

WORKING PAPER



United Nations Development Programme

Regional Bureau for Africa

WP 2012-013: February 2012

Economic Growth and Child Undernutrition in Africa

Kenneth Harttgen, Stephan Klasen, and Sebastian Vollmer¹

¹ Kenneth Harttgen (harttgen@nadel.ethz.ch), ETH Zurich, Nadel, Voltastrasse 24, CH-8092 Zurich, Switzerland. Stephan Klasen (sklasen@uni-goettingen.de), University of Göttingen, Department of Economics, Platz der Göttinger Sieben 3, 37073 Göttingen, Germany. Sebastian Vollmer (svollmer@hsph.harvard.edu), University of Hannover, Institute of Macroeconomics and Harvard School of Public Health, Department of Global Health and Population.

This paper is part of a series of recent research commissioned for the African Human Development Report. The authors include leading academics and practitioners from Africa and around the world, as well as UNDP researchers. The findings, interpretations and conclusions are strictly those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of UNDP or United Nations Member States. Moreover, the data may not be consistent with that presented in the African Human Development Report.

Abstract: Despite recent improvements in economic performance, undernutrition rates in Africa appear to have improved much less and rather inconsistently across the continent. We examine to what extent there is an empirical linkage between income growth and reductions of child undernutrition in Africa. We do this by pooling all DHS surveys for African countries, control for other correlates of undernutrition, and add country-level GDP per capita. We find that increases in GDP per capita are associated with lower individual probabilities of being underweight of about 2.5 percent per one hundred dollars (4.1 percent for the probability of being stunted). This association is economically meaningful, but other explanatory variables such as mother's education, socioeconomic status, and poor mother's nutritional status are quantitatively more important than economic growth and appear to contribute to a slowing of progress in reducing undernutrition in Africa.

Keywords: Undernutrition; child care; economic growth; Africa

JEL Classification: O15, J13, I12

1. Introduction

Reducing the risk of food insecurity is one of the major challenges in Africa, both in terms of addressing short-term risks such as the recent economic crisis and volatilities in food prices as well as in terms of addressing long-term risks of chronic undernutrition. Theoretical considerations would suggest a close linkage between income, income growth and undernutrition. More resources at the household level improve the ability of household members to acquire more calories and of parents to invest more in the nutrition and health of their children. These linkages would likely be larger in aggregated cross-country data as used below than in household-level data, as higher per capita incomes not only mean higher household-level incomes, but also tend to increase investments in public services in the areas of health, nutrition, water and sanitation, and social protection for all households, which are other important factors influencing hunger and childhood mortality.

Child health affects adulthood health status and socioeconomic status (Case et al. 2005; Duflo et al. 2007; Martorell, 1999). Children are most vulnerable to shocks at the micro and macro level. It is increasingly recognized that investments in child health made during critical periods of economic development results in larger returns and, conversely, that failure to investment can lead to severe long-term economic impact at the household-level, as well as at the macro-economic level. Thus understanding the determinants of child health is critical for long-term well-being of African populations,

But it is likely that the influences of economic resources on child health and nutrition change over time during the development path. A better understanding of the determinants of undernutrition across African countries and over time is needed for a better spatial and temporal targeting of assistance and to develop appropriate interventions to help those who suffer from structural food insecurity.

While it is clear that economic growth can be important for nutritional status of children (e.g. Smith and Haddad, 2002), it is not clear that the poor benefit from economic growth per se. For example, the most deprived population group can be bypassed by an average increase in per capita incomes. In addition, at the national level, increases in GDP per capita must not be translated into a rise in public services in the health sector. At the micro-level, there is growing body of literature that investigates the relationship between family income and the health status of children (see, e.g. Case et al., 2002; Case et al., 2008; Deaton, 2006; Duflo, 2003). Parents in wealthier households may better be able to invest in the health of their children because they are better able to buy health care or services that improve better health outcomes. In addition, income might also be related to other socioeconomic factors such as education, which affects child health positively (Burgess et al. 2004). But it is unclear whether these effects are mostly due to higher incomes or higher socioeconomic status that comes with these higher incomes and may afford several advantages. Higher socioeconomic status within society might also be the result of selection effects on unobservables that might be beneficial to health outcomes of children. Therefore it might be useful to examine simultaneously the impact of aggregate income levels as well as socioeconomic status to sort out these two effects.

There is only very little literature on the effect of macroeconomic development on the nutritional status of children. We are aware of the following studies: Smith and Haddad (2002) estimate the effect of economic development on undernutrition of children at the macro level for a panel of 63 developing countries with an average of three observations over time. They find a very strong effect and conclude that increases in GDP per capita between 1970 and 1995 have contributed to roughly half of the total reduction in the prevalence of child undernutrition in developing countries.

Haddad et al. (2002) estimate the effect of income on nutritional status of children at the micro level with cross-sectional data for Egypt, Jamaica, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, South Africa and Vietnam. They also find that income growth reduces child undernutrition, but the magnitude of the effect is not sufficient to reach the Millennium Development Goal of halving the levels of child underweight by 2015 through the effect of economic growth alone (assuming reasonable growth rates).

Klasen (2008) (and a range of similar studies) examines the drivers of undernutrition using cross-country data. He (as well as a range of methodologically related studies) find an impact of (log) incomes on undernutrition, but the effect tends to be rather small.

Subramanyam et al (2001) estimate the association of economic growth at the state level on child undernutrition in India with three household surveys between 1992 and 2006 (repeated cross-section). They find an inverse association between state economic growth and the risk of undernutrition in models that do not account for time fixed effects. In specifications that include time fixed effects, the association between state economic growth and underweight, stunting and wasting becomes insignificant.

A recent study by Friedman and Schady (2009) estimate the additional number of infant deaths in Sub-Sahara Africa as a result of the financial crisis. The authors also pooled DHS data sets for Sub-Saharan African countries and control for fluctuation in national income, i.e. they separately investigate the impact of booms and busts on child mortality rates. They find that there will be 30,000 to 50,000 additional deaths as the results of the reduced growth caused by the global financial crisis in Africa in 2009.

The aim of the paper is of particular relevance for the African Human Development Report – Food Security and Human Development. This paper deals with the question of why the number of poor people is falling but the number of malnourished (using FAO's data) does not change much and the level of childhood undernutrition is also falling only very slowly. While this is true at the global level it is not necessarily the case for sub-Saharan Africa.

The objective of the paper is to investigate the association of increases in GDP per capita and child undernutrition in sub-Saharan Africa. We find that increases in GDP per capita are associated with a reduction of the individual probability of being underweight of 2.5 percent per one hundred dollars (4.1 percent for the probability of being stunted). This association is economically meaningful. But other explanatory variables such as mother's education, socioeconomic status of the household within society, and poor mother's nutritional status are quantitatively more important than economic growth, and appear to contribute to a

slowing of progress in reducing undernutrition in Africa. Focusing on the impact of economic resources on childhood undernutrition, we identify a kind of micro-macro paradox. While individual resources at the household level have a rather strong influence on reducing undernutrition rates, resources at the aggregate level do not seem to have this effect. This would either suggest that relative income or selection effects explain the impact of household resources on undernutrition, while aggregate income is much less important. Of course, measurement error in aggregate income levels or growth thereof might also play a role.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we describe our empirical approach and the data. In section 3, we present and discuss the descriptive results and the outcomes of the regressions. Finally, in section 4, we conclude.

2. Empirical Analyses

2.1 Data

To analyze the determinants of child undernutrition across countries and over time, we use the nationally representative Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) data sets. The DHS are undertaken by *Macro International Inc., Calverton, Maryland* (usually in cooperation with local authorities and funded by USAID) and started in 1984. They provide detailed information on child mortality, health, and fertility. In particular, the DHS detailed information on anthropometric outcomes of children of the interviewed women (who are between the age of 15 and 49). In particular, information on child undernutrition is available for children born 5 years prior to the survey. We use these child histories to assess the levels and trends in child undernutrition. Besides the information in the anthropometric outcomes of children, the DHS data contain detailed information on the socioeconomic characteristics of all household members as well as on characteristics of the household. The data are generated by a self-weighted national survey of women aged between 15 and 49. The average sample size is about 5,000 to 6,000 women, and some are surveys are even larger than that.

The DHS include a household member recode and an individual recode for women of reproductive age. The household member recode lists all member of the household. At the household level, the DHS provide information on basic demographics, education and on the possession of household assets. Although the DHS are not completely standardized across time and countries, the design and coding of variables (especially on assets and dwelling characteristics) are generally comparable. The child recode provides detailed information on all children of women aged between 15 and 49 born within the last 5 years prior to the survey, including child health, child mortality and anthropometric indicators

To date, DHS data is available for 28 African countries for several years – resulting in more than 70 large scale household surveys. For our analysis, we pool all existing African DHS data sets between 1991 and 2009.² The estimation sample contains around 380,000 children

² Data before 1991 suffer by many missing values on anthropometric indicators of children.

born between 1996 and 2009. The countries and survey years are presented in Table 1. The pooled data includes a complete annual cross section for the time period 1991 and 2009.

Pooling the DHS data for African countries offers several advantages for our analysis. First, our data is of unparalleled scope in the literature on determinants of child health. Besides some studies that uses pooled DHS data sets such as Bhalotra and Rawlings (2009, 2010) to study intergeneration persistence in child health, many epidemiological studies use small scale survey data. Second, the standardization of the survey design allows the comparison of determinants of child undernutrition and socioeconomic characteristics across countries and over time. Third, the pooled micro data can be merged with country level macro-level panel data by country and survey year. In particular, we merge our pooled cross section DHS data set with data GDP per capita in constant 2005 prices (chain series) from the Penn World Tables (Version 7.0, 2011) by country and survey year between 1991 and 2009. Besides these advantages of the (pooled) DHS data sets, the data have also some limitations including, for example, the problem of measurement error as a result of the self-reporting of the child health by the mothers.³

2.2 Indicator of undernutrition

The underlying theoretical framework for the choice of the dependent and independent variables to study determinants of undernutrition across countries and over time in Africa closely follows the analytical framework proposed by Mosley and Chen (1984) to study child survival, and a related conceptual framework developed by UNICEF (1998) for childhood undernutrition. The idea of this framework is the assumption that social, economic, demographic, and medical determinants, i.e. the proximate determinants, affect the survival probability of the children through a set of biological mechanism. The proximate determinants are grouped at different hierarchical levels, i.e. the individual, the household level and economic growth measured by GDP per capita at the country and year level. In this analysis, the Mosley and Chen (1984) framework is combined with the conceptual framework to study the causes of child undernutrition proposed by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF, 1998), which is based on assumptions similar to the Mosley and Chen (1984) framework.

The DHS data sets provide information on several anthropometric outcomes of children, in particular the z-scores for weight for age, weight for height, and height for age. As dependent variables, we use a dummy variable whether the child is moderately stunted wasted and/or underweight, that is, whether the z-score (height for age - stunting, weight for height - underweight, weight for age - wasting) is below -2 standard deviations from the median of the reference population (WHO 2006). The z-score is defined as $z = \frac{AI_i - MAI}{\sigma}$, where AI_i refers to the individual anthropometric indicator (height for age - stunting, weight for height - underweight, weight for age - wasting), MAI refers to the median of the reference population, and σ refers to the standard deviation of the reference population. For example, the stunting z-scores are the outcomes of the ratio of height over age minus the median of the reference population and the standard deviation of the reference population

³ For a detailed discussion on the limitation of the DHS data, see Bhalotra and Rawlings (2010) and Thomas and Strauss (1998).

(see e.g. Klasen, 2003, 2008; Smith and Haddad, 2000). We also consider the case of severe undernutrition where the respective z-score is below -3 standard deviations of the reference. In addition, we also consider the stunting z-scores as the dependent variable to study the determinants of undernutrition.

Two issues might be worth highlighting when considering the z-Score as the key anthropometric indicator which are discussed in detail in deHaen, Klasen, and Qaim (2011). First, due to the worldwide switch to food that is higher in starch, sugar, and fat content (often called the nutrition transition), underweight rates might improve even though the nutritional status of the child has not improved. Using stunting as the key indicator seems to be less susceptible to this bias. Second, there are debates about the use of a single reference standard to compare undernutrition rates for children across countries (due to differences in the genetic height and weight potential). This is particularly a problem if one compares undernutrition rates across regions and thus might be somewhat less relevant here. Besides GDP per capita at the country and survey year level, we include a set of control variables at the individual and household level. At the household level, we control for the number of children in the household, the geographical area of the household, the age and education of the household head. For the individual child characteristics, we include the age and sex of the child. The nutritional status is supposed to worsen non-linearly with increasing age of the child, and with the sex variable we control for sex differentials in mortality and undernutrition in our countries as is often to be found in the empirical literature on child mortality and undernutrition (for example, see Marcoux, 2002; Klasen, 1996). In addition, we control for the fact whether the child has a twin brother and/or sister which might result in difficulties of allocating scarce household resources between the children; whether the child has a dead sibling, whether the child has had fever recently capturing her/his health status, and whether the child has received a vaccination against measles capturing the access to the health system.

We also control for the nutritional status of the mother to capture possible genetic transmission channels and/or socioeconomic factors that are not captured by the other control variables. In particular, we use the mother's BMI, which might affect childhood undernutrition via a genetic linkage or via a socioeconomic indication to what extent a mother with a low BMI is able to effectively care for her children.⁴ We also control for characteristics of the mother that could affect the nutritional status of the child in other ways. In particular, we include the number of births in the last five years, whether the mother is currently pregnant and/or breastfeeding to further capture possible constraints on the ability of the mother to care for her children. In addition, we control for the fact whether the mother has no educational attainment to take into account the direct ability of the mother to acquire skills to take care of the children with respect to their health as well as the indirect effect of her income earning opportunities.

As we do not have information on income or expenditure in the DHS, we consider an asset-based approach in defining long-term well-being of the household (Filmer and Pritchett, 2001; Sahn and Stifel, 2001). The so called 'asset index' is often used in the empirical

⁴ The recommended method to measure the nutritional status of adults is the body mass index (BMI), which is calculated by $BMI = \text{weight}(\text{kg}) / \text{height}^2(\text{m}^2)$. A mother is considered as malnourished if her BMI is less than 18.5.

literature on poverty and inequality analysis as a proxy variable for household income.⁵ For construction of the index, we use a principal component analysis on several household assets to derive an index that indicates the material status of a household. We use the following variables to construct an asset index: radio, TV, refrigerator, bike, motorized transport, capturing household durables and type of floor material, type of wall material, type of toilet, and type drinking water capturing the housing quality and we calculate the asset indices separately for each country and period. As we simultaneously control for GDP per capita and construct the asset index separately for each country, the asset index used here is largely an indicator of relative socioeconomic status (rather than another absolute income measure).

2.3 Estimation approach

In two sets of regressions we look at the association of (log) GDP per capita and child undernutrition at the macro level and at the individual level. First, we collapse the individual level survey data to obtain rates of underweight, stunting and wasting for each country and year. In simple linear regressions we study the association of (log) GDP per capita and the rates of underweight, stunting and wasting (moderate and severe). Next, we include country fixed effects to each regression. The regressions with country fixed effects measure the association of within country variation of (log) GDP per capita over time (thus implicitly economic growth) and the three indicators of child undernutrition. The country fixed effects also control for country specific omitted variables (that are constant over time), which potentially bias the result of the simple linear regression without control variables. Such omitted variables could include geographic characteristics, the disease environment but also institutions and infrastructure that did not change much in the observation period (and which are not available in the data sets). All standard errors are clustered at the country level.

Secondly, we study the individual probability of a child of being underweight, stunted or wasted (moderate and severe). To this end we run logistic regressions with an indicator variable that is one if the child is underweight and zero otherwise as dependent variable (same for stunting and wasting). The actual regression coefficients of logistic regressions do not have a meaningful interpretation. Therefore it is common to report marginal effects or odds ratios instead. We start with a very simple model that only includes (log) GDP per capita as explanatory variable. Next, we add individual level control variables to the regressions that include characteristics of the household, the mother and the child. The household level control variables include an asset index as a measure of household wealth, an indicator for urban or rural location, the number of children ever born, the sex of the household head as well as the level of education of the household head and of the mother. We further include indicator variables whether the mother is currently pregnant, currently

⁵ There is a large body of literature that uses an asset index to explain inequalities in educational outcomes (e.g. Ainsworth and Filmer, 2006; Bicego et al., 2003), health outcomes (e.g. Bollen et al., 2002), child malnutrition (e.g. Sahn and Stifel, 2003; Tarozzi and Mahajan, 2005), or child mortality (e.g. Sastry, 2004) when data on income or expenditure is not available. In addition, asset indices are used to analyze changes and determinants of poverty (Harttgen and Misselhorn, 2007; Sahn and Stifel, 2000; Stifel and Christiaensen, 2007; World Bank, 2006). Although the asset index has some shortcomings (see, Harttgen and Vollmer 2011) it has become a popular tool to overcome the problem of missing data on income or expenditure.

breastfeeding or has a low body mass index. At the child level we control for the sex of the child, the age of the child, whether the child is a twin. Next, we add country fixed effects to the regressions. As in the macro level regressions, the country fixed effects are supposed to account for country specific differences that are constant over time. Finally, we include survey year fixed effects to the regressions. The survey year fixed effects capture general developments that affect all countries. An example could be technological improvements that increase the level of agricultural productivity in all countries. However, the survey year fixed effects also take out the effect of increases in (log) GDP per capita that are common to all countries (e.g. the base effect of economic growth). The same is true for negative shocks to (log) GDP per capita that affect the entire region, such as the recent global financial crisis. We therefore caution to over-interpret the specification with survey year fixed effects.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Descriptive statistics

Table 2 shows the mean rates of moderate stunting, wasting, and underweight of children under five years of age as well as GDP per capita in USD PPP (constant 2005 prices) by country and survey year. On average, 24% of children under the age of five are underweight, 41% are stunted, and 10% are wasted in our sample. Average GDP per capita is slightly above 1000 USD. Starting with the levels of undernutrition across indicator, Table 2 shows that in almost all countries stunting rates are considerable higher than wasting rates, followed by rates of underweight.

Table 2 also reveals large differences across countries. Lowest average levels of child undernutrition are found in Senegal, Ghana, and Namibia, the richer countries in our sample. However, even in these countries, levels of child undernutrition are worryingly high. Although wasting and underweight are relatively low, in 2008, still between 20 and 30 percent of the children were stunted – indicating a persistent problem of chronic undernutrition. The highest levels of child undernutrition are found in Madagascar and Niger, where about half of the children are stunted. Levels of GDP per capita also differ between countries. Some countries such as Ethiopia, Malawi, Mozambique, and Niger have a GDP per capita level of about 500 USD. At the same time, other countries showed considerably higher levels of GDP such as Cameroon, Namibia, and Kenya. However, on average levels in GDP per capita are very low and the countries in our sample are among the poorest countries in the world.

The levels of severe undernutrition are shown in Table 3, which by definition are lower across countries. The ranking of the countries in terms of their rates of undernutrition does not differ very much between the various indicators. However, Tables 2 and 3 also reveal first interesting insights into changes in child undernutrition rates over time. First, there is a clear trend observable that Africa increases its level of GDP per capita over time for most countries; there are some exceptions though (see below). Second, it is less clear whether Africa increases or decreases its levels of child undernutrition. This observation is verified by Table 4, which presents the mean growth rates of the undernutrition indicators and GDP per capita of the countries for which more than one survey is available. Table 4 reveals three main findings. First, GDP per capita growth is positive in almost all countries, except,

Malawi, Togo, Zambia, Cameroon, Madagascar, and Zimbabwe. Second, on average, undernutrition went down. Third, reductions in undernutrition rates are unevenly distributed across countries and across indicators. Largest progress has been made in reducing stunting rates, with an average reduction of 2.1 percent per year, followed by underweight with an average reduction of 1.0 percent per year. Interesting (and equally worrisome) is, that on average wasting even increased in almost all countries between 1991 and 2009.

To illustrate the unequal distribution of progress, Figure 1 shows the underweight rates and GDP per capita levels for each country and survey year. The respective results for stunting and wasting are presented in Figure A1 and A2 in the Appendix. On average, countries with a decrease in underweight rates have also experienced a decrease in stunting and wasting rates. Exceptions are Benin, Mali and Zimbabwe. We can broadly categorize three groups of countries with respect to their development of GDP per capita over time. First, a group of countries with a positive trend in GDP per capita levels between 1990 and 2009. This group includes Burkina Faso, Chad, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, South Africa, Senegal, Sao Tome and Principe, Tanzania, and Uganda. The second group consists of countries that have experienced a decline in GDP per capita. This group includes Togo, Congo, Dem. Rep., Cote D'Ivoire, and Zimbabwe. The third group includes those countries where no clear trend is observable. These countries are Benin, Cameroon, Guinea, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Niger, Sierra Leone, and Zambia. It is more difficult to identify clear trends for undernutrition, because we only have a few observations per country over time. There are countries such as Ghana or Senegal, where increases in GDP per capita are associated with reductions in underweight rates. On the other hand, underweight rates worsened in Burkina Faso despite remarkable increases in GDP per capita. Interestingly in Kenya or Namibia, underweight rates improved in period when GDP per capita was fairly constant and underweight rates were fairly constant when GDP per capita strongly increased. The main pattern is that there is no clear pattern across countries; but one can note that in general, progress in reducing undernutrition has overall been disappointing, particularly given the generally more positive development in income growth rates.

In Figures 2 and 3 we illustrate the association between GDP per capita and child undernutrition. Figure 2 displays the average rates of undernutrition for the latest available survey. The countries are sorted by their level of GDP per capita from rich (left) to poor (right). None of the indicators for child undernutrition shows a clear gradient in GDP per capita. In Figure 3 we show the direct associations between GDP per capita and levels of undernutrition. The association between GDP per capita and underweight and stunting respectively is somewhat negative but weak; one should note, however, that the sometimes visible positive relation between income and undernutrition visible among very poor countries is heavily influenced by Zimbabwe, whose per capita income levels collapsed in recent years (making it the poorest country in the sample) while undernutrition rates have not increased nearly as fast; without this observation, the negative gradient would be somewhat clearer, but remains weak. There is no association between GDP per capita and wasting.

3.2 Estimation results

We will focus on the regression results with the underweight rate respectively the individual probability of being underweight as dependent variable. We focus on underweight, because it is an indicator for the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and therefore has particular political importance. In addition, underweight captures both immediate and chronic effects of undernutrition on child development while wasting and stunting only measure on or the other. However, we report the regression results with stunting and wasting as dependent variables in the appendix (c.f. Tables A1-A4) and briefly discuss the main differences to underweight in the last paragraph of this section.

In Table 5 we report the regression results at the macro level for all indicators of child undernutrition. The regressions confirm the observations from the descriptive analysis, i.e. that there is no statistically significant association between GDP per capita and the various measures of child undernutrition, esp. once we control for country-specific effects.

In Tables 6 and 7 we report the results of the logistic regressions for the individual probability of being underweight (moderate: Table 6 / severe: Table 7). The reported coefficients are odds ratios (OR) with 95 percent confidence intervals in parentheses. If the odds ratio is greater than one, it can be interpreted as an increased probability of $(OR-1)*100$ percent of being underweight. If the odds ratio is smaller than one, it can be interpreted as a decreased probability of $(1/OR-1)*100$ percent of being underweight. In the simple specification without control variables, a hundred dollar increase of GDP per capita is associated with a 1.2 percent smaller probability of being underweight (1.1 percent of being severely underweight). In the specification with control variables the magnitude is slightly smaller (0.5 percent for moderate underweight and 0.3 percent for severe underweight). In the specification with control variables and country fixed effects, a one hundred dollar increase of GDP per capita is associated with a 2.5 percent lower individual probability of being underweight (2.9 percent for severe underweight). It is important to control for heterogeneity across countries, therefore the last specification is the most credible. If we add time fixed effects, the coefficient of GDP per capita turns insignificant both for moderate and severe underweight. This is not surprising, because GDP per capita has a strong positive time trend. The time fixed effects absorb this increase in GDP per capita and the identification is based on variations around the time trend; thus we would prefer the specification without the time trend as our best estimate. In any case, the effect of GDP per capita on undernutrition is rather small.

For the discussion of the control variables we focus on the specification with the individual probability of being underweight as dependent variable with country fixed effects (third column of Table 6).⁶ A one-unit increase in the asset index is associated with a 26 percent lower probability of being underweight.⁷ Thus it appears that relative socioeconomic status

⁶ The results in the other specifications are qualitatively similar even though the magnitudes differ to some extent.

⁷ We also tried a model specification without GDP per capita to test whether this influences the effect of the asset index. However, leaving out GDP per capita has virtually no impact on the asset index coefficient. In addition, we also test for possible nonlinearities in the effect of the asset index. For this we include the squared asset index, but no nonlinearities could be identified.

within a society is much more important than average prosperity of the society. Children in urban households are 17 percent less likely to be underweight than children in rural households. Each additional child ever born in a household increases the probability of being underweight by 0.4 percent. Children in a male-headed household are 2.7 percent more likely to be underweight than children in a female-headed household. The age of the household head is associated with a 0.2 percent lower probability of being underweight per year. Children whose household head has primary or higher education are 10 to 18 percent less likely than children whose household head does not have any education. Interestingly, the education of the mother is associated with even lower probabilities of being underweight than the education of the household head (33 to 39 percent).⁸ The magnitude of the education variables suggests – similar to the asset variable – that relative socioeconomic status within a society is much more important than the average prosperity of a society. If the mother is currently pregnant, then the child is 24 percent more likely to be underweight. If the mother is currently breastfeeding, then the child is about 21 percent more likely to be underweight. Both of these indicators suggest that mothers who are burdened to care for many children are less able to care for each one. If the mother has BMI below 18.5, then the child is almost twice as likely to be underweight, suggesting a strong genetic and/or socioeconomic transmission from mother to child. Boys are about 21 percent more likely to be underweight than girls, and twins are more than twice as likely to be underweight than non-twins.

The outcomes with the individual probability of being stunted as dependent variable are qualitatively similar to the previous results. In the preferred specification with control variables and country fixed effects, a one hundred dollar increase in GDP per capita is associated with a 4.1 percent lower individual probability of being stunted (4.5 percent for severe stunting). For wasting we cannot find a statistically significant association between GDP per capita and the individual probability of being wasted in our preferred specification. Without country fixed effects, increases in GDP per capita are even associated with an increase in the probability of being wasted. Once time effects are included, increases in GDP per capita are associated with lower probabilities of being wasted. The findings for wasting don't make much sense and are probably due to the fact that the indicator for wasting picks up very recent nutritional problems rather than the nutrition over a period of a few years. To summarize, our individual-level findings suggest that individual and household covariates are much more important than aggregate economic conditions in explaining undernutrition rates in Africa. Socioeconomic status within a country (as proxied by the asset index) appears to be much more important than average prosperity of a society. This suggests either that being better off within a country is much more important than living in a richer society; this would suggest that lowering inequality in a society could be an important avenue to reduce undernutrition, possibly more important than achieving higher income growth. It might also, however, reflect selection effects in the sense that better off people within a society may have some unmeasured characteristics (e.g. such as health knowledge and behavior) that lead to lower undernutrition.

⁸ In some cases household head and mother are identical.

4. Conclusions

Nutritional status of children is an important indicator for child health and overall well-being. It is by now well known that nutritional status early in life has severe consequences for adult health, cognitive development and adult socio-economic status. Investments in child health and in particular child nutrition have a potentially high pay-off for the long-run development of the individual and of the society. It is important to understand if and to what extent macroeconomic development can contribute to improvements of children's nutritional status. In particular it is unclear whether overall economic growth reaches those who are in need.

Sub-Saharan Africa is particularly interesting case to study, because levels of GDP per capita increased quite strongly in recent years while levels of undernutrition showed very little improvement. And indeed, we cannot establish a link between increases in GDP per capita and rates of undernutrition at the macro level. However, we find that an increase of GDP per capita is associated with a 2.5 percent lower probability of being underweight and a 4.1 percent lower probability of being stunted per one hundred dollars. These associations are economically meaningful (but relatively small) and show the potential effect of economic growth on child undernutrition. However, other explanatory variables, such as mother's education, relative socio-economic status, and the mother's nutritional status are quantitatively even more important – in particular in the short run.

In the long-run, the results suggest that we can only be mildly optimistic that economic growth will help to eliminate undernutrition in sub-Saharan Africa and other developing regions. However, our results also suggest that there are various other factors that contribute to a slowing of progress in reducing child undernutrition; tackling those individual determinants might be more important than just growth alone. Policy can thus help to make sure that economic growth reaches those in need and that children in low-income countries can benefit from economic growth rather sooner than later.

Tables and Figures:

Table 1: DHS Data Sample

| Country | Year | N (children) | Country | Year | N (children) |
|---------------|------|-----------------|-----------------------|------|-----------------|
| Benin | 1996 | 2,589 | Mali | 1995 | 5,248 |
| Benin | 2001 | 4,436 | Mali | 2001 | 12,727 |
| Benin | 2006 | 53,356 | Mozambique | 1997 | 3,498 |
| Burkina Faso | 1992 | 4,524 | Mozambique | 2003 | 8,082 |
| Burkina Faso | 1998 | 4,693 | Namibia | 1992 | 2,655 |
| Burkina Faso | 2003 | 8,719 | Namibia | 2000 | 2,877 |
| Cameroon | 1991 | 3,524 | Namibia | 2007 | 3,686 |
| Cameroon | 1998 | 4,164 | Niger | 1992 | 5,777 |
| Cameroon | 2004 | 3,309 | Niger | 1998 | 3,938 |
| Chad | 1996 | 7,079 | Niger | 2006 | 3,842 |
| Chad | 2004 | 4,833 | Nigeria | 1999 | 2,795 |
| CongoDR | 2007 | 3,907 | Nigeria | 2003 | 4,732 |
| Cote D'Ivoire | 1994 | 3,479 | Nigeria | 2008 | 23,864 |
| Cote D'Ivoire | 1998 | 1,585 | Rwanda | 1992 | 4,375 |
| Ethiopia | 2000 | 9,032 | Rwanda | 2000 | 6,201 |
| Ethiopia | 2005 | 4,422 | Rwanda | 2005 | 3,737 |
| Ghana | 1993 | 1,965 | Sao Tome and Principe | 2009 | 1,807 |
| Ghana | 1998 | 2,838 | Senegal | 1992 | 4,634 |
| Ghana | 2003 | 3,381 | Senegal | 2005 | 2,814 |
| Ghana | 2008 | 2,684 | Sierra Leone | 2008 | 2,409 |
| Guinea | 1999 | 4,503 | Tanzania | 1992 | 6,533 |
| Guinea | 2005 | 2,710 | Tanzania | 1996 | 5,479 |
| Kenya | 1993 | 5,043 | Tanzania | 2004 | 7,382 |
| Kenya | 1998 | 3,022 | Togo | 1998 | 3,673 |
| Kenya | 2003 | 4,864 | Uganda | 1995 | 4,671 |
| Kenya | 2009 | 5,478 | Uganda | 2000 | 5,155 |
| Lesotho | 2004 | 1,461 | Uganda | 2006 | 2,408 |
| Lesotho | 2009 | 1,731 | Zambia | 1992 | 5,029 |
| Liberia | 2007 | 4,626 | Zambia | 1996 | 5,575 |
| Madagascar | 1992 | 4,220 | Zambia | 2001 | 5,537 |
| Madagascar | 1997 | 3,085 | Zimbabwe | 1994 | 2,134 |
| Madagascar | 2004 | 4,722 | Zimbabwe | 1999 | 3,040 |
| Madagascar | 2009 | 5,866 | Zimbabwe | 2006 | 4,517 |
| Malawi | 1992 | 3,348 | | | |
| Malawi | 2000 | 9,683 | | | |
| Malawi | 2004 | 8,658 | <i>Total</i> | | <i>378,370</i> |

Note: The number of observations refers to the number of children under age of 5.

Source: DHS data; author's calculations.

Table 2: Mean Rates of Moderate Undernutrition by Country and Survey Year

| Country | Year | Moderate | | | GDP per capita | Country | Year | Moderate | | | GDP per capita |
|---------------|------|-------------|----------|---------|----------------|----------------|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| | | Underweight | Stunting | Wasting | | | | Underweight | Stunting | Wasting | |
| Benin | 1996 | 0.27 | 0.35 | 0.18 | 1087 | Mali | 1995 | 0.38 | 0.36 | 0.28 | 706 |
| Benin | 2001 | 0.22 | 0.39 | 0.10 | 1194 | Mali | 2001 | 0.31 | 0.42 | 0.14 | 808 |
| Benin | 2006 | 0.20 | 0.44 | 0.08 | 1229 | Mozambique | 1997 | 0.29 | 0.45 | 0.13 | 403 |
| Burkina Faso | 1992 | 0.29 | 0.40 | 0.16 | 671 | Mozambique | 2003 | 0.22 | 0.47 | 0.06 | 561 |
| Burkina Faso | 1998 | 0.34 | 0.46 | 0.16 | 775 | Namibia | 1992 | 0.22 | 0.35 | 0.10 | 3348 |
| Burkina Faso | 2003 | 0.36 | 0.43 | 0.22 | 860 | Namibia | 2000 | 0.19 | 0.28 | 0.10 | 3367 |
| Cameroon | 1991 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 0.03 | 1762 | Namibia | 2007 | 0.18 | 0.30 | 0.08 | 4780 |
| Cameroon | 1998 | 0.16 | 0.35 | 0.05 | 1633 | Niger | 1992 | 0.40 | 0.48 | 0.19 | 492 |
| Cameroon | 2004 | 0.15 | 0.37 | 0.06 | 1799 | Niger | 1998 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.26 | 519 |
| Chad | 1996 | 0.34 | 0.45 | 0.18 | 720 | Niger | 2006 | 0.40 | 0.55 | 0.13 | 535 |
| Chad | 2004 | 0.34 | 0.44 | 0.16 | 1238 | Nigeria | 1999 | 0.26 | 0.53 | 0.14 | 1105 |
| CongoDR | 2007 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.11 | 227 | Nigeria | 2003 | 0.27 | 0.44 | 0.11 | 1776 |
| Cote d'Ivoire | 1994 | 0.21 | 0.32 | 0.11 | 1397 | Nigeria | 2008 | 0.27 | 0.41 | 0.15 | 1963 |
| Cote d'Ivoire | 1998 | 0.18 | 0.31 | 0.07 | 1550 | Rwanda | 1992 | 0.24 | 0.56 | 0.05 | 848 |
| Ethiopia | 2000 | 0.42 | 0.57 | 0.13 | 460 | Rwanda | 2000 | 0.20 | 0.48 | 0.09 | 662 |
| Ethiopia | 2005 | 0.34 | 0.50 | 0.12 | 510 | Rwanda | 2005 | 0.18 | 0.52 | 0.05 | 839 |
| Ghana | 1993 | 0.26 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 817 | Sao T. and P. | 2009 | 0.15 | 0.32 | 0.11 | 1681 |
| Ghana | 1998 | 0.21 | 0.32 | 0.10 | 821 | Senegal | 1992 | 0.22 | 0.33 | 0.09 | 1077 |
| Ghana | 2003 | 0.19 | 0.36 | 0.09 | 952 | Senegal | 2005 | 0.14 | 0.20 | 0.08 | 1465 |
| Ghana | 2008 | 0.14 | 0.28 | 0.09 | 1212 | Sierra Leone | 2008 | 0.21 | 0.38 | 0.11 | 855 |
| Guinea | 1999 | 0.21 | 0.34 | 0.10 | 755 | Tanzania | 1992 | 0.26 | 0.50 | 0.08 | 683 |
| Guinea | 2005 | 0.23 | 0.40 | 0.11 | 870 | Tanzania | 1996 | 0.27 | 0.49 | 0.09 | 675 |
| Kenya | 1993 | 0.20 | 0.40 | 0.07 | 1092 | Tanzania | 2004 | 0.17 | 0.44 | 0.04 | 825 |
| Kenya | 1998 | 0.18 | 0.38 | 0.09 | 1125 | Togo | 1998 | 0.24 | 0.31 | 0.14 | 865 |
| Kenya | 2003 | 0.16 | 0.36 | 0.06 | 1156 | Uganda | 1995 | 0.22 | 0.45 | 0.07 | 691 |
| Kenya | 2009 | 0.16 | 0.36 | 0.07 | 1206 | Uganda | 2000 | 0.19 | 0.45 | 0.05 | 821 |
| Lesotho | 2004 | 0.18 | 0.44 | 0.06 | 1251 | Uganda | 2006 | 0.17 | 0.38 | 0.07 | 1028 |
| Lesotho | 2009 | 0.14 | 0.38 | 0.04 | 1311 | Zambia | 1992 | 0.22 | 0.46 | 0.06 | 1110 |
| Liberia | 2007 | 0.19 | 0.38 | 0.08 | 403 | Zambia | 1996 | 0.20 | 0.49 | 0.05 | 892 |
| Madagascar | 1992 | 0.36 | 0.61 | 0.06 | 843 | Zambia | 2001 | 0.24 | 0.53 | 0.06 | 810 |
| Madagascar | 1997 | 0.36 | 0.57 | 0.10 | 787 | Zimbabwe | 1994 | 0.12 | 0.29 | 0.06 | 348 |
| Madagascar | 2004 | 0.36 | 0.53 | 0.16 | 712 | Zimbabwe | 1999 | 0.11 | 0.32 | 0.09 | 390 |
| Madagascar | 2009 | na | 0.49 | na | 753 | Zimbabwe | 2006 | 0.13 | 0.35 | 0.07 | 171 |
| Malawi | 1992 | 0.24 | 0.55 | 0.07 | 540 | | | | | | |
| Malawi | 2000 | 0.22 | 0.54 | 0.07 | 544 | | | | | | |
| Malawi | 2004 | 0.18 | 0.53 | 0.07 | 518 | Average | | 0.24 | 0.41 | 0.10 | 1070 |

Source: DHS data; author's calculations

Table 3: Mean Rates of Severe Undernutrition by Country and Survey Year

| Country | Year | Severe | | | Country | Year | Severe | | |
|---------------|------|-------------|----------|---------|----------------|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Underweight | Stunting | Wasting | | | Underweight | Stunting | Wasting |
| Benin | 1996 | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.07 | Mali | 1995 | 0.20 | 0.19 | 0.13 |
| Benin | 2001 | 0.07 | 0.17 | 0.03 | Mali | 2001 | 0.13 | 0.23 | 0.05 |
| Benin | 2006 | 0.06 | 0.24 | 0.03 | Mozambique | 1997 | 0.14 | 0.25 | 0.05 |
| Burkina Faso | 1992 | 0.11 | 0.18 | 0.06 | Mozambique | 2003 | 0.08 | 0.23 | 0.02 |
| Burkina Faso | 1998 | 0.15 | 0.24 | 0.06 | Namibia | 1992 | 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.03 |
| Burkina Faso | 2003 | 0.17 | 0.24 | 0.10 | Namibia | 2000 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.03 |
| Cameroon | 1991 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.01 | Namibia | 2007 | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0.02 |
| Cameroon | 1998 | 0.05 | 0.16 | 0.01 | Niger | 1992 | 0.19 | 0.27 | 0.07 |
| Cameroon | 2004 | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.02 | Niger | 1998 | 0.21 | 0.25 | 0.09 |
| Chad | 1996 | 0.15 | 0.24 | 0.06 | Niger | 2006 | 0.16 | 0.34 | 0.05 |
| Chad | 2004 | 0.15 | 0.27 | 0.07 | Nigeria | 1999 | 0.13 | 0.36 | 0.08 |
| CongoDR | 2007 | 0.09 | 0.24 | 0.05 | Nigeria | 2003 | 0.12 | 0.24 | 0.05 |
| Cote D Ivoire | 1994 | 0.08 | 0.14 | 0.03 | Nigeria | 2008 | 0.13 | 0.24 | 0.08 |
| Cote D Ivoire | 1998 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.02 | Rwanda | 1992 | 0.07 | 0.27 | 0.02 |
| Ethiopia | 2000 | 0.17 | 0.32 | 0.04 | Rwanda | 2000 | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.04 |
| Ethiopia | 2005 | 0.13 | 0.28 | 0.05 | Rwanda | 2005 | 0.05 | 0.25 | 0.02 |
| Ghana | 1993 | 0.10 | 0.14 | 0.05 | Sao T. and P. | 2009 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0.05 |
| Ghana | 1998 | 0.06 | 0.13 | 0.03 | Senegal | 1992 | 0.08 | 0.16 | 0.03 |
| Ghana | 2003 | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.03 | Senegal | 2005 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.02 |
| Ghana | 2008 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.03 | Sierra Leone | 2008 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.05 |
| Guinea | 1999 | 0.07 | 0.16 | 0.04 | Tanzania | 1992 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0.03 |
| Guinea | 2005 | 0.08 | 0.19 | 0.05 | Tanzania | 1996 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0.03 |
| Kenya | 1993 | 0.07 | 0.18 | 0.03 | Tanzania | 2004 | 0.04 | 0.17 | 0.01 |
| Kenya | 1998 | 0.06 | 0.18 | 0.04 | Togo | 1998 | 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.04 |
| Kenya | 2003 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.02 | Uganda | 1995 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 0.02 |
| Kenya | 2009 | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.02 | Uganda | 2000 | 0.06 | 0.19 | 0.02 |
| Lesotho | 2004 | 0.05 | 0.20 | 0.03 | Uganda | 2006 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.02 |
| Lesotho | 2009 | 0.03 | 0.14 | 0.02 | Zambia | 1992 | 0.06 | 0.20 | 0.02 |
| Liberia | 2007 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.03 | Zambia | 1996 | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.02 |
| Madagascar | 1992 | 0.11 | 0.32 | 0.01 | Zambia | 2001 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.02 |
| Madagascar | 1997 | 0.14 | 0.29 | 0.03 | Zimbabwe | 1994 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.02 |
| Madagascar | 2004 | 0.13 | 0.29 | 0.06 | Zimbabwe | 1999 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.04 |
| Madagascar | 2009 | na | 0.26 | na | Zimbabwe | 2006 | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.03 |
| Malawi | 1992 | 0.09 | 0.29 | 0.02 | | | | | |
| Malawi | 2000 | 0.07 | 0.30 | 0.03 | | | | | |
| Malawi | 2004 | 0.05 | 0.27 | 0.03 | Average | | 0.09 | 0.20 | 0.04 |

Source: DHS data; author's calculations

Table 4: Rates of Change in Undernutrition and GDP Per Capita

| Country | Stunting change | Wasting change | Underweight change | GDP per capita growth |
|----------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Benin | 0.029 | -0.030 | -0.025 | 2.111 |
| Burkina Faso | 0.021 | 0.028 | 0.033 | 1.590 |
| Cameroon | 0.039 | 0.009 | 0.006 | -1.225 |
| Chad | -0.003 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 13.346 |
| Cote D Ivoire | -0.012 | -0.021 | -0.029 | -0.223 |
| Egypt | 0.005 | 0.009 | -0.003 | 4.593 |
| Ethiopia | -0.032 | -0.004 | -0.033 | 5.658 |
| Ghana | -0.012 | -0.012 | -0.028 | 3.559 |
| Guinea | 0.028 | 0.005 | 0.009 | 2.196 |
| Kenya | -0.011 | 0.003 | -0.009 | 0.866 |
| Lesotho | -0.030 | -0.006 | -0.020 | 1.890 |
| Madagascar | -0.033 | 0.028 | -0.004 | -0.409 |
| Malawi | 0.001 | 0.002 | -0.011 | -5.794 |
| Mali | 0.029 | -0.073 | -0.036 | 3.444 |
| Mozambique | 0.001 | -0.029 | -0.037 | 6.456 |
| Namibia | -0.018 | -0.004 | -0.013 | 2.403 |
| Niger | 0.022 | -0.019 | -0.003 | 1.459 |
| Nigeria | -0.035 | 0.004 | 0.007 | 2.864 |
| Rwanda | -0.013 | -0.001 | -0.018 | 6.588 |
| Senegal | -0.059 | -0.001 | -0.034 | 1.109 |
| Tanzania | -0.027 | -0.013 | -0.030 | 1.460 |
| Uganda | -0.010 | 0.001 | -0.009 | 0.789 |
| Zambia | 0.021 | -0.001 | 0.005 | -3.276 |
| Zimbabwe | 0.016 | 0.001 | 0.003 | 0.425 |

Note: The growth rates refer to annual percentage rates for the countries where at least two DHS data sets are available.

Source: DHS data; author's calculations.

Table 5: Regression Results (macro level)

| | Moderate Stunting rate | Moderate Stunting rate | Severe Stunting rate | Severe Stunting rate | Moderate Wasting rate | Moderate Wasting rate | Severe Wasting rate | Severe Wasting rate | Moderate Underweight rate | Moderate Underweight rate | Severe Underweight rate | Severe Underweight rate |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Loggdp | -0.0576* (0.0290) | -0.0608 (0.0410) | -0.0381 (0.0227) | -0.0580 (0.0430) | -0.00866 (0.0118) | -0.0330 (0.0286) | -0.00476 (0.00487) | -0.0120 (0.0155) | -0.0316 (0.0288) | -0.0557 (0.0387) | -0.0161 (0.0144) | -0.0345 (0.0227) |
| Benin | | 0.825*** | | 0.593* | | 0.353* | | 0.129 | | 0.627** | | 0.325* |
| Burkina Faso | | 0.819*** | | 0.592** | | 0.395** | | 0.152 | | 0.690** | | 0.368** |
| Cameroon | | 0.767** | | 0.575* | | 0.292 | | 0.104 | | 0.550* | | 0.302* |
| Chad | | 0.844*** | | 0.637** | | 0.399* | | 0.149 | | 0.713** | | 0.381** |
| CongoDR | | 0.782*** | | 0.557** | | 0.285* | | 0.114 | | 0.550** | | 0.278** |
| Cote D Ivoire | | 0.743** | | 0.546* | | 0.330 | | 0.115 | | 0.588** | | 0.313* |
| Ethiopia | | 0.881*** | | 0.632** | | 0.340* | | 0.121 | | 0.713*** | | 0.362** |
| Ghana | | 0.745** | | 0.532* | | 0.335* | | 0.118 | | 0.588** | | 0.301* |
| Guinea | | 0.777*** | | 0.559* | | 0.325 | | 0.122 | | 0.592** | | 0.305* |
| Kenya | | 0.795** | | 0.565* | | 0.310 | | 0.114 | | 0.570** | | 0.301* |
| Lesotho | | 0.861*** | | 0.589* | | 0.288 | | 0.110 | | 0.564* | | 0.289* |
| Liberia | | 0.753*** | | 0.541** | | 0.276 | | 0.104 | | 0.530** | | 0.278* |
| Madagascar | | 0.932*** | | 0.661** | | 0.322 | | 0.112 | | 0.712** | | 0.345** |
| Malawi | | 0.909*** | | 0.634** | | 0.269 | | 0.100 | | 0.548** | | 0.282* |
| Mali | | 0.794*** | | 0.588** | | 0.428** | | 0.167 | | 0.719*** | | 0.393** |
| Mozambique | | 0.829*** | | 0.579** | | 0.284 | | 0.106 | | 0.577** | | 0.304** |
| Namibia | | 0.809** | | 0.592 | | 0.366 | | 0.127 | | 0.654** | | 0.342* |
| Niger | | 0.847*** | | 0.615** | | 0.392** | | 0.140 | | 0.735*** | | 0.381** |
| Nigeria | | 0.907*** | | 0.711** | | 0.376* | | 0.156 | | 0.683** | | 0.380** |
| Rwanda | | 0.911*** | | 0.630** | | 0.281 | | 0.104 | | 0.575** | | 0.287* |
| Sao Tome and Principe | | 0.755** | | 0.567* | | 0.378* | | 0.142 | | 0.566* | | 0.302* |
| Senegal | | 0.709** | | 0.529* | | 0.328 | | 0.112 | | 0.583** | | 0.304* |
| Sierra Leone | | 0.779*** | | 0.604** | | 0.339* | | 0.129 | | 0.580** | | 0.307* |
| Tanzania | | 0.879*** | | 0.598** | | 0.290 | | 0.103 | | 0.603** | | 0.304* |
| Togo | | 0.732** | | 0.528* | | 0.373* | | 0.127 | | 0.628** | | 0.323** |
| Uganda | | 0.825*** | | 0.564* | | 0.285 | | 0.102 | | 0.561** | | 0.291* |
| Zambia | | 0.921*** | | 0.640** | | 0.286 | | 0.103 | | 0.603** | | 0.305* |
| Zimbabwe | | 0.662*** | | 0.448* | | 0.260 | | 0.0991 | | 0.440* | | 0.228* |
| Constant | 0.801*** | | 0.456*** | | 0.161* | | 0.0706** | | 0.447** | | 0.193* | |
| Observations | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 |
| R-squared | 0.150 | 0.995 | 0.124 | 0.987 | 0.010 | 0.956 | 0.015 | 0.921 | 0.056 | 0.990 | 0.049 | 0.975 |

Source: DHS data; author's calculations.

Table 6: Regression Results: Individual Probability of Being Underweight

| | Individual probability of being underweight | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| GDP per capita/100 | 0.988*** (0.985 - 0.990) | 0.995*** (0.993 - 0.997) | 0.976*** (0.969 - 0.984) | 0.989 (0.969 - 1.009) |
| Asset index | | 0.838*** (0.824 - 0.852) | 0.795*** (0.781 - 0.809) | 0.790*** (0.776 - 0.805) |
| Urban | | 0.859*** (0.830 - 0.888) | 0.855*** (0.828 - 0.884) | 0.860*** (0.832 - 0.888) |
| Number of children ever born | | 1.012*** (1.007 - 1.016) | 1.004* (0.999 - 1.008) | 1.003 (0.999 - 1.008) |
| Household head is male | | 1.136*** (1.107 - 1.165) | 1.027** (1.001 - 1.054) | 1.024* (0.998 - 1.052) |
| Age of household head | | 0.997*** (0.997 - 0.998) | 0.998*** (0.998 - 0.999) | 0.998*** (0.998 - 0.999) |
| Household head has primary education | | 0.708*** (0.691 - 0.725) | 0.849*** (0.827 - 0.871) | 0.851*** (0.830 - 0.873) |
| Household head has secondary or higher education | | 0.927*** (0.900 - 0.956) | 0.909*** (0.882 - 0.938) | 0.915*** (0.887 - 0.944) |
| Mother is currently pregnant | | 1.286*** (1.237 - 1.337) | 1.235*** (1.187 - 1.284) | 1.231*** (1.184 - 1.280) |
| Mother is currently breastfeeding | | 1.227*** (1.195 - 1.260) | 1.206*** (1.173 - 1.239) | 1.208*** (1.176 - 1.241) |
| Mother has BMI below 18.5 | | 2.044*** (1.988 - 2.103) | 1.881*** (1.829 - 1.934) | 1.878*** (1.827 - 1.931) |
| Mother has primary education | | 0.707*** (0.686 - 0.728) | 0.722*** (0.700 - 0.744) | 0.721*** (0.699 - 0.743) |
| Mother has secondary or higher education | | 0.803*** (0.743 - 0.868) | 0.752*** (0.695 - 0.814) | 0.760*** (0.702 - 0.822) |
| Child is a boy | | 1.212*** (1.189 - 1.235) | 1.211*** (1.188 - 1.235) | 1.212*** (1.189 - 1.236) |
| Age of child | | 1.007*** (1.006 - 1.007) | 1.007*** (1.006 - 1.008) | 1.008*** (1.007 - 1.008) |
| Child is a twin | | 2.251*** (2.094 - 2.421) | 2.361*** (2.193 - 2.542) | 2.373*** (2.205 - 2.555) |
| Country Fixed Effects | | | Yes | Yes |
| Year Fixed Effects | | | | Yes |
| Observations | 326,331 | 309,187 | 309,187 | 309,187 |

Robust confidence intervals based on clustered standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: DHS data; author's calculations.

Table 7: Regression Results: Individual Probability of Being Severely Underweight


| | Individual probability of being severely underweight | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| GDP per capita/100 | 0.989*** (0.986 - 0.992) | 0.997* (0.994 - 1.000) | 0.972*** (0.961 - 0.983) | 0.989 (0.960 - 1.019) |
| Asset index | | 0.813*** (0.791 - 0.835) | 0.759*** (0.738 - 0.781) | 0.754*** (0.732 - 0.776) |
| Urban | | 0.841*** (0.795 - 0.889) | 0.843*** (0.798 - 0.891) | 0.850*** (0.804 - 0.898) |
| Number of children ever born | | 1.022*** (1.016 - 1.028) | 1.013*** (1.007 - 1.019) | 1.012*** (1.006 - 1.018) |
| Household head is male | | 1.196*** (1.148 - 1.246) | 1.039* (0.997 - 1.083) | 1.031 (0.989 - 1.075) |
| Age of household head | | 0.997*** (0.996 - 0.998) | 0.998*** (0.997 - 0.999) | 0.998*** (0.997 - 1.000) |
| Household head has primary education | | 0.631*** (0.609 - 0.654) | 0.810*** (0.778 - 0.843) | 0.813*** (0.781 - 0.846) |
| Household head has secondary or higher education | | 0.973 (0.927 - 1.021) | 0.926*** (0.882 - 0.972) | 0.934*** (0.889 - 0.980) |
| Mother is currently pregnant | | 1.331*** (1.258 - 1.408) | 1.276*** (1.206 - 1.350) | 1.271*** (1.202 - 1.345) |
| Mother is currently breastfeeding | | 1.263*** (1.214 - 1.313) | 1.248*** (1.200 - 1.298) | 1.251*** (1.203 - 1.301) |
| Mother has BMI below 18.5 | | 2.086*** (2.008 - 2.167) | 1.900*** (1.827 - 1.976) | 1.894*** (1.821 - 1.969) |
| Mother has primary education | | 0.622*** (0.592 - 0.652) | 0.653*** (0.620 - 0.688) | 0.653*** (0.620 - 0.688) |
| Mother has secondary or higher education | | 0.854** (0.757 - 0.963) | 0.729*** (0.646 - 0.824) | 0.735*** (0.650 - 0.830) |
| Child is a boy | | 1.243*** (1.207 - 1.280) | 1.241*** (1.204 - 1.278) | 1.242*** (1.206 - 1.279) |
| Age of child | | 1.000 (1.000 - 1.001) | 1.001* (1.000 - 1.002) | 1.002*** (1.001 - 1.002) |
| Child is a twin | | 2.362*** (2.161 - 2.583) | 2.493*** (2.273 - 2.735) | 2.513*** (2.292 - 2.755) |
| Country Fixed Effects | | | Yes | Yes |
| Year Fixed Effects | | | | Yes |
| Observations | 326,331 | 309,187 | 309,187 | 309,187 |









Robust confidence intervals based on clustered standard errors in parentheses









*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1


Source: DHS data; author's calculations

Figure 1: Underweight Rate and GDP Per Capita by Country and Year










Source: DHS data; author's calculations.


Figure 2: Undernutrition Rates by GDP Per Capita Levels



Note: The countries are sorted by GDP per capita PPP in descending order (i.e. richer countries are on the left). Results are shown for the latest available survey.

Source: DHS data; author's calculations

Figure 3: GDP per Capita versus Undernutrition (Total Sample - Africa)



Source: DHS data; author's calculations

Appendix:

Table A1: Regression Results: Individual Probability of Being Stunted

| | Individual probability of being stunted | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| GDP per capita/100 | 0.979*** (0.977 - 0.981) | 0.986*** (0.984 - 0.987) | 0.961*** (0.953 - 0.968) | 0.948*** (0.931 - 0.965) |
| Asset index | | 0.810*** (0.799 - 0.821) | 0.797*** (0.786 - 0.808) | 0.795*** (0.785 - 0.806) |
| Urban | | 0.820*** (0.797 - 0.844) | 0.844*** (0.821 - 0.868) | 0.847*** (0.824 - 0.870) |
| Number of children ever born | | 0.995*** (0.991 - 0.999) | 0.990*** (0.986 - 0.993) | 0.989*** (0.986 - 0.993) |
| Household head is male | | 1.050*** (1.026 - 1.075) | 1.027** (1.004 - 1.051) | 1.029** (1.006 - 1.053) |
| Age of household head | | 0.996*** (0.996 - 0.997) | 0.998*** (0.997 - 0.999) | 0.998*** (0.997 - 0.999) |
| Household head has primary education | | 1.051*** (1.029 - 1.074) | 0.940*** (0.920 - 0.961) | 0.940*** (0.920 - 0.960) |
| Household head has secondary or higher education | | 0.834*** (0.813 - 0.855) | 0.897*** (0.874 - 0.920) | 0.895*** (0.873 - 0.918) |
| Mother is currently pregnant | | 1.330*** (1.289 - 1.372) | 1.293*** (1.254 - 1.334) | 1.288*** (1.249 - 1.329) |
| Mother is currently breastfeeding | | 1.055*** (1.032 - 1.079) | 1.027** (1.005 - 1.051) | 1.027** (1.005 - 1.050) |
| Mother has BMI below 18.5 | | 1.258*** (1.225 - 1.291) | 1.224*** (1.192 - 1.257) | 1.227*** (1.196 - 1.260) |
| Mother has primary education | | 0.834*** (0.814 - 0.855) | 0.810*** (0.789 - 0.832) | 0.808*** (0.787 - 0.829) |
| Mother has secondary or higher education | | 0.709*** (0.670 - 0.750) | 0.685*** (0.648 - 0.726) | 0.692*** (0.654 - 0.733) |
| Child is a boy | | 1.227*** (1.207 - 1.247) | 1.232*** (1.212 - 1.252) | 1.232*** (1.212 - 1.253) |
| Age of child | | 1.022*** (1.021 - 1.022) | 1.022*** (1.021 - 1.022) | 1.022*** (1.022 - 1.023) |
| Child is a twin | | 1.970*** (1.830 - 2.120) | 2.023*** (1.876 - 2.180) | 2.030*** (1.884 - 2.188) |
| Country Fixed Effects | | | Yes | Yes |
| Year Fixed Effects | | | | Yes |
| Observations | 321,971 | 305,038 | 305,038 | 305,038 |

Robust confidence intervals based on clustered standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: DHS data; author's calculations.

Table A2: Regression Results: Individual Probability of Being Severely Stunted

| | Individual probability of being severely stunted | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| GDP per capita/100 | 0.982*** (0.979 - 0.984) | 0.989*** (0.987 - 0.991) | 0.957*** (0.947 - 0.966) | 0.933*** (0.913 - 0.954) |
| Asset index | | 0.789*** (0.775 - 0.804) | 0.773*** (0.759 - 0.788) | 0.772*** (0.758 - 0.787) |
| Urban | | 0.824*** (0.795 - 0.854) | 0.829*** (0.800 - 0.859) | 0.832*** (0.804 - 0.862) |
| Number of children ever born | | 1.005** (1.000 - 1.009) | 0.999 (0.994 - 1.003) | 0.999 (0.994 - 1.003) |
| Household head is male | | 1.084*** (1.056 - 1.114) | 1.033** (1.005 - 1.062) | 1.038*** (1.010 - 1.067) |
| Age of household head | | 0.995*** (0.995 - 0.996) | 0.997*** (0.997 - 0.998) | 0.997*** (0.997 - 0.998) |
| Household head has primary education | | 0.958*** (0.933 - 0.983) | 0.920*** (0.895 - 0.945) | 0.917*** (0.893 - 0.942) |
| Household head has secondary or higher education | | 0.847*** (0.821 - 0.874) | 0.877*** (0.849 - 0.905) | 0.873*** (0.846 - 0.902) |
| Mother is currently pregnant | | 1.356*** (1.309 - 1.404) | 1.316*** (1.270 - 1.363) | 1.314*** (1.268 - 1.361) |
| Mother is currently breastfeeding | | 1.112*** (1.083 - 1.141) | 1.089*** (1.060 - 1.118) | 1.089*** (1.061 - 1.119) |
| Mother has BMI below 18.5 | | 1.273*** (1.236 - 1.312) | 1.221*** (1.185 - 1.257) | 1.225*** (1.190 - 1.261) |
| Mother has primary education | | 0.773*** (0.750 - 0.797) | 0.780*** (0.756 - 0.804) | 0.777*** (0.754 - 0.802) |
| Mother has secondary or higher education | | 0.833*** (0.776 - 0.895) | 0.753*** (0.702 - 0.807) | 0.759*** (0.707 - 0.814) |
| Child is a boy | | 1.282*** (1.256 - 1.308) | 1.286*** (1.261 - 1.312) | 1.287*** (1.261 - 1.313) |
| Age of child | | 1.016*** (1.016 - 1.017) | 1.016*** (1.016 - 1.017) | 1.017*** (1.016 - 1.017) |
| Child is a twin | | 1.990*** (1.851 - 2.138) | 2.047*** (1.901 - 2.204) | 2.052*** (1.906 - 2.208) |
| Country Fixed Effects | | | Yes | Yes |
| Year Fixed Effects | | | | Yes |
| Observations | 321,971 | 305,038 | 305,038 | 305,038 |

Robust confidence intervals based on clustered standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: DHS data; author's calculations

Table A3: Regression Results: Individual Probability of Being Wasted

| | Individual probability of being wasted | | | |
|--|--|---------|------------------------------|---------|
| GDP per capita/100 | 0.997** (0.995 1.000) | - | 1.004*** (1.001 1.006) | - |
| Asset index | | - | 0.913*** (0.892 0.935) | - |
| Urban | | - | 0.991 (0.955 1.052) | - |
| Number of children ever born | | - | 1.018*** (1.013 1.024) | - |
| Household head is male | | - | 1.036* (0.997 1.077) | - |
| Age of household head | | - | 0.999* (0.997 0.999) | - |
| Household head has primary education | | - | 0.807*** (0.567 0.609) | - |
| Household head has secondary or higher education | | - | 1.005 (1.060 1.153) | - |
| Mother is currently pregnant | | - | 1.065** (1.004 1.130) | - |
| Mother is currently breastfeeding | | - | 1.128*** (1.086 1.171) | - |
| Mother has BMI below 18.5 | | - | 1.825*** (1.760 1.892) | - |
| Mother has primary education | | - | 0.802*** (0.768 0.837) | - |
| Mother has secondary or higher education | | - | 0.889** (0.806 0.980) | - |
| Child is a boy | | - | 1.174*** (1.142 1.206) | - |
| Age of child | | - | 0.975*** (0.974 0.976) | - |
| Child is a twin | | - | 1.560*** (1.409 1.728) | - |
| Country Fixed Effects | | | Yes | Yes |
| Year Fixed Effects | | | | Yes |
| Observations | 315,320 | 298,377 | 298,377 | 298,377 |

Robust confidence intervals based on clustered standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: DHS data; author's calculations.

Table A4: Regression Results: Individual Probability of Being Severely Wasted


| | Individual probability of being severely wasted | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | 1.002 | 1.009*** | 1.010 | 0.935*** |
| GDP per capita/100 | (0.998 - 1.005) | (1.006 - 1.013) | (0.995 - 1.025) | (0.898 - 0.973) |
| Asset index | | 0.930*** | 0.900*** | 0.904*** |
| | | (0.900 - 0.962) | (0.871 - 0.931) | (0.874 - 0.934) |
| Urban | | 0.999 | 1.000 | 0.989 |
| | | (0.929 - 1.075) | (0.929 - 1.076) | (0.918 - 1.066) |
| Number of children ever born | | 1.028*** | 1.022*** | 1.021*** |
| | | (1.020 - 1.036) | (1.014 - 1.029) | (1.014 - 1.029) |
| Household head is male | | 1.270*** | 1.097*** | 1.077*** |
| | | (1.201 - 1.344) | (1.037 - 1.161) | (1.018 - 1.140) |
| Age of household head | | 0.997*** | 0.999* | 0.999 |
| | | (0.996 - 0.999) | (0.997 - 1.000) | (0.997 - 1.000) |
| Household head has primary education | | 0.596*** | 0.794*** | 0.797*** |
| | | (0.569 - 0.625) | (0.753 - 0.837) | (0.756 - 0.840) |
| Household head has secondary or higher education | | 1.099*** | 0.987 | 0.990 |
| | | (1.033 - 1.170) | (0.926 - 1.051) | (0.929 - 1.054) |
| Mother is currently pregnant | | 1.053 | 1.039 | 1.041 |
| | | (0.968 - 1.146) | (0.955 - 1.131) | (0.957 - 1.133) |
| Mother is currently breastfeeding | | 1.058* | 1.057* | 1.063** |
| | | (0.997 - 1.121) | (0.997 - 1.120) | (1.003 - 1.126) |
| Mother has BMI below 18.5 | | 1.821*** | 1.705*** | 1.685*** |
| | | (1.724 - 1.924) | (1.614 - 1.802) | (1.594 - 1.780) |
| Mother has primary education | | 0.743*** | 0.782*** | 0.778*** |
| | | (0.700 - 0.789) | (0.734 - 0.834) | (0.729 - 0.829) |
| Mother has secondary or higher education | | 1.176** | 0.935 | 0.917 |
| | | (1.031 - 1.341) | (0.820 - 1.066) | (0.805 - 1.045) |
| Child is a boy | | 1.242*** | 1.242*** | 1.244*** |
| | | (1.193 - 1.293) | (1.193 - 1.293) | (1.195 - 1.295) |
| Age of child | | 0.973*** | 0.973*** | 0.973*** |
| | | (0.972 - 0.975) | (0.971 - 0.974) | (0.972 - 0.975) |
| Child is a twin | | 1.522*** | 1.546*** | 1.558*** |
| | | (1.330 - 1.741) | (1.347 - 1.773) | (1.361 - 1.784) |
| Country Fixed Effects | | | Yes | Yes |
| Year Fixed Effects | | | | Yes |
| Observations | 315,320 | 298,377 | 298,377 | 298,377 |








Robust confidence intervals based on clustered standard errors in parentheses









*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1


Source: DHS data; author's calculations

Figure A1: Stunting Rate and GDP Per Capita by Country and Year



























Source: DHS data; author's calculations.

Figure A2: Wasting Rate and GDP Per Capita by Country and Year











Source: DHS data; author's calculations

Figure A3: GDP Per Capita versus Severe Undernutrition (Total Sample - Africa)



Source: DHS data; author's calculations

Figure A4: Severe Undernutrition Rates by Year (Total Sample - Africa)



Source: DHS data; author's calculations

References

Ainsworth, M. and D. Filmer (2006), Children's Schooling: AIDS, Orphanhood, Poverty, and Gender, *World Development* 34(6):1099-1128.

Banerjee, A., E. Duflo, G. Postel-Vinay, and T. M. Watts (2007). Long Run Health Impacts of Income Shocks: Wine and Phylloxera in the 19th Century France. NBER Working Paper No. 12895, NBER.

Bhalotra, S. and S. Rawlings (2010). Intergenerational persistence in health in developing countries: Trends and country-differences. University of Bristol.

Bhalotra, S. and S. Rawlings (2009). Gradients of the Intergenerational Transmission of Health in Developing Countries. University of Bristol.

Bicego, G., S. Rutstein, and K. Johnson (2003), Dimensions of the Emerging Orphan Crisis in Sub-Saharan Africa, *Social Science and Medicine* 56(6):1235-1247.

Bollen, K. A., J. L. Glanville, and G. Stecklov (2002), Economic Status Proxies in Studies of Fertility In Developing Countries: Does the Measure matter?, *Population Studies* 56(1):81-96.

Burgess, S., C. Propper, J. Rigg, and the ALSPAC Study Team (2004). The Impact of Low-Income on Child Health: Evidence from a Birth Cohort Study, CMPO Working Paper Series No. 04/098, Leverulme Centre for Market and Public Organisation, University of Bristol.

Case, A., D. Lee, and C. Paxson (2008). The income gradient in children's: A comment on Currie Shields and Whealtley Price. *Journal of Health Economics*, 27: 801-807.

Case, A., A. Fertig, and C. Paxson (2004). The lasting impact of child health and circumstance. *Journal of Health Economics*, 24: 365-389.

Case, A., D. Lubotsky, and C. Paxson (2002). Economic Status and Health in Childhood: The Origins of the Gradient. *American Economic Review*, 92 (2): 1308-1334.

Currie, J. (2008). Healthy, Wealthy, and Wise: Socioeconomic Status, Poor Health in Childhood, and Human Capital Development, NBER Working Series No. 13987.

Deaton, A. (2007). Height, health, and development. *PNAS* 104 (33): 13232-13237.

Duflo, E. (2003). Grandmothers and Granddaughters: Old Age Pension and Intra-household Allocation in South Africa. *World Bank Economic Review*, 17 (1): 1-25.

Filmer, D. and L.H. Pritchett (2001), Estimating Wealth Effects without Expenditure Data -or Tears: An Application to Educational Enrollments in States of India, *Demography*, 38 (1): 115-132.

Friedman, J. and N. Schady (2009). How Many More Infants Are Likely to Die in Africa as a Result of the Global Financial Crisis? World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5023. Washington, World Bank.

Harttgen, K. and S. Vollmer (2011). Inequality Decomposition without Income or Expenditure Data: Using an Asset Index to Simulate Household Income. University of Göttingen.

Harttgen, K. and M. Misselhorn (2006), A Multilevel Approach to Explain Child Mortality and Undernutrition in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, Ibero-America Institute Discussion Paper No. 152.

Haddad, L., H. Alderman, S. Appleton, L. Song, and Y. Yohannes (2002). Reducing Child Undernutrition: How Far Does Income Growth Take Us? Food Consumption and Nutrition Division Discussion Paper No. 137, IFPRI, Washington.

Hoddinott, J. and B. Kinsey (2001). Child growth in the time of drought. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 63 (4): 905-949.

Klasen, S. (2008). Poverty, undernutrition and child mortality: Some inter-regional puzzles and their implications for research and policy. *Journal of Economic Inequality* 6(1):89-115.

Klasen, S. (1996), Nutrition, Health, and Mortality in Sub-Saharan Africa: Is there a Gender Bias?, *Journal of Development Studies*, 32: 913-933.

Klasen, S. (2003), Malnourished and Surviving in South Asia, better Nourished and Dying Young in Africa: What can Explain this Puzzle? in FAO (eds) Measurement and Assessment of Food Deprivation and Undernutrition, Rome: FAO.+

Marcoux, A. (2002), Sex Differentials in Undernutrition: A look at Survey Evidence, *Population and Development Review*, 28 (2): 275-284.

Martorell, R. (1999). The nature of child malnutrition and its long-term implications. *Food and Nutrition Bulletin*, 20: 288-292.

Morduch, J. (1995). Income smoothing and consumption smoothing. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9: 103-114.

Morduch, J. (1999). Between the market and the state: Can informal insurance patch the safety net? *World Bank Research Observer*, 14: 187-207.

Mosley, W.H. and L.C. Chen (1984). An Analytical Framework for the Study of Child Survival in Developing Countries, *Population and Development Review*, 10: 25-45.

Sahn, D.E. and D.C. Stifel (2003), Exploring Alternative Measures of Welfare in the Absence of Expenditure Data, *Review of Income and Wealth*, 49 (4): 463-489.

Sahn, D.E. and D. C. Stifel (2001), Poverty Comparisons Over Time and Across Countries in Africa,

World Development, 28 (12): 2123-2155.

Sastry, N. (2004), Trends in Socioeconomic Inequalities in Mortality in Developing Countries: The case of Child Survival in Sao Paulo, Brazil, *Demography* 41(3): 443-464.

Smith, L. C. and L. Haddad (2002). How Potent is Economic Growth in Reducing Undernutrition? What are the pathways of Impact? New Cross-Country Evidence. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 51 (1): 55-76.

Stifel, D. and L. Christiaensen (2007), Tracking Poverty Over Time in the Absence of Comparable Consumption Data, *The World Bank Economic Review* 21(2):317-341.

Subramanyam, M. A., I. Kawachi, L. F. Berkman, S. V. Subramanian (2011). Is Economic Growth Associated with Reduction in Child Undernutrition in India? *PLoS Medicine*, (8) 3.

Tarozzi, A. and A. Mahajan (2005), Child Nutrition in India in the Nineties: A Story of Increased Gender Inequality?, Unpublished manuscript. Duke University and Stanford University.

Thomas, D. and J. Strauss (1998). Health, nutrition, and economic development. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 36: 766-817.

Townsend, R. (1995). Consumption Insurance An evaluation of risk-bearing systems in low income countries. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9: 83-102.

Udry, C. (1990); Credit markets in northern Nigeria: Credit as Insurance in a rural economy. *World Bank Economic Review*, 4: 251-269.

UNICEF (1998). Strategy for improved nutrition of children and women in developing countries, New York, UNICEF.

WHO (2006). *WHO Child Growth Standards - Length/ height-for-age, weight for-age, weight-for-length and body mass index for age - Methods and Development*, Geneva: WHO.

World Bank (2006), World Development Report 2007: Development and the Next Generation, The World Bank and Oxford University Press. Washington, DC.