavior. Next, we specifically analyzed the differentials by the types of health insurance. Finally, the behavior of female NHI insurants was compared with those of male NHI insurants. By focusing our analyses narrowly toward the various categories of the population, our empirical results will have direct policy implications for the prevention of illness among the population in Japan. In knowing the cause-and-effect of the health check-up, policy makers as well as employers (or firms) can carefully implement specific and appropriate policies to promote people's health, and assist in containing their growing medical expenditures.

---

[34] The values are the probabilities of health check-up for individuals in SIZE1000 in comparison with those in SIZE1.
[35] One may say that the relationship between having health check-up and NOTVISIT is not causal, but both are in fact similar variables. That is, one who does not want to visit medical institutions does not have their health check-up anyway. We have few arguments to defend the inclusion of the variable in the models. First, if not-health-check-up means not-visit-hospital, then the variable should have a nearly perfect prediction of the health check-up behavior but that is not the case here. Second, the t-value of NOTVISIT is not always overwhelming. Lastly, and probably more importantly, NHI insurants usually have the health check-up at health centers, which are not considered medical institutions.

In our analysis regarding the individual's health check-up decision, we apply a probit model not only to a gender-specific sample but also to health insurance type specific and a NHI-classified age group-specific sample. Among the socio-economic and demographic variables studied in the models, the major explanatory variables of interest are: age, gender, wage rate, health insurance coverage, affiliated firm size, and objective evaluations of the individual's health condition.

In our empirical results on the demand for the health check-up, most of the estimated coefficients of the aforementioned variables have the theoretically predicted signs and are highly significant. The estimated coefficients on age and age-squared are positive and negative, respectively. This reflects that the incentive for an individual to have the health check-up increases at a diminishing rate as his stock of health rises. In other words, an individual's stock of health accumulates as her age increases, and so does the loss of earning ability rise, thus the incentive for the health check-up rises. Gender also plays an important role for the individual's decision on health check-up. Males are more likely to have their health check-up than females because of genetic and biological differences. Especially, females of the age group of 30-39 significantly decrease their demand for health check up; this is probably due to the timing of marriage and maternity.

Normally, health check-up is a time-consuming health input. For this reason, the opportunity costs for giving up working hours or days should be considered a major determinant in the health check-up decision. The sign of the individual's wage rate is negative and highly significant and the wage elasticity of health check-up is -0.095 for males and -0.035 for females. Family expenditures have positive effects on both males and females and their expenditure elasticity is nearly the same, about 0.005.

Health insurance coverage is one of the major factors analyzed in the models. We find the significantly positive and robust effects of the Government-managed Health Insurance (GOVTHI), the Society-managed Health Insurance (SOCIHI), and the Mutual Aid Associations Health Insurance (MUTUHI) on health check-up for both males and females, given the negative effect of NHI. Our findings show that the higher the coverage of medical costs is, the more the individuals are willing to have the health check-up. Furthermore, based on the significantly positive effects of firm sizes with more employees on the health check-up for both males and females, larger-sized enterprises are witnessed to be more encouraging of their employees regarding the health check-up than the smaller-sized enterprises. This may be attributed to the fact that fringe benefits and working conditions for employees in the former are much more favorable than for those in the latter. Thus, in order to promote the health check-up among

population irrespective to gender, a public policy that improves accessibility of health check-up, which consequently lowers the opportunity costs of health check-up for population, is needed.

For the effects of the individual's objective as well as subjective health conditions, the estimated coefficients are always statistically robust for both males and females. The more the number of illnesses are (and also the number of stress), the more the individuals are likely to have the health check-up. Furthermore, individuals who practice health promoting activities as well as those who are highly evaluative of their own health tend toward the health check-up more. On the other hand, when an individual has had no experience of visiting clinics and hospitals for the past year, which here we consider as reflecting her higher stock of health; the less the individual's incentive to have health check-up, *ceteris paribus*.

Next, when we highlight the differentials of the health check-up by the types of health insurance such as NHI, GOVTHI, SOCIHHI and MUTUHI, the basic signs and significance in these models do not differ so much from the above results of the gender-specific model. However, an evaluation of each variable in its marginal effect does provide different aspects of its effect on the behavior of the health check-up. For example, the positive marginal effect of age for people with NHI is one third or one fourth of that for those employed in a large-sized firm and by public institutions Persons who are proprietors, family workers and house workers, covered by the NHI, are the most disadvantaged groups with respect to accessibility to the health check-up. Therefore, the coverage of medical costs is another major factor that differentiates the health check-up behavior among population.

Females of the maternity age have substantially low demand for health check-up across the different health insurance types. On the other hand, as far as the males are concerned, some of the major factors across the health insurance types are wages and status as head of household: the former have strong negative effects on the health check-up and the latter has positive effects. The negative wage elasticity is more elastic for male NHI insurants. In addition, a change in employment status that is reflected by a change in insurance coverage, e.g. SOCIHI to NHI, lowers the demand for the health check-up. It will be more natural to interpret the decrease as to substantial changes in their opportunities of health check-up rather than a change in preference. Another major deterrent factor is job opportunity: once individuals are unemployed they decrease the demand for health check-up. Females are more responsive to an incidence of losing jobs than males, shown by the reduction in the demand for the health check-up.

In our final models, we have examined factors that might cause the low demand for health check-up among male and female NHI insurants alike. In so doing, we group the males and the females into 10-year age ranges such as 20-29, 30-39, and so forth. In these analyses, the

types of employment status, such as employment at large-sized firms, is a dominant factor that motivates both male and female NHI insurants to take the health check-ups. Occupation types, like sales and services, are also major factors that affect the demand for health check-up among females in their 20s, 30s, and 40s. As for individual health conditions, such as sickness, stress, health practice, health excellent, and others, the effects are highly and positively significant.

As a concluding remark, the differentials in the demand for the health check-up are reflective of the opportunities in accessing the health check-up. Among the working population of the society, people employed by large firms or public institutions are a highly advantaged group, while those working in small firms or households are at a disadvantage with respect to accessibility. If the health check-up does play its role as a means of detecting illnesses and thus a means of preventive medical care, the individuals who take the health check-up are less likely to be caught off guard by serious illness. The high longevity rate of the Japanese may be attributed to the current health check-up program under the comprehensive health insurance system. Maintaining such a tendency among the population requires certain adjustments with regard to the prevalent preventive health care system.

REFERENCES

Arrow, Kenneth J. 1963. Uncertainty and the Welfare Economics of Medical Care. *American Economic Review* 53, no. 5: 941-73.

Basmann, R. L. 1960. On Finite Sample Distributions of Generalized Classical Linear Identifiability Test Statistics. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 55, nos. 289-292: 650-659.

Becker, Gary S. 1976. A Theory of the Allocation of Time. In *The Economic Approach to Human Behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coffey, Rosanna M. 1983. The Effect of Time Price on the Demand for Medical-Care Services. *Journal of Human Resources* 18, no. 3: 407-24.

Ehrlich, Issac, and Gary S. Becker. 1972. Market Insurance, Self-Insurance, and Self-Protection. *Journal of Political Economy* 80, no. 4: 623-48.

Greene, William H. 2000. Econometric Analysis. 4th Edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Grossman, Michael. 1972. On the Concept of Health Capital and the Demand for Health. *Journal of Political Economy* 80, no. 2: 223-55.

_____. 1999. The Human Capital Model of the Demand for Health. Working Paper no.7078. Cambridge, Mass.: NBER.

Gujarati, Damodar N. 1995. *Basic Econometrics*. 3rd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Hausman, Jerry A. 1983. Specification and Estimation of Simultaneous Equation Models. In *Handbook of Econometrics*, Vol. 1, ed. Zvi Griliches and Michael D. Intriligator. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Health and Welfare Statistics Association. 1999. *Movements in National Sanitation, 1999* (Kokumin Eisei no Doko, in Japanese). Tokyo: Health and Welfare Statistics Association.

Hsieh, Chee-ruey, and Shin-jong Lin. 1997. Health Information and the Demand for Preventive Care among the Elderly in Taiwan. *Journal of Human Resources* 32, no. 2: 308-33.

Institute of Labor Administration. 1998. *Situations of Fringe Benefits* (Fukuri Kosei Jijou, in Japanese). '98 issue. Tokyo: Institute of Labor Administration (Roumu Gyosei KenKyujo, in Japanese).

Kenkel, Donald S. 1990. Consumer Health Information and the Demand for Medical Care. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 72, no. 3: 587-95.

_____. 1991. Health Behavior, Health Knowledge, and Schooling. *Journal of Political Economy* 99, no. 2: 287-305.

_____. 1994. The demand for preventive medical care. *Applied Economics* 26, no. 4: 313-25.

Ministry of Labor, Government of Japan. 1999. *Whitepaper on Female Labor 1998*. Tokyo: the 21 Century Vocation Foundation.

Pauly, Mark V. 1989. Overinsurance and Public Provision of Insurance: the Roles of Moral Hazard and Adverse Selection. In *Uncertainty in Economics: Readings and Exercises*, ed. Peter Diamond and Michael Rothschild. London: Academic Press, Inc.

Phelps, Charles E., and Joseph P. Newhouse. 1974. Coinsurance, the Price of Time, and the Demand for Medical Services. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 56, no.3: 334-42.

Silberberg, Eugene. 1990. *The Structure of Economics: A Mathematical Analysis*. 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Social Insurance Agency, Government of Japan. 1999. *Outline of Social Insurance in Japan 1998*. Tokyo: Japan International Social Security Association.

Statistics Bureau, Management and Coordination Agency, Government of Japan. 1998. *Japan Statistical Yearbook*. 48th Edition (1999). Tokyo: Japan Statistical Association.

Tables and Figures

Table 1 Health Check-up: Type of Insurance Cover

	20～64	20～29	30～39	40～49	50～60	61～64
	Years Old					
National Health Insurance						
n=141,424	0.419	0.269	0.311	0.396	0.490	0.550
Government-managed Insurance						
n=145,452	0.582	0.474	0.532	0.630	0.668	0.654
Society-managed Insurance						
n=106,593	0.647	0.550	0.610	0.704	0.733	0.666
Mutual Aid Associations Insurance						
n=49,980	0.692	0.563	0.648	0.755	0.775	0.690
Seamen's Insurance & Other Health Insurance n=5,602	0.451	0.369	0.477	0.465	0.491	0.421



Table 2. Health Check-up Rate by Health Insurance Type for both Males and Females

	20～64 Years Old	20～29	30～39	40～49	50～60	61～64
National Health Insurance						
MALE						
n_{male}=67,320	0.409	0.286	0.346	0.397	0.458	0.523
FEMALE						
n_{female}=74,104	0.429	0.252	0.278	0.396	0.517	0.573
Government-Managed Insurance						
MALE						
n_{male}=69,743	0.635	0.504	0.633	0.682	0.705	0.684
FEMALE						
n_{female}=75,709	0.535	0.448	0.438	0.584	0.635	0.623
Society-Managed Insurance						
MALE						
n_{male}=55,112	0.739	0.590	0.763	0.809	0.808	0.715
FEMALE						
n_{female}=51,481	0.549	0.510	0.455	0.595	0.644	0.612
Mutual Associations Insurance						
MALE						
n_{male}=24,797	0.789	0.598	0.808	0.848	0.841	0.709
FEMALE						
n_{female}=25,183	0.598	0.534	0.503	0.662	0.697	0.675



Table 3. Health Check-up: Married/Single Females by Health Insurance Type

AGE GROUPS	20～64	20～29	30～39	40～49	50～60	61～64
National Health Insurance						
MARRIED						
$n_{married}$=53,590	0.453	0.188	0.277	0.409	0.530	0.585
SINGLE						
n_{single}=20,514	0.368	0.282	0.280	0.346	0.464	0.530
Government-Managed Insurance						
MARRIED						
$n_{married}$=54,769	0.525	0.299	0.409	0.578	0.630	0.625
SINGLE						
n_{single}=20,940	0.562	0.516	0.588	0.633	0.662	0.619
Society-Managed Insurance						
MARRIED						
$n_{married}$=37,675	0.521	0.333	0.419	0.582	0.636	0.614
SINGLE						
n_{single}= 13,806	0.625	0.589	0.712	0.742	0.701	0.607
Mutual Aid Associations Insurance						
MARRIED						
$n_{married}$=19,825	0.583	0.409	0.479	0.651	0.685	0.696
SINGLE						
n_{single}=5,358	0.656	0.597	0.731	0.813	0.775	0.626



Table 4. Health Check-up: Married/Single Males by Health Insurance Type

AGE GROUPS	20～64	20～29	30～39	40～49	50～60	61～64
National Health Insurance						
MARRIED						
$n_{married}$=48,949	0.447	0.331	0.366	0.415	0.469	0.530
SINGLE						
n_{single}=18,371	0.309	0.274	0.310	0.329	0.364	0.437
Government-Managed Insurance						
MARRIED						
$n_{married}$=48,602	0.678	0.564	0.646	0.693	0.710	0.689
SINGLE						
n_{single}=21,141	0.536	0.488	0.601	0.611	0.647	0.603
Society-Managed Insurance						
MARRIED						
$n_{married}$=38,072	0.798	0.701	0.788	0.820	0.812	0.724
SINGLE						
n_{single}= 17,040	0.607	0.564	0.691	0.714	0.729	0.549
Mutual Aid Associations Insurance						
MARRIED						
$n_{married}$=19,504	0.832	0.747	0.820	0.850	0.844	0.722
SINGLE						
n_{single}=5,293	0.631	0.561	0.753	0.819	0.750	0.543

Figure 4. Health Check-up: Married/Single Males by Insurance Type



Table 5. Health Check-up: NHI Female Insurants' Employment Status by Age Group

AGE GROUPS		20～64	20～29	30～39	40～49	50～60	61～64
Self-Employed W/ Employees	n=2,178	0.394	0.267	0.281	0.361	0.459	0.478
Self-Employed W/O Employees	n=4,045	0.482	0.267	0.353	0.447	0.519	0.589
Family Workers	n=14,522	0.445	0.191	0.278	0.408	0.533	0.607
Co.'s & Assoc. Workers	n=662	0.403	0.288	0.339	0.405	0.455	0.576
Employees of Gen. Enterprises with 1-4 workers	n=2,394	0.343	0.233	0.267	0.385	0.478	0.455
Employees of Gen. Enterprises with 5-29 workers	n=3,991	0.403	0.276	0.333	0.439	0.531	0.5406
Employees of Gen. Enterprises with 30-99 workers	n=1,711	0.478	0.371	0.402	0.464	0.597	0.661
Employees of Gen. Enterprises with 100-499 workers	n=845	0.581	0.526	0.507	0.642	0.625	0.632
Employees of Gen. Enterprises with 500-999 workers	n=169	0.527	0.415	0.500	0.667	0.583	0.714
Employees of Gen. Enterprises with over 1,000 workers	n=314	0.624	0.627	0.583	0.661	0.604	0.714
Public Employees	n=112	0.625	0.667	0.500	0.696	0.682	0.546
Part-timers by Month	n=1,986	0.457	0.290	0.321	0.485	0.624	0.616
Part-timers by Day	n = 693	0.442	0.269	0.301	0.415	0.514	0.632
Household Workers	n= 839	0.393	0.123	0.260	0.327	0.481	0.542
Others	n= 1,386	0.398	0.220	0.295	0.375	0.534	0.572
Not Working	n=38,257	0.420	0.223	0.241	0.356	0.506	0.567

Note: Total number of positive observations = 74,104.



Table 6. Health Check-up: NHI Male Insurants' Employment Status by Age Group

Age groups		20~64	20~29	30~39	40~49	50~60	61~64
Self-Employed W/ Employees	n=10,699	0.390	0.262	0.301	0.369	0.425	0.494
Self-Employed W/O Employees	n=19,443	0.430	0.245	0.287	0.394	0.462	0.541
Family Workers	n=4,540	0.289	0.201	0.292	0.352	0.419	0.472
Co.'s & Assoc. Workers	n=1,765	0.475	0.335	0.404	0.465	0.527	0.608
Employees of Gen. Enterprises with 1-4 workers	n=3,608	0.331	0.233	0.306	0.366	0.380	0.483
Employees of Gen. Enterprises with 5-29 workers	n=6,430	0.409	0.281	0.386	0.437	0.483	0.538
Employees of Gen. Enterprises with 30-99 workers	n=2,433	0.517	0.404	0.502	0.519	0.603	0.610
Employees of Gen. Enterprises with 100-499 workers	n=1,220	0.611	0.516	0.623	0.652	0.665	0.646
Employees of Gen. Enterprises with 500-999 workers	n=306	0.690	0.567	0.769	0.709	0.722	0.909
Employees of Gen. Enterprises with over 1,000 workers	n=733	0.784	0.707	0.836	0.795	0.840	0.783
Public Employees	n=87	0.598	0.438	0.471	0.625	0.778	0.643
Part-timers by Month	n=1,278	0.463	0.311	0.391	0.409	0.521	0.630
Part-timers by Day	n =773	0.387	0.253	0.299	0.362	0.398	0.558
Household Workers	n= 60	0.383	0.455	0	0.500	0.143	0.556
Others	n= 1,117	0.390	0.231	0.362	0.384	0.416	0.545
Not Working	n=12,828	0.380	0.278	0.312	0.289	0.420	0.492

Note: Total number of positive observations =67,320.



Table 7. Description of Variables and Gender-Specific Statistics of Sample Used in the Study

Variables	Description	Females Sample n=223,958 Mean	Std. Dev.	Males Sample n=214,948 Mean	Std. Dev.
HCHECKUP	If the individual has health check-up, HCHECKUP=1; otherwise =0.	0.509	0.500	0.607	0.488
AGE	Age	42.41	12.78	42.22	12.69
AGESQ	Age squared.	1961.80	1082.10	1943.19	1070.22
MATERNITY	If the female observation's age falls within the average maternity age group (30-39), MATERNITY=1; otherwise=0.	0.203	0.402	----	----
MARRIED	If the individual is married, MARRIED=1; otherwise=0.	0.731	0.444	0.714	0.452
WAGE	Wage rate per hour (in 1,000 Yen) [a]	1.196	0.224	1.796	0.430
BREADWIN	If the individual is the highest income earner in the household, BREADWIN=1; otherwise=0.	0.135	0.342	0.753	0.431
MONTHEXP	Monthly expenditures (in 10,000 yen)	29.04	37.99	28.77	38.21
MOEXPDUM	If monthly expenditures are not reported, MOEXPDUM=1; otherwise=0.	0.061	0.238	0.063	0.242
NHI	If the individual has National Health Insurance, NHI=1, otherwise=0.	0.324	0.468	0.306	0.461
GOVTHI	If the individual has Health Insurance managed by Government, GOVTHI=1; otherwise=0.	0.331	0.470	0.317	0.465
SOCIHI	If the individual has Health Insurance managed by Associations, SOCIHI=1; otherwise=0.	0.225	0.417	0.250	0.433
MUTUHI	If the individual has Mutual Aid Associations Insurance, MUTUHI=1; otherwise=0.	0.110	0.313	0.113	0.316
PROPRIET	If the individual works as a proprietor, or self-employed, PROPRIET=1; otherwise=0.	0.035	0.183	0.155	0.362
FAMILYWK	If the individual works for a family-owned business, FAMILYWK=0; otherwise=0.	0.075	0.263	0.024	0.154
SIZE1	If the individual is an employee of a firm with 1-4 employees, SIZE1=1; otherwise=0.	0.023	0.150	0.026	0.159
SIZE5	If the individual is an employee of a firm with 5-29 employees, SIZE5=1; otherwise=0.	0.096	0.295	0.132	0.339
SIZE30	If the individual is an employee of a firm with 30-99 employees, SIZE30=1; otherwise=0.	0.082	0.274	0.120	0.325
SIZE100	If the individual is an employee of a firm with 100-499 employees, SIZE100=1; otherwise=0.	0.070	0.254	0.117	0.322
SIZE500	If the individual is an employee of a firm with 500-999 employees, SIZE500=1; otherwise=0.	0.018	0.133	0.041	0.197
SIZE1000	If the individual is an employee of firm with 1,000 or more employees, SIZE1000=1; otherwise=0.	0.040	0.195	0.123	0.329
PUBEMPLY	If the individual is a public employee. PUBEMPLY=1; otherwise=0.	0.038	0.190	0.081	0.272
PARTTIME	If the individual works part time, PARTTIME=1; otherwise=0.	0.043	0.203	0.016	0.124
HUSWRKR	If the individual is a home-based employee, HUSWRKR=1; otherwise=0.	0.026	0.159	0.009	0.092
NOJOB	If the individual is not working, NOJOB=1; otherwise=0.	0.440	0.496	0.103	0.304
PROFES	If the individual is a professional such as engineer, PROFES=1; otherwise=0.	0.082	0.274	0.142	0.349
ADMINI	If the individual is an administrator, ADMINI=1; otherwise=0.	0.015	0.123	0.081	0.272
CLERIC	If the individual is a clerk, CLERIC=1; otherwise=0.	0.136	0.343	0.111	0.314

Table 7 (continued...)

SALES	*If the individual is a sales person, SALES=1;* otherwise=0.	0.075	0.263	0.088	0.283
SERVIC	If the individual is an employee of the service *industry, SERVIC=1; otherwise=0.*	0.082	0.274	0.064	0.244
AGRICU	If the individual works in the agricultural sector, AGRICU=1; otherwise=0.	0.027	0.162	0.036	0.186
FOREST	If the individual works in the forestry sector, FOREST=1; otherwise=0	0.001	0.030	0.003	0.050
FISHER	If the individual works in the fishery sector, FISHER=1; otherwise=0	0.002	0.049	0.008	0.087
TRANSP	If the individual is an employee of the transportation industry, *TRANSP=1; otherwise=0.*	0.003	0.054	0.046	0.210
CRAFTM	If the individual is works in the crafts- making industry, CRAFTM=1; otherwise=0.	0.106	0.308	0.265	0.441
DOCTOR	*The number of physicians per 100,000 populations in* a prefecture.	187.47	35.66	186.58	35.99
SICKNUMB	The number of injuries and illnesses.	0.407	0.838	0.323	0.739
STRESS	*The number of stressful events had been/being* experienced.	1.069	1.653	0.815	1.437
NOTVISIT	If the individual did not visit medical institutions for *the past year, NOTVISIT=1;* otherwise=0.	0.091	0.287	0.077	0.267
HLTHPRAC	The number of health-related daily practices.	2.659	1.882	2.348	1.909
HLTHEXCE	*Self-evaluation of the individual's health: if excellent,* HLTHEXCE=1; otherwise=0	0.295	0.456	0.338	0.473
HLTHGOOD	Self-evaluation of the individual's health: if good *HLTHGOOD=1; otherwise=0*	0.175	0.380	0.175	0.380
HLTHFAIR	Self-evaluation of the individual's health: if fair, HLTHFAIR=1; otherwise=0.	0.401	0.490	0.368	0.482
EDU	The average proportion of high school graduates who went to either college or university in a prefecture.	0.439	0.078	0.296	0.061
LIFEINSU	The average amount of *life insurance's contract (in* 10,000 Yen) in a prefecture.	779.91	65.03	781.57	64.93
POP1M	If a resident of a city with a population of 1 million or more, *POP1M=1; otherwise=0.*	0.138	0.345	0.139	0.346
POP150	If a resident in a city with a population of more than 150, 000 & less than 1 million, POP150=1; *otherwise=0.*	0.269	0.444	0.266	0.442
POP50	If a resident in a city with a population of more than 50,000 but less than 150,000, POP50=1; otherwise=0.	0.095	0.293	0.094	0.291
POPCUNTY	*If a resident in a city or town with a population less* than 50,000, POPCUNTY=1; otherwise=0.	0.287	0.452	0.290	0.454
REGIOND1	Regional Dummy: Hokkaido=1, *otherwise=0.*	0.022	0.148	0.020	0.141
REGIOND2	*Regional Dummy:* Tohoku=1, otherwise=0.	0.138	0.345	0.139	0.346
REGIOND4	Regional Dummy: KantoII=1,otherwise=0.	0.108	0.310	0.115	0.318
REGIOND5	Regional Dummy: Hokuriku=1, otherwise=0.	0.087	0.282	0.087	0.282
REGIOND6	Regional Dummy: Tokai=1, otherwise=0.	0.071	0.256	0.073	0.261
REGIOND7	*Regional Dummy:* Kinki I=1, otherwise=0.	0.046	0.210	0.046	0.209
REGIOND8	Regional Dummy: Kinki II=1,otherwise=0.	0.061	0.240	0.061	0.240
REGIOND9	Regional Dummy: Cyugoku=1, otherwise=0.	0.104	0.305	0.103	0.304
REGIOND10	Regional Dummy: Sikoku=1, otherwise=0.	0.078	0.268	0.075	0.263
REGIOND11	*Regional Dummy:*KitaKyusyu=1,otherwise=0.	0.092	0.290	0.087	0.282
REGIOND12	Regional Dummy: Minami Kyusyu=1, otherwise=0.	0.077	0.267	0.073	0.260

Table 8. Health Check-up Rate: Gender-Specific PROBIT Results

	Males			Females		
Variable	Estimate	t-statistic*	Marginal	Estimate	t-statistic*	Marginal
C	-1.398	-16.684	-----	-1.159	-14.764	-----
AGE	0.046	13.506	0.015	0.032	14.800	0.011
AGESQ	0.000	-11.068	0.000	0.000	-5.319	0.000
MATERNITY	-----	-----	-----	-0.142	-17.633	-0.030
MARRIED	0.146	17.156	0.048	-0.086	-9.281	-0.049
WAGE	-0.099	-5.600	-0.032	-0.042	-1.964	-0.015
BREADWIN	0.105	12.273	0.034	-0.028	-2.767	-0.010
MONTHEXP	0.000	2.871	0.000	0.000	4.257	0.000
MOEXPDUM	-0.105	-8.528	-0.034	-0.065	-5.323	-0.022
NHI	-0.130	-5.096	-0.043	0.053	1.970	0.018
GOVTHI	0.201	7.930	0.064	0.229	8.527	0.079
SOCIHI	0.309	11.962	0.099	0.328	12.070	0.112
MUTUHI	0.335	11.799	0.105	0.326	11.558	0.112
PROPRIET	-0.330	-19.768	-0.110	-0.199	-7.036	-0.069
FAMILYWK	-0.383	-15.634	-0.127	-0.262	-9.816	-0.090
SIZE1	-0.363	-15.929	-0.120	-0.246	-8.176	-0.085
SIZE5	-0.063	-3.970	-0.020	0.061	2.425	0.021
SIZE30	0.256	15.816	0.080	0.347	13.487	0.119
SIZE100	0.447	27.316	0.138	0.558	21.258	0.188
SIZE500	0.498	24.046	0.149	0.636	19.735	0.210
SIZE1000	0.622	36.284	0.188	0.824	28.881	0.266
PUBEMPLY	0.481	21.464	0.147	0.673	22.675	0.223
PARTTIME	-0.085	-3.135	-0.027	0.060	2.193	0.021
HUSWRKR	-0.189	-5.593	-0.062	-0.174	-5.917	-0.060
NOJOB	-0.175	-8.275	-0.058	-0.317	-11.119	-0.116
PROFES	0.016	1.036	0.005	0.110	5.762	0.038
ADMINI	0.111	6.363	0.035	-0.075	-2.587	-0.026
CLERIC	0.071	4.462	0.023	0.077	4.261	0.027
SALES	-0.080	-4.905	-0.026	-0.098	-5.124	-0.034
SERVIC	-0.098	-5.667	-0.032	-0.125	-6.638	-0.043
AGRICU	0.230	11.040	0.072	0.235	9.474	0.081
FOREST	0.068	1.157	0.022	-0.078	-0.809	-0.027
FISHER	-0.030	-0.834	-0.010	0.025	0.430	0.009
TRANSP	-0.024	-1.246	-0.008	-0.054	-0.992	-0.019
CRAFTM	-0.009	-0.641	-0.003	-0.044	-2.407	-0.015
DOCTOR	0.000	2.233	0.000	0.000	0.764	0.000
SICKNUMB	0.145	32.685	0.047	0.133	35.677	0.046
STRESS	0.060	27.306	0.019	0.043	23.929	0.017
NOTVISIT	-0.142	-13.060	-0.046	-0.178	-18.155	-0.062
HLTHPRAC	0.078	47.390	0.026	0.086	54.173	0.030
HLTHEXCE	0.503	46.462	0.155	0.353	33.779	0.120
HLTHGOOD	0.571	49.484	0.172	0.409	37.558	0.139
HLTHFAIR	0.542	53.502	0.169	0.392	41.632	0.134
EDU	-0.616	-7.637	-0.198	-0.810	-10.592	-0.280
LIFEINSU	0.000	-6.473	0.000	0.000	-5.979	0.000
POP1M	-0.033	-2.827	-0.009	-0.052	-4.580	-0.018
POP150	-0.035	-4.080	-0.011	-0.081	-9.816	-0.028
POP50	0.052	4.444	0.017	0.132	11.905	0.045
POPCUNTY	0.160	18.502	0.051	0.264	32.301	0.092
REGIOND1	-0.176	-7.198	-----	-0.307	-11.707	-----
REGIOND2	0.056	3.512	-----	0.062	3.197	-----
REGIOND4	-0.008	-0.581	-----	0.009	0.681	-----
REGIOND5	0.079	4.325	-----	0.058	3.926	-----
REGIOND6	0.022	1.270	-----	0.015	1.021	-----
REGIOND7	-0.149	-8.402	-----	-0.083	-4.695	-----
REGIOND8	-0.196	-11.721	-----	-0.142	-8.644	-----
REGIOND9	-0.054	-3.121	-----	-0.038	-2.254	-----
REGIOND10	-0.267	-14.004	-----	-0.154	-8.497	-----
REGIOND11	-0.143	-7.943	-----	-0.125	-6.913	-----
REGIOND12	-0.125	-6.741	-----	-0.080	-3.967	-----
R-squared	0.19463			0.16283		
Log Likelihood	-121879.00			-135856.00		
N	219,983			229,068		

* Asymptotic t-statistics: the critival value at 1% significance level=2.576; the critical value at 5% significance level=1.960; and the critical value at 10% significance level=1.645.

Table 9. Health Check-up Rate: Insurance Type-Specific PROBIT Results

	NHI		GovtHI		SociHI		MutuHI	
Variable	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*
C	-0.746	-8.648	-1.106	-12.982	-1.491	-13.821	-1.199	-7.467
AGE	0.015	5.118	0.042	15.218	0.051	14.232	0.066	11.689
AGESQ	0.000	0.169	0.000	-8.989	0.000	-9.620	-0.001	-8.330
FEMALE	0.042	4.793	-0.024	-2.999	-0.029	-2.664	-0.066	-4.302
MARRIED	0.087	9.304	-0.045	-4.630	-0.050	-3.915	-0.085	-4.049
WAGE	-0.142	-7.916	-0.104	-5.867	-0.062	-2.963	-0.189	-5.675
BREADWIN	0.087	8.090	0.062	6.005	0.127	9.673	0.106	5.426
MONTHEXP	0.000	2.696	0.000	2.824	0.000	4.038	0.000	2.520
MOEXPDUM	-0.037	-2.583	-0.128	-8.253	-0.100	-5.420	-0.036	-1.190
PROPRIET	-0.197	-6.760	-0.298	-11.046	-0.495	-11.204	-0.556	-6.346
FAMILYWK	-0.205	-6.654	-0.286	-9.206	-0.526	-8.752	-0.238	-1.927
SIZE1	-0.188	-5.628	-0.319	-11.465	-0.533	-10.863	-0.708	-6.941
SIZE5	-0.020	-0.627	0.050	2.658	-0.197	-6.555	-0.236	-3.718
SIZE30	0.216	6.170	0.358	18.895	0.083	2.892	0.017	0.269
SIZE100	0.529	13.020	0.549	28.089	0.299	10.814	0.116	1.946
SIZE500	0.676	10.106	0.625	22.572	0.373	12.453	-0.051	-0.668
SIZE1000	0.998	19.345	0.710	24.974	0.503	18.921	0.293	4.954
PUBEMPLY	0.380	3.840	0.528	9.372	0.373	5.637	0.251	4.868
PARTTIME	-0.029	-0.825	0.043	1.569	-0.151	-4.263	-0.304	-4.758
HUSWRKR	-0.186	-5.064	-0.176	-5.057	-0.356	-8.385	-0.390	-5.452
NOJOB	-0.204	-5.964	-0.310	-11.622	-0.532	-15.767	-0.734	-12.623
PROFES	0.061	2.726	0.110	4.988	0.043	1.739	-0.018	-0.620
ADMINI	0.044	1.396	0.094	3.612	0.131	4.304	0.030	0.878
CLERIC	0.001	0.050	0.131	6.146	0.085	3.598	0.041	1.428
SALES	-0.104	-4.788	-0.068	-3.090	0.008	0.320	-0.179	-3.346
SERVIC	-0.107	-4.857	-0.085	-3.741	-0.063	-2.317	-0.079	-1.875
AGRICU	0.181	8.005	0.202	4.336	0.182	2.570	0.014	0.180
FOREST	-0.003	-0.039	0.008	0.094	-0.253	-1.456	0.082	0.356
FISHER	-0.103	-2.661	-0.099	-1.006	-0.126	-0.846	-0.518	-2.490
TRANSP	-0.061	-1.632	-0.036	-1.287	-0.051	-1.450	0.061	1.302
CRAFTM	-0.018	-0.883	0.012	0.583	-0.034	-1.450	-0.126	-2.755
DOCTOR	0.000	2.628	0.000	-0.308	0.000	-0.273	0.000	0.067
SICKNUMB	0.157	35.798	0.128	24.592	0.130	19.168	0.121	11.715
STRESS	0.042	17.430	0.044	18.210	0.059	20.357	0.049	11.623
NOTVISIT	-0.182	-14.466	-0.136	-10.890	-0.177	-11.381	-0.159	-6.636
HLTHPRAC	0.089	46.169	0.078	39.018	0.080	32.434	0.070	19.270
HLTHEXCE	0.347	27.346	0.417	31.306	0.531	33.007	0.440	18.311
HLTHGOOD	0.408	30.292	0.464	32.972	0.584	34.681	0.549	21.973
HLTHFAIR	0.379	33.356	0.456	36.966	0.566	37.627	0.528	23.546
EDU	-0.643	-7.950	-0.805	-10.406	-0.490	-4.610	-0.482	-3.394
LIFEINSU	-0.001	-9.375	0.000	-3.663	0.000	0.775	0.000	0.228
POP1M	0.011	0.773	-0.081	-5.501	-0.048	-3.218	-0.063	-2.430
POP150	-0.067	-6.171	-0.063	-6.065	-0.050	-4.214	-0.057	-3.027
POP50	0.102	7.411	0.105	7.827	0.077	3.991	0.045	1.810
POPCUNTY	0.274	26.559	0.206	20.443	0.137	10.395	0.142	7.601
REGIOND1	-0.227	-7.434	-0.263	-8.947	-0.186	-4.795	-0.204	-4.215
REGIOND2	0.076	3.827	0.047	2.126	0.083	3.539	-0.021	-0.566
REGIOND4	0.021	1.270	0.012	0.584	-0.024	-1.375	-0.048	-1.526
REGIOND5	0.066	3.387	0.092	4.495	0.067	2.980	0.003	0.080
REGIOND6	0.019	0.979	0.000	-0.014	0.023	1.173	-0.008	-0.234
REGIOND7	-0.102	-4.714	-0.100	-4.093	-0.119	-5.281	-0.144	-3.432
REGIOND8	-0.229	-11.147	-0.153	-6.558	-0.128	-5.898	-0.160	-4.526
REGIOND9	-0.081	-3.909	-0.004	-0.163	-0.024	-0.994	-0.131	-3.588
REGIOND10	-0.228	-10.315	-0.203	-8.524	-0.138	-4.891	-0.272	-6.873
REGIOND11	-0.170	-8.108	-0.102	-4.517	-0.099	-3.845	-0.201	-5.237
REGIOND12	-0.099	-4.636	-0.099	-4.213	-0.056	-1.862	-0.184	-4.708
R-squared	0.12064		0.14146		0.18251		0.19170	
Log Likelihood	-85409.00		-86020.50		-57768.90		-25520.10	
N	138,308		142,069		104,113		48,873	

* Asymptotic t-statistics: the critival value at 1% significance level=2.576; the critical value at 5% significance level=1.960; and the critical value at 10% significance level=1.645.

Table 10. Health Check-up Rate: Insurance Type-Specific PROBIT Results for Females

	NHI		GOVTHI		SOCIHI		MUTUHI	
Variable	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*
C	-0.940	-6.982	-1.041	-7.916	-1.349	-8.088	-0.911	-3.661
AGE	0.009	2.521	0.046	12.068	0.059	11.317	0.065	8.394
AGESQ	0.000	2.467	0.000	-6.621	0.000	-7.249	-0.001	-5.515
MATERNITY	-0.168	-10.195	-0.137	-10.001	-0.121	-7.389	-0.192	-8.505
MARRIED	0.044	2.948	-0.160	-9.890	-0.235	-10.810	-0.155	-4.700
WAGE	0.012	0.315	-0.080	-2.159	0.007	0.135	-0.154	-2.308
BREADWIN	-0.004	-0.249	-0.041	-2.315	0.000	0.006	0.049	1.463
MONTHEXP	0.000	1.992	0.000	2.624	0.000	2.087	0.000	1.436
MOEXPDUM	-0.030	-1.496	-0.113	-5.156	-0.085	-3.230	-0.026	-0.641
PROPRIET	-0.016	-0.284	-0.211	-3.902	-0.252	-3.001	-0.761	-5.604
FAMILYWK	-0.110	-1.952	-0.281	-6.366	-0.454	-5.297	-0.514	-3.091
SIZE1	-0.049	-0.791	-0.246	-5.561	-0.426	-5.551	-0.778	-5.419
SIZE5	0.085	1.443	0.088	2.522	-0.099	-1.630	-0.364	-3.164
SIZE30	0.278	4.375	0.368	10.454	0.170	2.812	-0.081	-0.695
SIZE100	0.602	8.446	0.571	15.762	0.372	6.229	0.046	0.399
SIZE500	0.523	4.571	0.686	14.090	0.477	7.447	-0.210	-1.520
SIZE1000	0.862	9.287	0.760	15.396	0.660	11.106	0.287	2.351
PUBEMPLY	0.568	4.102	0.566	7.214	0.455	4.259	0.209	1.958
PARTTIME	0.132	2.181	0.089	2.217	-0.040	-0.651	-0.365	-3.208
HUSWRKR	-0.082	-1.326	-0.163	-3.529	-0.269	-4.018	-0.492	-4.080
NOJOB	-0.153	-2.507	-0.324	-7.434	-0.444	-6.892	-0.819	-6.975
PROFES	0.052	1.422	0.180	5.381	0.086	2.110	0.046	0.858
ADMINI	-0.061	-1.021	-0.138	-2.918	-0.133	-1.857	0.111	1.495
CLERIC	-0.001	-0.035	0.118	3.810	0.074	2.041	0.018	0.317
SALES	-0.125	-3.782	-0.089	-2.675	-0.022	-0.553	-0.162	-2.158
SERVIC	-0.131	-4.030	-0.103	-3.124	-0.083	-2.071	-0.097	-1.485
AGRICU	0.198	5.606	0.206	3.282	0.207	2.223	0.163	1.416
FOREST	-0.139	-0.960	0.010	0.062	-0.145	-0.515	0.094	0.215
FISHER	0.033	0.462	-0.132	-0.825	0.095	0.461	-0.191	-0.598
TRANSP	-0.041	-0.381	-0.119	-1.313	0.053	0.446	-0.005	-0.037
CRAFTM	-0.042	-1.265	-0.014	-0.441	-0.028	-0.738	-0.131	-1.789
DOCTOR	0.000	0.440	0.000	-0.157	0.000	0.089	0.000	-0.318
SICKNUMB	0.146	25.208	0.131	18.980	0.125	14.262	0.113	8.558
STRESS	0.042	13.110	0.040	12.804	0.048	12.821	0.044	8.226
NOTVISIT	-0.182	-10.636	-0.154	-9.153	-0.225	-10.764	-0.156	-4.962
HLTHPRAC	0.099	36.853	0.082	29.288	0.077	22.534	0.067	13.532
HLTHEXCE	0.307	17.410	0.356	19.077	0.429	18.834	0.355	10.801
HLTHGOOD	0.364	19.666	0.405	20.804	0.467	19.827	0.457	13.547
HLTHFAIR	0.354	22.908	0.394	23.226	0.446	21.317	0.417	13.853
EDU	-0.496	-3.645	-1.141	-8.959	-0.805	-4.489	-0.741	-3.272
LIFEINSU	-0.001	-5.826	0.000	-2.405	0.000	-1.022	0.000	-0.351
POP1M	-0.024	-1.168	-0.086	-4.079	-0.038	-1.822	-0.063	-1.767
POP150	-0.101	-6.809	-0.075	-5.248	-0.061	-3.647	-0.072	-2.837
POP50	0.127	6.657	0.142	7.744	0.131	4.863	0.110	3.228
POPCUNTY	0.308	21.547	0.265	19.025	0.192	10.492	0.219	8.655
REGIOND1	-0.189	-3.975	-0.378	-8.189	-0.265	-4.429	-0.308	-4.096
REGIOND2	0.166	4.818	0.032	0.873	0.036	0.861	-0.025	-0.419
REGIOND4	0.058	2.335	0.034	1.190	-0.013	-0.515	-0.039	-0.888
REGIOND5	0.097	3.663	0.066	2.309	0.076	2.394	0.006	0.140
REGIOND6	0.049	1.823	0.012	0.405	0.027	0.963	-0.011	-0.238
REGIOND7	-0.080	-2.593	-0.013	-0.365	-0.127	-3.837	-0.078	-1.338
REGIOND8	-0.175	-6.004	-0.089	-2.669	-0.108	-3.343	-0.168	-3.438
REGIOND9	0.013	0.433	-0.010	-0.306	-0.028	-0.782	-0.128	-2.469
REGIOND10	-0.103	-3.249	-0.147	-4.361	-0.080	-1.946	-0.277	-5.078
REGIOND11	-0.077	-2.415	-0.102	-3.029	-0.123	-3.100	-0.226	-3.989
REGIOND12	0.045	1.287	-0.109	-2.947	-0.125	-2.654	-0.205	-3.377
R-squared	0.13884		0.15478		0.16101		0.19174	
Log Likelihood	-44235.10		-45070.70		-30346.50		-14118.60	
N	72,452		74,019		50,278		24,644	

* Asymptotic t-statistics: the critival value at 1% significance level=2.576; the critical value at 5% significance level=1.960; and the critical value at 10% significance level=1.645.

Table 11. Health Check-up Rate: Insurance Type-Specific PROBIT Results for Males

	NHI		GOVTHI		SOCIHI		MUTUHI	
Variable	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*
C	-0.510	-3.565	-1.357	-9.742	-2.305	-13.018	-2.165	-8.084
AGE	0.007	1.106	0.056	9.423	0.075	10.390	0.101	8.559
AGESQ	0.000	0.339	-0.001	-7.884	-0.001	-9.762	-0.001	-8.245
MARRIED	0.146	9.916	0.098	6.659	0.154	8.396	0.141	4.432
WAGE	-0.070	-2.316	-0.093	-2.858	-0.063	-1.703	-0.126	-2.054
BREADWIN	0.167	10.832	0.053	3.540	0.098	5.398	0.050	1.764
MONTHEXP	0.000	1.783	0.000	0.684	0.000	2.269	0.000	1.331
MOEXPDUM	-0.052	-2.560	-0.151	-6.784	-0.128	-4.897	-0.065	-1.418
PROPRIET	-0.232	-6.846	-0.318	-10.217	-0.577	-10.837	-0.191	-1.311
FAMILYWK	-0.299	-7.410	-0.279	-4.977	-0.540	-4.882	0.332	1.032
SIZE1	-0.240	-5.961	-0.391	-10.197	-0.556	-7.230	-0.644	-2.865
SIZE5	-0.046	-1.222	0.024	1.077	-0.233	-6.400	-0.081	-0.902
SIZE30	0.216	5.076	0.350	15.412	0.047	1.401	0.063	0.838
SIZE100	0.509	10.102	0.533	22.627	0.264	8.328	0.124	1.728
SIZE500	0.757	9.005	0.581	17.078	0.324	9.421	0.018	0.195
SIZE1000	1.051	16.660	0.678	19.252	0.433	14.378	0.234	3.442
PUBEMPLY	0.298	2.046	0.484	5.815	0.353	4.025	0.238	4.033
PARTTIME	-0.082	-1.829	0.037	0.637	-0.074	-0.965	-0.138	-1.162
HUSWRKR	-0.184	-3.583	-0.027	-0.320	-0.136	-1.290	-0.185	-1.487
NOJOB	-0.113	-2.640	-0.087	-2.248	-0.294	-6.485	-0.370	-5.041
PROFES	0.059	2.041	0.039	1.325	0.027	0.861	-0.076	-2.241
ADMINI	0.069	1.802	0.149	4.608	0.168	4.633	0.041	1.053
CLERIC	0.031	0.732	0.107	3.575	0.053	1.654	0.064	1.865
SALES	-0.090	-3.089	-0.082	-2.747	0.000	0.006	-0.154	-1.699
SERVIC	-0.101	-3.240	-0.098	-3.097	-0.064	-1.718	-0.027	-0.434
AGRICU	0.204	6.863	0.151	2.097	0.105	0.934	-0.122	-1.033
FOREST	0.110	1.372	0.068	0.634	-0.209	-0.936	0.221	0.800
FISHER	-0.106	-2.274	-0.073	-0.583	-0.368	-1.672	-0.744	-2.675
TRANSP	-0.069	-1.649	-0.028	-0.851	-0.042	-1.051	0.079	1.561
CRAFTM	0.000	0.002	0.029	1.097	-0.015	-0.508	-0.092	-1.484
DOCTOR	0.000	2.147	0.000	1.051	0.000	-0.705	0.000	-0.275
SICKNUMB	0.173	25.455	0.120	14.902	0.131	12.225	0.132	7.812
STRESS	0.047	12.768	0.057	14.639	0.084	17.753	0.066	9.217
NOTVISIT	-0.177	-9.549	-0.112	-5.928	-0.122	-5.126	-0.168	-4.519
HLTHPRAC	0.079	28.487	0.075	25.915	0.085	23.542	0.074	13.781
HLTHEXCE	0.398	21.596	0.500	26.117	0.653	28.680	0.562	15.861
HLTHGOOD	0.465	23.519	0.545	26.651	0.724	29.943	0.680	18.204
HLTHFAIR	0.412	24.379	0.535	29.695	0.702	32.468	0.679	20.091
EDU	-0.750	-5.365	-0.994	-7.401	-0.280	-1.454	-0.111	-0.435
LIFEINSU	-0.001	-8.092	0.000	-3.162	0.000	2.329	0.000	0.106
POP1M	0.021	0.992	-0.061	-2.860	-0.050	-2.298	-0.071	-1.837
POP150	-0.034	-2.166	-0.044	-2.914	-0.033	-1.908	-0.038	-1.355
POP50	0.081	4.025	0.063	3.223	0.023	0.819	-0.030	-0.810
POPCUNTY	0.245	16.290	0.143	9.701	0.075	3.945	0.039	1.396
REGIOND1	-0.136	-3.048	-0.192	-4.534	-0.129	-2.253	-0.078	-1.090
REGIOND2	0.097	3.486	0.026	0.827	0.133	4.026	-0.002	-0.036
REGIOND4	0.050	2.000	-0.002	-0.057	-0.022	-0.825	-0.046	-0.941
REGIOND5	0.104	3.203	0.145	4.302	0.057	1.449	-0.019	-0.315
REGIOND6	0.042	1.403	0.030	0.901	0.036	1.091	-0.008	-0.136
REGIOND7	-0.106	-3.399	-0.186	-5.310	-0.106	-3.250	-0.183	-2.929
REGIOND8	-0.241	-8.069	-0.191	-5.639	-0.128	-4.013	-0.140	-2.567
REGIOND9	-0.087	-2.782	0.009	0.284	0.006	0.160	-0.094	-1.617
REGIOND10	-0.273	-8.143	-0.252	-7.079	-0.174	-4.116	-0.227	-3.607
REGIOND11	-0.161	-5.092	-0.112	-3.313	-0.067	-1.716	-0.133	-2.219
REGIOND12	-0.123	-3.855	-0.125	-3.549	0.031	0.690	-0.117	-1.910
R-squared	0.11028		0.11957		0.15327		0.12936	
Log Likelihood	-40781.20		-40493.50		-26989.10		-1154.70	
N	65,856		68,050		53,835		24,229	

* Asymptotic t-statistics: the critival value at 1% significance level=2.576; the critical value at 5% significance level=1.960; and the critical value at 10% significance level=1.645.

Table 12: Health Check-up Rate: PROBIT Results for NHI Female Insurants by Age Group

	20～29		30～39		40～49		50～60		61～64	
Variable	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*
C	-2.254	-1.893	-1.631	-0.735	-0.783	-0.258	-2.553	-0.846	40.711	0.904
AGE	0.168	1.782	0.063	0.491	-0.036	-0.266	0.059	0.542	-1.292	-0.897
AGESQ	-0.003	-1.721	-0.001	-0.279	0.001	0.459	0.000	-0.363	0.010	0.887
MARRIED	-0.300	-8.454	-0.013	-0.341	0.154	4.139	0.152	5.202	0.101	2.803
WAGE	-0.054	-0.253	-0.105	-0.775	0.210	2.601	-0.014	-0.241	0.100	1.055
BREADWIN	0.258	6.382	-0.042	-0.786	-0.046	-1.081	-0.003	-0.085	-0.011	-0.262
MONTHEXP	0.000	0.330	0.000	0.514	0.000	-0.317	0.001	2.364	0.000	0.688
MOEXPDUM	-0.039	-0.769	0.065	1.198	-0.027	-0.661	-0.074	-2.082	-0.067	-1.246
PROPRIET	-0.065	-0.427	0.011	0.074	0.001	0.007	0.133	1.271	-0.173	-0.902
FAMILYWK	-0.198	-1.352	-0.183	-1.304	-0.175	-1.687	0.065	0.622	-0.194	-1.016
SIZE1	-0.116	-0.794	-0.085	-0.559	-0.022	-0.191	0.117	0.997	-0.281	-1.258
SIZE5	-0.022	-0.152	0.094	0.648	0.083	0.754	0.244	2.206	-0.130	-0.632
SIZE30	0.248	1.676	0.310	1.965	0.158	1.305	0.409	3.412	0.148	0.662
SIZE100	0.621	3.925	0.538	3.077	0.696	5.030	0.556	4.001	0.120	0.460
SIZE500	0.359	1.700	0.578	2.069	0.706	2.825	0.409	1.708	0.358	0.603
SIZE1000	0.957	5.298	0.819	3.825	0.775	3.834	0.600	3.015	0.286	0.666
PUBEMPLY	0.724	2.591	0.392	1.343	0.547	1.768	0.594	1.932	0.131	0.302
PARTTIME	-0.015	-0.102	0.043	0.289	0.141	1.225	0.368	3.247	-0.032	-0.157
HUSWRKR	-0.237	-1.495	-0.092	-0.594	-0.133	-1.147	0.170	1.487	-0.203	-1.003
NOJOB	-0.182	-1.220	-0.258	-1.670	-0.252	-2.195	0.135	1.207	-0.308	-1.520
PROFES	0.081	0.932	0.104	1.151	0.008	0.115	0.116	1.656	-0.293	-2.411
ADMINI	-0.206	-1.078	0.164	1.037	-0.199	-1.750	0.060	0.587	-0.109	-0.631
CLERIC	0.019	0.231	0.010	0.110	-0.019	-0.278	0.013	0.184	-0.333	-2.533
SALES	-0.281	-3.201	-0.136	-1.578	-0.147	-2.380	-0.010	-0.170	-0.082	-0.807
SERVIC	-0.298	-3.525	-0.163	-1.909	-0.169	-2.774	0.035	0.607	-0.145	-1.417
AGRICU	0.256	1.621	0.017	0.173	0.235	3.401	0.326	5.330	0.089	0.913
FOREST	-0.227	-0.351	-0.412	-0.935	-0.510	-1.769	-0.079	-0.334	0.725	1.712
FISHER	-0.622	-1.576	-0.296	-1.461	0.005	0.038	0.232	1.994	0.041	0.207
TRANSP	0.054	0.233	-0.325	-1.233	0.097	0.473	0.089	0.428	-1.166	-2.122
CRAFTM	-0.069	-0.717	-0.050	-0.565	-0.072	-1.156	0.076	1.293	-0.148	-1.466
DOCTOR	0.001	0.943	0.001	1.412	-0.001	-1.434	0.000	-1.174	0.001	1.238
SICKNUMB	0.110	4.437	0.106	4.598	0.136	9.605	0.141	15.761	0.172	15.287
STRESS	0.037	3.998	0.022	3.119	0.040	6.325	0.049	8.329	0.073	7.647
NOTVISIT	-0.105	-2.006	-0.070	-1.562	-0.175	-5.367	-0.252	-8.180	-0.227	-5.116
HLTHPRAC	0.063	7.875	0.057	7.214	0.086	14.625	0.105	22.833	0.144	24.257
HLTHEXCE	0.324	5.873	0.176	3.414	0.253	6.595	0.331	11.041	0.334	8.310
HLTHGOOD	0.329	5.640	0.221	4.094	0.357	8.742	0.394	12.488	0.375	9.129
HLTHFAIR	0.311	5.860	0.178	3.692	0.298	8.615	0.404	15.940	0.395	12.120
EDU	-0.530	-1.378	-1.221	-3.294	0.166	0.545	-0.445	-1.829	-0.683	-2.230
LIFEINSU	-0.001	-3.007	0.000	-1.562	0.000	-1.329	-0.001	-3.180	-0.001	-3.207
POP1M	0.011	0.217	-0.007	-0.114	-0.021	-0.485	-0.079	-2.170	-0.019	-0.377
POP150	-0.049	-1.194	-0.160	-3.832	-0.104	-3.293	-0.111	-4.263	-0.100	-2.853
POP50	0.060	1.007	0.071	1.341	0.167	4.119	0.133	4.046	0.152	3.500
POPCUNTY	0.239	5.680	0.284	7.239	0.314	10.396	0.300	12.019	0.375	11.312
REGIOND1	-0.321	-2.440	-0.305	-2.399	0.127	1.239	-0.232	-2.694	-0.153	-1.282
REGIOND2	0.069	0.747	0.134	1.304	0.408	5.265	0.137	2.194	0.180	2.091
REGIOND4	0.063	1.021	0.253	3.673	0.145	2.688	-0.041	-0.922	0.117	1.814
REGIOND5	0.027	0.352	0.113	1.424	0.296	5.171	0.017	0.380	0.158	2.326
REGIOND6	-0.041	-0.572	0.126	1.667	0.125	2.202	0.052	1.090	0.050	0.706
REGIOND7	-0.137	-1.762	0.013	0.156	-0.021	-0.324	-0.110	-2.031	-0.058	-0.721
REGIOND8	-0.240	-2.939	-0.048	-0.588	-0.109	-1.761	-0.175	-3.452	-0.223	-2.993
REGIOND9	-0.036	-0.439	0.046	0.524	0.068	1.033	-0.001	-0.012	0.109	1.403
REGIOND10	-0.102	-1.129	-0.129	-1.370	-0.014	-0.200	-0.084	-1.490	-0.076	-0.950
REGIOND11	-0.266	-2.990	-0.080	-0.831	0.074	1.024	-0.089	-1.554	0.042	0.550
REGIOND12	-0.152	-1.549	-0.055	-0.526	0.188	2.411	0.078	1.240	0.203	2.274
R-squared	0.07749		0.06600		0.08276		0.10206		0.13514	
Log Likelihoo	-5471.05		-5724.49		-9900.48		-14628.10		-8056.22	
N	10,383		10,252		15,737		22,900		13,180	

* Asymptotic t-statistics: the critival value at 1% significance level=2.576; the critical value at 5% significance level=1.960; and the critical value at 10% significance level=1.645.

Table 13: Health Check-up Rate: PROBIT Results for NHI Male Insurants by Age Group

	20~29		30~39		40~49		50~60		61~64	
Variable	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*	Estimate	t-statistic*
C	-0.279	-0.244	3.593	1.620	0.190	0.063	0.090	0.025	28.350	0.579
AGE	0.014	0.159	-0.194	-1.513	-0.016	-0.119	-0.033	-0.250	-0.918	-0.586
AGESQ	0.000	0.100	0.003	1.644	0.000	0.111	0.000	0.336	0.007	0.591
MARRIED	-0.023	-0.601	0.154	4.781	0.187	6.629	0.209	6.383	0.156	3.370
WAGE	-0.306	-1.687	-0.285	-1.984	0.040	0.408	-0.055	-0.894	-0.028	-0.196
BREADWIN	0.341	10.441	0.127	3.519	0.047	1.333	0.081	1.890	0.082	2.200
MONTHEXP	0.000	0.190	0.000	-0.397	0.000	0.730	0.000	1.923	0.000	1.303
MOEXPDUM	-0.138	-2.845	-0.054	-0.973	-0.003	-0.065	-0.033	-0.864	-0.073	-1.312
PROPRIET	-0.218	-1.958	-0.352	-4.393	-0.218	-3.572	-0.220	-3.473	-0.213	-2.104
FAMILYWK	-0.274	-2.471	-0.272	-3.064	-0.285	-3.671	-0.276	-2.872	-0.445	-3.222
SIZE1	-0.234	-2.067	-0.276	-2.986	-0.184	-2.492	-0.276	-3.487	-0.204	-1.553
SIZE5	-0.091	-0.840	-0.024	-0.274	0.008	0.120	-0.035	-0.484	-0.128	-1.104
SIZE30	0.223	1.920	0.257	2.622	0.197	2.466	0.253	3.016	0.063	0.480
SIZE100	0.487	3.877	0.581	5.364	0.568	5.763	0.473	4.234	0.061	0.357
SIZE500	0.540	3.174	1.035	5.213	0.748	4.822	0.753	3.700	1.367	2.338
SIZE1000	0.928	6.778	1.205	8.385	1.031	8.533	1.082	7.162	0.565	1.772
PUBEMPLY	0.246	0.737	0.307	0.957	0.255	0.546	0.837	2.231	-0.032	-0.119
PARTTIME	-0.048	-0.398	-0.130	-1.107	-0.131	-1.389	-0.114	-1.309	-0.042	-0.362
HUSWRKR	-0.202	-1.475	-0.159	-1.200	-0.169	-1.586	-0.230	-2.308	-0.168	-1.308
NOJOB	0.007	0.060	-0.196	-1.831	-0.295	-3.418	-0.082	-0.974	-0.261	-2.210
PROFES	0.153	1.955	-0.008	-0.113	0.055	0.997	0.115	2.127	-0.087	-1.058
ADMINI	-0.109	-0.747	-0.176	-1.766	0.137	1.921	0.144	2.142	0.065	0.636
CLERIC	0.060	0.649	-0.160	-1.663	-0.010	-0.115	0.129	1.393	0.186	1.361
SALES	-0.110	-1.374	-0.251	-3.386	-0.078	-1.383	0.002	0.043	-0.144	-1.796
SERVIC	-0.187	-2.370	-0.306	-3.901	-0.088	-1.451	0.054	0.942	-0.087	-0.943
AGRICU	0.066	0.629	-0.036	-0.447	0.153	2.591	0.338	6.269	0.139	1.897
FOREST	-0.532	-1.097	-0.438	-1.259	0.016	0.093	0.266	2.107	0.142	0.858
FISHER	0.012	0.076	-0.433	-3.271	-0.090	-0.974	0.031	0.375	-0.217	-1.947
TRANSP	-0.118	-1.105	-0.254	-2.472	-0.059	-0.731	0.114	1.457	-0.167	-1.215
CRAFTM	0.095	1.358	-0.069	-1.039	-0.019	-0.358	0.059	1.193	-0.084	-1.191
DOCTOR	0.001	0.975	0.000	0.156	0.002	3.399	0.000	-1.123	0.000	0.558
SICKNUMB	0.141	4.356	0.003	2.013	0.190	11.942	0.166	15.015	0.181	14.550
STRESS	0.035	3.373	0.043	4.897	0.037	5.559	0.053	7.436	0.083	7.595
NOTVISIT	-0.003	-0.065	-0.105	-2.046	-0.205	-5.966	-0.245	-7.137	-0.211	-4.357
HLTHPRAC	0.066	8.704	0.065	8.650	0.056	9.957	0.095	18.173	0.108	16.983
HLTHEXCE	0.323	5.873	0.316	6.196	0.379	9.995	0.403	12.101	0.405	9.478
HLTHGOOD	0.408	6.937	0.348	6.352	0.407	10.026	0.482	13.434	0.523	11.613
HLTHFAIR	0.360	6.620	0.284	5.749	0.364	10.426	0.437	14.779	0.454	12.514
EDU	-0.772	-1.952	-0.834	-2.175	-1.232	-4.324	-0.453	-1.723	-0.609	-1.827
LIFEINSU	-0.001	-4.078	-0.001	-2.751	-0.001	-4.423	0.000	-2.293	-0.001	-2.914
POP1M	0.039	0.789	0.053	0.938	-0.084	-1.883	0.078	1.870	-0.035	-0.625
POP150	0.001	0.016	0.019	0.457	-0.079	-2.473	-0.024	-0.786	-0.095	-2.442
POP50	0.001	0.012	0.043	0.779	0.132	3.379	0.096	2.556	0.076	1.623
POPCUNTY	0.134	3.224	0.251	6.217	0.242	8.123	0.261	9.278	0.309	8.647
REGIOND1	-0.247	-2.299	-0.182	-1.472	0.061	0.608	-0.081	-0.883	-0.302	-2.202
REGIOND2	0.069	1.015	-0.061	-0.748	0.102	1.447	0.216	3.765	0.082	0.839
REGIOND4	0.102	1.734	-0.039	-0.556	0.095	1.623	0.070	1.387	-0.020	-0.253
REGIOND5	0.122	1.492	-0.015	-0.151	0.184	2.264	0.142	2.177	0.038	0.377
REGIOND6	0.136	1.830	0.040	0.480	0.096	1.409	0.018	0.314	-0.062	-0.745
REGIOND7	-0.073	-1.060	-0.177	-2.093	-0.185	-2.681	-0.068	-1.129	-0.046	-0.527
REGIOND8	-0.117	-1.593	-0.420	-5.038	-0.274	-4.084	-0.125	-2.145	-0.324	-3.655
REGIOND9	-0.116	-1.543	-0.085	-0.916	-0.140	-1.744	0.029	0.460	-0.130	-1.230
REGIOND10	-0.323	-3.794	-0.433	-4.386	-0.320	-3.604	-0.140	-2.034	-0.219	-2.086
REGIOND11	-0.292	-3.736	-0.225	-2.377	-0.224	-2.746	-0.003	-0.044	-0.108	-0.987
REGIOND12	-0.233	-2.902	-0.396	-4.062	-0.188	-2.147	0.046	0.678	0.110	0.981
R-squared	0.08392		0.09370		0.08229		0.10132		0.11750	
Log Likelihoo	-5927.91		-5748.80		-10333.00		-11556.50		-6933.40	
N	10,629		9,631		16,420		18,166		11,010	

* Asymptotic t-statistics: the critival value at 1% significance level=2.576; the critical value at 5% significance level=1.960; and the critical value at 10% significance level=1.645.