Ethnicity, class and health


Anyone concerned with the complex interrelations of ethnicity and class to health should peruse this volume. It is one of a series based on the Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities in the UK, descriptions of the main findings of the initial analyses were published in three volumes in 1997. This volume focuses on an explanation of these findings and works through the complex interactions involving ethnicity, “race”, socioeconomic status, class, and important health outcomes including mental health.

The Fourth Survey is exceptional in terms of coverage of the ethnic minority groups (nationally representative sampling of the main minority groups along with a comparison sample of the white population), the use of community based interview data rather than hospital based records, the range of health assessments conducted (general health, C-V disease, diabetes, respiratory disease, mental health, and life style factors, such as tobacco and alcohol use, its appraisal of socioeconomic status and other life features of the ethnic minority populations. Potential limitations of the survey: (a) cross sectional data so that the direction of possible causal relations cannot be assured and (b) self reported data (with questions not yet cross culturally validated).

The main ethnic groups—overall 5.5% of the UK population—are black (Caribbean, African, and other), South Asian (Indian, Pakistani, and Bangladeshi), and Chinese and others (Chinese, other Asian and other other). Important differences in health status and in the patterns of disease from one ethnic minority group to another and from that of the white population are delineated and Nazroo carefully examines possible explanations for these health inequalities.

The assembled evidence points to socioeconomic factors as the major determinants of health in all groups and the principal reason underlying inequalities in health status of ethnic minorities. But class factors do not fully explain the differences. Other kinds of disadvantage: life style factors, such as tobacco and alcohol use, its appraisal of socioeconomic status and other life features of the ethnic minority populations. Potential limitations of the survey: (a) cross sectional data so that the direction of possible causal relations cannot be assured and (b) self reported data (with questions not yet cross culturally validated).
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on the Periodic Health Examination and the ensuing Canadian guide to clinical preventive health care were the first and an impetus to its US equivalent. EBPH is presented here as a unifying concept instead of explaining specific streams of thought just in the English speaking world (Pp 599; £50, €72). ISBN 0-19-510969-4.

Multiauthored books often look like an incongruous pastiche and taste like an indroitly cooked panaché de légumes. Not this one: the editors visibly put a lot of effort to achieve a uniform structure and style. Such coherence is particularly welcome in a text-book; otherwise, the main purpose of such book is defeated when its covers just bind a heterogeneous assortment of reviews. While written by an additional 21 contributors—mostly from Boston, Stockholm, and Athens—the fact that at least one of the editors coauthored each and every chapter shows and pays off.

Part I takes about 110 pages, and it covers: the following sites or types of malignant tumours: oral and pharyngeal cancer, the biliary tract, pancreatic, cancer of the lung, cervical, endometrial, ovarian, prostate, testicular, urinary bladder, thyroid cancer, Hodgkin’s disease, non-Hodgkin’s lymphomas, and the leukaemias. All these chapters open with a brief introduction and a brief clinical synopsis (main clinicopathological features of the cancer at stake). Each chapter then continues with three main sections: descriptive epidemiology, genetic and molecular epidemiology, and the more classic risk factors; the latter are discussed in the same order throughout these chapters. There are plenty of figures and tables.

Textbook of cancer epidemiology

Weaknesses? Despite rich practical examples and illustrations provided by authors, the typesetter succeeded in producing a visually unattractive book (to put it mildly). Pages are crammed; a good number of valuable information is lost in a rather visually amorphous flood of message, forcing the reader to read very carefully in his or her search for essentials among fillers.

Competing titles? None for the moment. Recommended? Yes, warmly. Especially given the most challenging task to write a première in any domain of interest. The floodgate is open.

Milos Jenicek
McMaster University, Canada

Regulating entrepreneurial behaviour in European health care systems
Edited by R B Saltman, R Busse, E Mossialos. (Pp 240; £22.50 (pbk), £65.00 (hbk)). Open University Press, Buckingham, 2002. ISBN 0-335-20922-X (pbk); 0-335-20923-8 (hbk)

This is a hugely interesting book on healthcare systems in Europe and their current regulation, accreditation, and corruption. It aspires to an evidence based approach embracing clinical management and audit and clearly lays out the danger in entrepreneurialism without appropriate regulation in the healthcare setting.

The authors present a detailed and clear understanding of the very differing health-care systems in Europe and help us to understand the consequences of these differences.

There are extremely valuable chapters on factors that have an impact on entrepreneurial behaviour in the health sector such as regulation, accreditation, and corruption. It aspires to an evidence based approach embracing clinical management and audit and clearly lays out the danger in entrepreneurialism without appropriate regulation in the healthcare setting.

An obvious absence in the book is a significant contribution from patients or healthcare providers with the notable exception of dentists. When doctors are mentioned it is to point out that they are always a problem when efforts at reform are attempted. There is no analysis as to why doctors seem to be negative. Nevertheless, I highly recommend this book to any healthcare professional who wants to begin to understand the healthcare “big picture” even if they will have to endure such beauties as “negative opportunistic behaviour”!

Luke Clancy
Dublin University Crest, Clinical Directorate St James’ Hospital, Dublin 8, Ireland

Given the recent history of the UK NHS it is a bit surprising that so many of the examples are based on the UK “reforms”. Partially no doubt this is due to the fact that the NHS has experimented extensively in systems change. The authors present a detailed and clear understanding of the very differing health-care systems in Europe and help us to understand the consequences of these differences.

The structure of the book seems somewhat unusual in so much as part 1, written by the editors, embodies material that is presented and analysed by invited contributors later in part 2. Part 2 is labelled “conceptual issues” and looks at entrepreneurial activity and regulation in a number of contexts including hospitals, the pharmaceutical industry, general practice, and oral health.

The careful reader will also be in an excellent position to critically appraise the current, fascinating expansion of knowledge on the biological mechanisms of cancer occurrence (such as gene-environment interactions), no matter whether such knowledge stems from classic epidemiological approaches or from the increasingly epidemiology integrated, related disciplines.

While the text is easily comprehensible by someone who knows little about cancer, experienced researchers will also use it: at the very least, to check how other experts summarise the state of the art in specific areas. This true textbook will hence be useful, pleasant, and rewarding to students of epidemiology and public health, medicine, and other health and life sciences. It will similarly work for researchers and health practitioners, clinicians, and public health professionals.

Miquel Porta
Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona and Institut Municipal de Investigació Médica, Spain

Regulating entrepreneurial behaviour in European health care systems
Edited by R B Saltman, R Busse, E Mossialos. (Pp 240; £22.50 (pbk), £65.00 (hbk)). Open University Press, Buckingham, 2002. ISBN 0-335-20922-X (pbk); 0-335-20923-8 (hbk)

This is a hugely interesting book on health care systems in Europe.

It is fascinating from a clinician’s point of view to read a book full of detail about health care that hardly mentions patients, doctors, nurses, or indeed any other healthcare workers. It is not easy to read from cover to cover but is rewarding.
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