

RRFSS 2014: General Health

Figure 1




Table 1. Self-reported general health status of adults (18 years +), HKPR District, 2014

Response	Percent	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI
Excellent/Very Good	56.9	53.91	59.89
Good	30.1	27.35	32.91
Fair/Poor	13.0	11.17	15.12

Interpretation†:


The percent of adults (18 years +), residing in the HKPR District, who reported their general health status as ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’ is 56.9% (95% CI: 53.91, 59.89).

The percent of adults (18 years +), residing in the HKPR District, who reported their general health status as ‘good’ is 30.1% (95% CI: 27.35, 32.91).

The percent of adults (18 years +), residing in the HKPR District, who reported their general health status as ‘fair’ or ‘poor’ is 13.0% (95% CI: 11.17, 15.12).

RRFSS 2014: General Health

Figure 2



Sample Size: 1207
 *High Variability; Interpret with caution
 **Data not released

Table 2. Self-reported general health status of adults (18 years +), by sex, HKPR District, 2014

Sex	Response	Percent	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI
Male	Excellent/Very Good	55.2	50.50	59.93
Female	Excellent/Very Good	58.2	54.21	61.90
Male	Good	31.0	26.75	35.49
Female	Good	29.4	25.95	33.15
Male	Fair/Poor	13.8	10.87	17.33
Female	Fair/Poor	12.4	10.19	15.17

Interpretation†:

The percent of males (18 years +), residing in the HKPR District, who reported their general health status as 'excellent' or 'very good' is 55.2% (95% CI: 50.50, 59.93).

The percent of females (18 years +), residing in the HKPR District, who reported their general health status as 'excellent' or 'very good' is 58.2% (95% CI: 54.21, 61.90).

RRFSS 2014: General Health

The percent of males (18 years +), residing in the HKPR District, who reported their general health status as 'good' is 31.0 % (95% CI: 26.75, 35.49).


The percent of females (18 years +), residing in the HKPR District, who reported their general health status as 'good' is 29.4% (95% CI: 25.95, 33.15).

The percent of males (18 years +), residing in the HKPR District, who reported their general health status as 'fair' or 'poor' is 13.8% (95% CI: 10.87, 17.35).

The percent of females (18 years +), residing in the HKPR District, who reported their general health status as 'fair' or 'poor' is 12.4% (95% CI: 10.19, 15.17).

RRFSS 2014: General Health

Figure 3



Sample Size: 1177

*High Variability; Interpret with caution

**Data not released

Data Source: RRFSS (-, 2014), HKPR District Health Unit and Institute for Social Research (ISR), York University.

Table 3. The percent of adults (18 years +) who reported their general health status as 'excellent' or 'very good', by age-group, HKPR District, 2014

Age	Response	Percent	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI
18-24	Excellent/Very Good	**	.	.
25-44	Excellent/Very Good	66.2	58.33	73.42
45-64	Excellent/Very Good	58.8	54.07	63.44
65+	Excellent/Very Good	49.4	44.73	53.95

Interpretation†:

The percent of adults aged 18-24, residing in the HKPR District, who reported their general health status as 'excellent' or 'very good' has been suppressed for data quality.

The percent of adults aged 25-44, residing in the HKPR District, who reported their general health status as 'excellent' or 'very good' was 66.2% (95% CI: 58.33, 73.42).

The percent of adults aged 45-64, residing in the HKPR District, who reported their general health status as 'excellent' or 'very good' was 58.8% (95% CI: 54.07, 63.44).

The percent of adults aged 65+, residing in the HKPR District, who reported their general health status as 'excellent' or 'very good' was 49.4% (95% CI: 44.73, 53.95).

RRFSS 2014: General Health

Data Limitations:

1. Questions are only asked of adult residents aged 18+.
2. The telephone survey is only conducted in English.
3. Results are based on self-reported behaviours.
4. (*) indicates that results are based on small sample size; thus, estimates have high variability.
5. (**) indicates the data is not released due to small sample size.

Data Notes:

1. Source: Rapid Risk Factor Surveillance System (RRFSS), Jan–Dec 2014, Haliburton, Kawartha, Pine Ridge (HKPR) District Health Unit and Institute for Social Research (ISR), York University.
2. Missing responses are not included in the analysis.
3. "Do not know" and "Refused" responses are analyzed according to RRFSS Analysis Guidelines.
4. The 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) are the range of variability for a population estimate. There is a 95% probability that the true estimate is within that range.
5. Release criteria of the data are according to RRFSS Analysis Guidelines.
6. Percent across age-groups will not sum to 100% as the responses are analyzed within each age-group.
7. (†) If the 95% confidence intervals of estimates do not overlap, the estimates are significantly different (i.e., if the lower confidence interval of estimate A is > the upper confidence interval of estimate B, the estimates are statistically significant). However, if confidence intervals do overlap, it is not necessarily true that estimates are not different.