

The Intergenerational Inequality of Health in China

Tor Eriksson

Department of Economics and Business, Business and Social Sciences, Aarhus University

Jay Pan

West China School of Public Health, Sichuan University

Western China Research Center for Rural Health Development, Sichuan University

Xuezheng Qin

School of Economics, Peking University

Contact information of authors:

Tor Eriksson

Address: Fuglesangs Allé 4, Building 2632/L111, 8210 Aarhus V, Denmark

Telephone: +45-871-64978

Email: tor@asb.dk

Jay Pan

Address: West China School of Public Health, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, 610041

Telephone: +86-28-8550-1272

Fax: +86-28-8550-1528

Email: panjie.jay@gmail.com

Xuezheng Qin (corresponding author)

Address: School of Economics, Peking University, Beijing, China, 100871

Telephone: +86-10-6275-7237

Fax: +86-10-6275-4237

Email: qin.econpku@gmail.com

Acknowledgements:

We are grateful to the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 71103009), Ministry of Education of China (Grant No. 12JZD036) and the Sino-Danish Center for Education and Research for their financial support. The authors are responsible for all remaining errors.

The Intergenerational Inequality of Health in China

Tor Eriksson

Department of Economics and Business, Business and Social Sciences, Aarhus University

Jay Pan

West China School of Public Health, Sichuan University

Western China Research Center for Rural Health Development, Sichuan University

Xuezheng Qin

School of Economics, Peking University

Abstract:

This paper estimates the intergenerational health transmission in China using the 1991-2009 China Health and Nutrition Survey (CHNS) data. Three decades of persistent economic growth in China has been accompanied by high income inequality, which may in turn be caused by the inequality of opportunity in education and health. In this paper, we find that there is a strong correlation of health status between parent and their offspring in both the urban and rural sectors, suggesting the existence of intergenerational health inequality in China. The correlation is persistent with different health measures and various model specifications, and is robust when unobserved household heterogeneity is removed. We also find that the parents' (especially the mothers') socio-economic characteristics and environmental / health care choices are strongly correlated with their own and their children's health, supporting the "nature-nurture interaction" hypothesis. The Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition further indicates that 15% to 27% of the rural-urban inequality of child health is attributable to the endowed inequality from their parents' health. An important policy implication of our study is that the increasing inequality of income and opportunity in China can be ameliorated through the improvement of the current generation's health status and living standards.

Keywords:

Intergenerational Transmission; Health; Inequality; China

JEL classification:

I14; I12

1. Introduction and Background

Three decades of persistent high economic growth in China has been accompanied by an increasing inequality in income. A growing literature has documented and analyzed the sources of the internationally large income differences between individuals, households, regions and the urban/rural areas (see e.g., Shi and Sicular (2012)). Considerably less attention has been paid to income mobility over individuals' life cycles and the intergenerational persistence of income differences. As for the latter, four recent studies (Zhang and Eriksson (2010), Eriksson and Zhang (2012), Gong, Leigh and Meng (2012) and Quheng, Gustafsson and Shi (2012)) have documented (i) internationally high and persistent inequality in opportunity, (ii) that income inequality is to a high extent explained by inequality of opportunity, and (iii) there are high and persistent income correlations between parents and their offspring in the rural as well as the urban areas in China. While this research implies that the likelihood that the high levels of income inequality will persist in the future is high, it does not inform us how this development can be turned around as we know relatively little about which mechanisms are important in generating the low level of intergenerational mobility. Two prime candidates are inequality in opportunities to access education and inequality of health. The current paper is concerned with the latter.

The paucity of research based knowledge about the underlying mechanisms of intergenerational income inequality does not only pertain to China but also more generally to the international literature on intergenerational mobility.¹ In developing countries health plays an important role as a determinant of income from work (Deaton, 2003) and we know from a burgeoning research literature on the determinants of health that especially early childhood conditions are key (Case, Fertig and Paxson (2005); Currie (2009), (2011)). Consequently, it is interesting to examine to what extent ill health is transferred across generations and to search for factors that contribute to breaking the correlation between the generations. Related to this are a number of issues like: to what extent is the transfer of poor health from one generation to the next a question of lack of resources (low income), residence in areas with differing access to health care, lifestyle and food, basic education and environmental hazards. Can the transfer of

¹For one of the few exceptions, see Lefgren, Lindquist and Sims (2012).

health from parents to their offspring explain the strong similarity in income and between siblings and between children and their parents?

In China the preferential treatment of urban areas, which among other things implies different health care systems for urban and rural residents, coupled with the residential permit system (*hukou*) which restricted internal migration, led in the period 1985-93 to an increasing gap in health status between urban and rural areas (Liu, Hsiao and Eggleston(1999)). However, Liu, Fang and Zhao (2012) have shown that for children, the urban-rural health and nutritional disparities have decreased during the period 1989 to 2006. At the same time, the gap in access to preventive health care for children has also shrunk. Although differences have declined, they remain large and a cause for concern.

The aim of this paper is three fold. First, we study the intergenerational persistency of health using data from a long panel covering nine Chinese provinces, the focus of which is to examine how children's health is related to the health of their parents, catering for a host of other explanatory variables, notably parental socio-economic status and characteristics of the environment in which the child is growing up. We exploit the longitudinal nature of the dataset, and use panel data methods to correct for unobserved heterogeneity in documenting the intergenerational health transfer. Second, we carry out a Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition of the urban-rural child health differential in order to examine the extent to which this is attributable to observed differences in parental characteristics and inequality in parents' health. Third, we study whether there is evidence of nature-nurture interactions in the determinants of child health in China.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first China-based study of the intergenerational transmission of health, and also the first study to account for the role of the intergenerational factors in examining the child health gap between urban and rural areas in China. Needless to say, the results regarding intergenerational health inequality and the urban-rural child disparity have potentially important policy implications for the most populous country in the world.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives a short overview of previous research on intergenerational mobility. In Section 3 we describe the benchmark econometric model and its extensions. Moreover, the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition analysis and the analysis of the nature-nurture interaction hypothesis are presented. A description of the

dataset and the key variables of the study are given in the fourth section. Section 5 contains the presentation of the results of the analyses. A summary of the findings and their implications for policy and future research concludes the paper.

2. Previous Research – a Brief Review

Since the early 1990's there has been a renewed interest in intergenerational mobility issues among economists. This was chiefly due to some very influential papers by Solon (1992) and Zimmermann (1992) that reconsidered the methodology for measuring the phenomenon. In particular, they demonstrated that the earlier studies had significantly overestimated the degree of social mobility and economic opportunities.² As pointed out in Solon's (1999) survey, there are basically two ways one can address the intergenerational mobility issue: either by examining the parent-offspring income disparity or by studying sibling similarity in incomes. Most studies have adopted the former approach although it has the disadvantage of being based on one single characteristic of the family – typically of the father – and is, furthermore, associated with considerable demands on the data to be used.³

Parent-offspring income correlations vary across countries but for many countries they are in the neighborhood of 0.3; see Björklund and Jäntti (2009) for a survey. The estimates are quite sensitive to differences in the data used and in some countries also to the period studied. The estimates from the siblings approach are as a rule substantially higher, which is to be expected as sibling income similarity is the fraction of the total variation in incomes that can be attributed to variation in the family component – that is, not only factors directly related to parents' income but also values and aspirations – shared by the siblings in the family. As emphasized by Björklund and Salvanes (2011), the sibling correlation is a lower bound of family and neighborhood effects as parents may have treated their offspring differently.

A lot of attention has been paid to the difference between intergenerational mobility in the US as compared to other advanced industrialized countries; see e.g., Björklund, Eriksson, Jäntti,

² The new literature which made use of the improved methods and data is summarized and discussed in Solon (1999). The more recent research efforts are reviewed in Björklund and Jäntti (2009), (2012) and Black and Devereux (2011).

³ Not only are observations on earnings from generations at roughly the same age needed but in order to reduce the noise in the lifetime income measure (which likely leads to downward biased estimates) earnings should also be measured after the beginning of the individuals' labor market careers and preferably over a number of years.

Raaum and Österbacka (2002), Grawe (2004) and a recent paper by Corak (2012). Studies of intergenerational mobility in developing economies are rare.⁴ The study by Grawe (2004) reports father-son income elasticities for five developing countries (Ecuador, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan and Peru) and finds that these are internationally high and in particular for the Latin American countries much higher than in the United States. Dunn's (2007) estimates for Brazil also exceeds those obtained for U.S. and European countries.

For China we are aware of three studies of intergenerational income mobility. Gong et al. (2012) estimate parent-offspring income elasticities from data from urban areas in twelve provinces. They use a survey from 2004 to retrieve information about the offspring's incomes (plus characteristics of their parents) while parents' incomes are predicted from repeated cross-section data from years 1986-2004. The results show notably high intergenerational income persistence. Another study by Eriksson and Zhang (2012) makes use of the same data source⁵ as the current paper to estimate sibling correlations in earnings for rural areas in nine provinces. The low intergenerational mobility is found to be present also in the rural parts of China. Finally, a recent paper by Quheng et al. (2012) uses data from CHIP 1995 and 2002 (from 69 and 70 cities in 11 provinces, respectively) to estimate parent-offspring income elasticities, and find high intergenerational income persistency.

The growing literature documenting intergenerational income mobility has not been accompanied by a corresponding growth in research based knowledge about the mechanisms giving rise to resemblance in incomes between parents and children and between siblings. What research there is, predominantly deals with cognitive skills. This is logical as the standard economic model for intergenerational transmission (Becker and Tomes (1979)) is concerned with parents' investments in their children's human capital.

Although human capital typically is interpreted as the stock of cognitive skills, it can be much broader and include non-cognitive skills, health and personality characteristics (Bowles, Gintis and Osborne (2001)). Blanden, Gregg and Macmillan (2007) find a non-trivial role for non-cognitive skills in explaining the intergenerational income elasticity, and Dohmen, Falk,

⁴There is more research on educational persistence across generations for developing countries; see e.g., Hertz, Jayasundera, Piraino, Selcuk, Smith and Verashchagina (2008).

⁵ A related study, Zhang and Eriksson (2010), focuses on the role of inequality of opportunity and inequality of income.

Huffman and Sunde (2012) document a strong intergenerational similarity in personality characteristics like risk and trust attitudes. A recent book edited by Ermisch, Jäntti and Smeeding (2012) contains a number of studies of the intergenerational transmission of both cognitive and non-cognitive skills in highly developed countries.

The potentially important role for health as a part of the transmission process of socio-economic status across generations has been pointed to by e.g., Bowles, Gintis and Groves (2005) and Case et al. (2005), but the dearth of adequate data has greatly hampered the research of intergenerational transmission of health. There are a number of studies of correlations of parents' and offspring's birth weight (see Currie and Moretti (2007) and references therein)⁶ but only a few have focused on health outcomes as adults. One is an unpublished paper by Eriksson, Bratsberg and Raaum (2007) that makes use of the Danish Youth Cohort Study where the respondents are asked to answer a battery of questions concerning their own health (when they are in their early fifties) and then later the same questions are also asked about their parents' health. The study finds fairly strong correlations in health problems across generations and moreover, that accounting for health gives a significant reduction in the intergenerational income mobility measures used. In another unpublished paper, Akbulut and Kugler (no date) utilize NLSY data (from the U.S.) in estimating intergenerational elasticities for weight, height, BMI, depression and asthma for natives and immigrants, separately. They find that children inherit a sizable fraction of their health status from their parents.

There is considerably more research on the impact of early-life health on adult outcomes; a recent review is provided in Almond and Currie (2010). Summing up, this literature shows that early life health does have decisive impacts on individuals' future outcomes like education and earnings and that inequality begins already before children reach school age, and indeed, even prior to birth.⁷ The new science of epigenetics has shown that health differences at birth are not primarily due to genetic factors but are more likely to reflect interactions between nature and nurture; see Currie (2011) for a summary (accessible to economists) of this research.

The bulk of the literature of the impacts of early life health is based on analyses of data

⁶See also Bhalotra and Rawlings (2012) for a study of the relationship between maternal health and infant mortality risk and child height based on a large sample collected from 38 developing countries.

⁷A large part of the empirical studies have focused on health before birth. This is in part inspired by the so called Barker hypothesis, emphasizing conditions in utero, but also because the pre-birth period and the health shocks during it are well defined.

from rich countries. But there is also a small but growing stock of studies of early health shocks on data sets from developing countries. In a recent review of these studies, Currie and Vogl (2012) emphasize that the long-term effects of early childhood health shocks are likely to be larger in poorer countries. Here, health shocks are not only more likely to occur but also to interact. As the starting levels of health are lower, the probability that a given shock has detrimental / larger effects is higher than in developed countries, where mitigation is available to larger extent and more effective. Studies of developing countries have typically focused on height as the health variable⁸ and the health shocks considered are malnutrition (of which famines are an extreme case), diseases, pollution and war.

To the best of our knowledge, the studies on early life health consequences in China have all examined the long-term effects of the great famine triggered by the Great Leap Forward; see Meng and Qian (2009), Chen and Zhou (2007), Almond, Edlund, Li and Zhang (2010), Gorgens, Xin and Vaithianathan (2012). Dramatic shocks like famines, epidemics and wars are, however, associated with mortality selection which, if not controlled for, yields a downward bias in the estimated effects of the shock. Pollution of air, water and soil is a health shock that is typically stronger in developing countries, affects poor people proportionately more (as they lack the means to move out of polluted areas) and often affects children more than adults (as children are still developing and because of their smaller size receive a higher doses per body mass). All in all, this suggests that environmental pollution may have very large longer term adverse effects on child development in less developed countries. Most of the research on the consequences of pollution is, however, from developed countries, in particular the United States.⁹

3. Econometric Model and Estimation

3.1 The Benchmark Model of Intergenerational Health Transmission

To examine the intergenerational inequality of health in China, we start by formulating a benchmark model which characterizes the transmission of health capital from parents to their offspring, conditional on other influencing factors:

⁸This is a broader measure than weight which mainly captures differences in nutrition, whereas height also reflects other health conditions in early critical periods of life.

⁹Currie (2011) reviews and discusses some of these studies, which all are of relatively recent date.

$$CHealth_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_m MHealth_{it} + \alpha_f FHealth_{it} + \theta X_{it} + \gamma W_{it} + \delta E_{it} + \lambda H_{it} + u_{it} \quad (1)$$

The outcome variable in equation (1) is $CHealth_{it}$, which denotes the health status of child i in period t , measured by two different indicators: the height-for-age and weight-for-age z scores calculated with the child's height and weight data according to the WHO standard. The two key explanatory variables in equation (1) are $MHealth_{it}$ and $FHealth_{it}$, which are the health status of the mother and father of Child i in period t , respectively. These are measured correspondingly by their height (in centimeters) and weight (in kilograms). The parameters α_m and α_f thus indicate the correlation of health between the two generations, and are the key coefficients of interest in the model.

The additional explanatory variables in equation (1) capture other major determinants of health, such as the demographic, environmental, socio-economic, and health care related factors. The demographic factors are represented by a vector X_{it} , which is a set of individual level variables such as the child's age, gender and the ages of parents. To control for the time trend and the regional fixed effects on children's health, X_{it} also include a set of dummy variables identifying the survey years (year93, year97, year00, year04, year06, year09) and residential regions (East, Central; omitted category is West). Another vector, W_{it} , contains the socio-economic characteristics of the child's family and includes the information on the household's income, the parents' educational attainment (primary school or below, middle school, high school, college or above) and their type of employment (farmer, government, state owned enterprises, collective owned enterprises, private or foreign enterprises). Thus, W_{it} captures the impact of the family's accumulation of financial capital (wealth), human capital (education) and social capital (employment rank) on the child's health.

A vector E_{it} is included in equation (1) to control for the environmental impact, which includes the child's accessibility to the in-house flush toilet (as an overall hygiene indicator) and tap water (indicating improved drinking water), as well as the adult smoking prevalence rate in the Child's residential community (as a measure of in-door air pollution level). The vector H_{it} represents the child's access to medical care, which is measured by the distance from the child's residence to the closest health care facility in the community. u_{it} is the random error that varies

with individual and year. Equation (1) will be estimated using OLS separately for the urban and rural samples.

3.2 Accounting for the Unobserved Heterogeneity in Health

In the above benchmark model, it is possible that the key explanatory variables MHealth and FHealth are endogenous, leading to potential bias in the estimation of intergenerational health transfer elasticity. Theoretically, the endogeneity may arise due to three reasons: (1) omitted variables affecting the health of both the child and the parents; (2) “reverse causality” between child health and parental health; (3) measurement error in parents’ reported health variables. In our model, it is not likely that (2) and (3) will be the case, as the child health cannot “reverse” affect parental health, and the health indicators employed in our model (height and weight) do not usually suffer from substantial recalling errors. Thus, the possible endogeneity will most likely arise from the unobserved factors that affect both the parents’ and the child’s health status.

For example, gene and epigenome (the genetic codes that determine which genes are expressed through inheritance) are natural endowments and are transmitted from generation to generation, resulting in parents and their offspring sharing many physical traits (e.g. height, weight, inheritable diseases). Such heritable genetic characteristics are often important predictors for the child’s future health outcomes, but they are unobserved by researchers and thus cannot be included in the regression. Another example is the health related habits and lifestyles shared by the family members (e.g., poor diet, sedentary lifestyle, toxic exposure), which simultaneously determine both the parents’ and the child’s health. Such habits are largely determined by family traditions and cultural context which are unobservable from the survey data.

The above-mentioned variables that influence the health of two generations are usually family specific and time-invariant characteristics, reflecting the unobserved household heterogeneity. Failing to account for such unobserved heterogeneity will mistakenly assign its explanatory power on child health to the other independent variables in the regression, leading to upward or downward bias in the estimate of the impact of parental health. Due to the limited data availability, none of the existing studies have addressed this issue in estimating the intergenerational transmission of health. This paper thus improves upon earlier studies by explicitly accounting for such unobserved heterogeneity using the panel data methods. The

longitudinal nature of the CHNS data allows us to eliminate any time-invariant household characteristics (heterogeneity) by means of the following model:

$$CHealth_{ijt} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_m MHealth_{ijt} + \alpha_f FHealth_{ijt} + \theta X_{ijt} + \gamma W_{ijt} + \delta E_{ijt} + \lambda H_{it} + v_j + u_{ijt} \quad (2)$$

where i, j and t index the person, household and year, respectively. Compared to equation (1), the added term v_j represents the unobserved household heterogeneity. We use the random effects model through the quasi-demeaned transformation (Greene, 2011) to obtain consistent estimates of α_m and α_f , which are generally considered to be superior to the estimates of the basic OLS model because of the elimination of unobserved heterogeneity at the household level.

3.3 A Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition of Health Inequality

The Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition method proposed by Blinder (1973) and Oaxaca (1973) is frequently used in the economics literature to explore the sources of wage discrimination in the labor market. The method breaks the overall difference between two groups (e.g. white vs. non-white) into two components: the endowment effect which is the group difference in the observed characteristics (e.g. education and work experience), and the discrimination effect which is the group difference in the impact of these characteristics on the outcomes (e.g. wage rate). In our study, the urban-rural disparity in child health can be decomposed in a similar fashion. First, the urban and rural parents are likely to have strong disparities in health endowment, socio-economic status, and other environmental and health care related characteristics, and hence a significant part of the urban-rural inequality in child health is attributable to this “endowed disparity” in the observed characteristics. Second, unobserved differences between the urban and rural families may also lead to heterogeneous impact of the above characteristics on children’s health outcomes, resulting in the “discrimination” component in the overall health inequality (i.e. the disparity unexplained by the observables).

Formally, the twofold Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition quantifies the urban-rural differential in child health through the following equation:

$$\overline{CHealth}_u - \overline{CHealth}_r = (\bar{Z}_u - \bar{Z}_r)B^* + \bar{Z}_u(B_u - B^*) + \bar{Z}_r(B^* - B_r) \quad (3)$$

where the outcome variable $CHealth$ is defined in section 3.1, and the subscript u and r denotes urban and rural sectors, respectively. Z is the vector of observed characteristics, which includes the sub-vectors $MHealth_{it}$, $FHealth_{it}$, X_{it} , W_{it} , E_{it} , and H_{it} . B is the associated coefficient vector, with B^* denoting the nondiscriminatory coefficients (the benchmark impact of Z). Thus, the first right-hand-side term of equation (3) captures the endowment effect (the health disparity explained by Z), and the other two terms on the right hand side jointly capture the discrimination effect (the part of health inequality due to unobserved factors).

This decomposition requires estimation of B^* , the impact of Z on $CHealth$ in the absence of a discrimination effect. Following the convention in the previous literature (e.g. Bowblis et al., 2013), we assume that the urban group is immune to “discrimination”, and is consequently used as the base category. This assumption is justified by the higher income and higher socio-economic status (including education, health care and employment privileges) enjoyed by the urban residents. On the other hand, the rural *hukou* holders have traditionally been put into disadvantage and are restricted from migration into the cities. Replacing B^* with B_u (the coefficient vector associated with the urban sample), equation (3) can be re-written as:

$$\overline{CHealth}_u - \overline{CHealth}_r = (\bar{Z}_u - \bar{Z}_r)B_u + \bar{Z}_r(B_r - B_u) \quad (4)$$

Making use of equation (4), we can calculate the endowment effect (the first right-hand-side term) and the discrimination effect (the second right-hand-side term) using the group means of the urban / rural samples and the coefficient estimates in the benchmark models. For example, the endowment effect is the summed products of group differences of each variable in vector Z multiplied by their estimated coefficients from equation (1), and the discrimination effect is obtained in a corresponding manner. Furthermore, the standard errors and statistical significance of the two estimated effects can be computed using the delta method specified in Morduch and Sicular (2002) and Jann (2005).

Based on the definition of vector Z , we can further identify the detailed sources of health disparity by decomposing the total endowment effect and the total discrimination effect respectively into six dimensions: parent health ($MHealth_{it}$ and $FHealth_{it}$), parent socioeconomic

status as represented by the variables in vector W_{it} , household environment (E_{it}), access to health facilities (H_{it}), demographic variables (child's age and sex, parent age), and the other factors (such as the year and region fixed effects). The contribution of each dimension can be calculated by the same method as the total effects. For instance, the endowed intergenerational health inequality is obtained by summing over the group difference between father's and mother's health, each multiplied by their coefficient estimates. Among the six dimensions, our key interest is in the impact of parental health, which is now decomposed into the endowed and discriminatory effects. The endowment effect reveals the contribution of the observed parental health to their children's health inequality, thus can be considered as the *direct* intergenerational health inequality between the urban and rural sectors. The discrimination effect reflects the different elasticity of health transmission from parent to their offspring (the heterogeneous impact of parent health between urban and rural families), which can be considered as the *indirect* intergenerational health inequality.

3.4 The Nature-Nurture Interaction in Intergenerational Health Transmission

The medical literature traditionally divides the determinants of the human health into two categories: nature, which represents the genetic endowment at birth such as the inborn traits and abilities; nurture, which represents the acquired traits and abilities due to environmental influences or personal behavior. However, recent studies in medical sciences and health economics have accounted for and consistently documented the interaction between the two dimensions. In particular, many differences in health outcomes that are often conceived of as being innate may in fact reflect the effects of “nurture” or the individual choices (Currie, 2011).

For example, height is a strongly heritable genetic trait that is a strong predictor of a person's health outcomes. However, the sequencing of human genome indicates that there are too few genes in the human body to fully explain the variation in height between individuals. Instead, the epigenome (the genetic “switch” that determine which genes are expressed through inheritance) plays an important role in the determination of height outcome. The epigenome switches, which are easily triggered by environmental factors and largely determine our health outcomes (such as height, weight and inheritable diseases), may interact in at least three ways with the nurture factors:

(1) A large body of research on the “fetal origin” suggests that adult health outcomes are to a high extent determined before the person is born, and access to medical care in the prenatal and nursing period is a critical determinant of an individual’s health in childhood, adulthood and even in the next generation; see Almond and Currie (2011) for a review on this topic.

(2) During the prenatal period, both the pregnant mother and the *in utero* child may adapt to changes in the natural environment. Thus, the environmental choices made by the parents (e.g. regarding exposure to toxic substance, polluted air and water) also play a significant role in the child outcomes. Relevant studies can be found in Currie (2011), Lien and Evans (2005), Nilsson (2008), Currie and Neidell (2009), Banzhaf and Walsh (2008), etc.

(3) Parental socio-economic status (such as income and education) largely determines the quality of care and nutrition intake received by the child during the *in utero* period and childhood, and consequently the adaptation to the social environment is also an important channel of the nature-nurture interplay; see Currie and Moretti (2003), Johnson and Schoeni (2011), and Chen and Li (2009).

Through the above mechanisms, the nurturing factors are able to model the epigenome switches and the expression of genes thus make a difference in the intergenerational transmission of health, revealing the complex interaction between nature and nurture.

We adopt the following model to explore the possible nature-nurture interactions:

$$Z_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_m MHealth_{it} + \beta_f FHealth_{it} + \theta X_{it} + v_i + u_{it} \quad (5)$$

Z_{it} denotes the nurturing factors that contribute to the health of child i in period t . Based upon the previous analysis, Z_{it} includes the parents’ socio-economic status (W_{it}), the parents’ choice of environmental influences on their child (E_{it}), and the child’s access to medical care (H_{it}). $MHealth_{it}$ and $FHealth_{it}$ denote the health of the mother and father respectively, which represent the “nature” (or hereditary) determinant of child i ’s health, and are measured by the aforementioned indicators. The vector X_{it} controls for the basic individual characteristics such as age, sex and the time and region fixed effects. v_i represents the unobserved heterogeneity of child i that is individual specific and time-invariant.

In equation (5) β_m and β_f are the key parameters of interest. They represent the correlation

between the parents' health status (the nature factors) and their environmental and behavioral choices (the nurture factors). Positive β 's indicate that the healthier parents tend to exert better nurturing influences on their children's health, and the nature-nurture interaction tends to exacerbate the intergenerational transfer of health capital. For example, healthier parents may seek to live in a "cleaner" environment (measured by usage of improved drinking water, flush toilet and less exposure to air pollution), or they may on average enjoy better access to medical care by choosing to live closer to a medical facility. It can also be the case that healthier parents tend to be wealthier, better educated and to enjoy higher social status (see Cutler, Lleyras-Muney and Vogl (2011) for a review on the health-SES gradient). Since such nurturing choices would all benefit the health of the child [revealed by γ, δ, λ in equation (2)], the signs and statistical significance of the β 's will shed light on the mechanisms of the intergenerational health transmission, and will provide verification tests of the hypothesized nature-nurture interaction in China.

As in section 3.2, we control for unobserved individual heterogeneity that may affect child health by estimating equation (5) using the random effects model with the quasi-demeaned transformation. In addition, the split-sample estimation will also be performed based on the urban and rural observations to reflect the different mechanisms of health transmission between the two sectors.

4. Data and Sample

4.1 Data Source

The data used in this paper are from the 1991-2009 China Health and Nutrition Survey (CHNS), which is an ongoing international collaborative project since 1989 between the Carolina Population Center at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention.¹⁰ The survey is longitudinal and has so far included eight waves (1989, 1991, 1993, 1997, 2000, 2004, 2006 and 2009). In each round of surveys, CHNS uses a multistage random cluster process to draw a sample of about 4,400 households with a total of 15,000 to 19,000 individuals in nine provinces (Guangxi, Guizhou, Heilongjiang, Henan, Hubei, Hunan, Jiangsu, Liaoning, and Shandong) that vary substantially in geographic

¹⁰See <http://www.cpc.unc.edu/china> for a detailed description of the project and data constructed within it.

and economic characteristics. In each province, four counties are randomly selected based on a weighted sampling scheme; within each county, “communities” are randomly selected as primary sampling units (PSU) which represent urban / suburban neighborhoods and rural towns / villages. The household / individual survey collects detailed information on the respondent’s socio-demographic characteristics, health status and nutrition intake, the utilization and expenses of medical care, etc. The community survey provides information on the local hygiene condition, public service infrastructure, health care resources, insurance coverage profile, etc. Moreover, the panel feature of the CHNS data allows us to track the changes in individual characteristics over the years, thus enabling the better control for the unobserved individual heterogeneity.

For the present study, we first collect the pooled samples from the 1991-2009 waves of CHNS data and use the parent-child identifiers to select a sample consisting of parent-offspring pairs. We restrict our sample to children less than 18 years of age. For families with multiple children, their family bond (and thus the family fixed effects) is identified by household IDs. The demographic, socio-economic and health related information of the child and parents is extracted from the CHNS child and adult questionnaires, respectively. The household questionnaire is used to obtain the information about family income as well as the household’s access to improved drinking water and toilet facilities. Moreover, the community level restrict-use files are employed to extract data on the other environmental characteristics, such as the access to the nearby hospitals and the adult smoking rate within the neighborhood. The resulting study sample consists of 16,057 non-adult observations with matching parental information, among which 4,398 live in urban areas and 11,659 in the rural regions.

The central outcome variable in our model is child health, which is measured by the height-for-age and weight-for-age z scores based on the anthropometrical records in CHNS¹¹. A large body of medical research has shown that such anthropometric indices are good indicators for children’s short-term and long-term health outcomes in developing countries. In particular, the height-for-age z score is consistently recognized as the best indicator (Thomas et al., 1991; Strauss and Thomas, 1998), and has been widely used as a health proxy measure for studies on

¹¹CHNS also contains subjective health measures (self-rated health status) for parents and children above 12. However, this indicator may not be reliable, as many children of this age cannot evaluate their overall health in an objective and precise manner, and their reference groups can be very different thus making their evaluation incomparable. For the above reasons, we did not use the subjective health indicators in our study.

Chinese children (Chen and Li, 2009; Mangyo, 2008; Chen et al., 2010). We thus focus on the height-for-age z scores in the following analyses, and use the weight-for-age z score as a robustness check. The z scores are calculated as the deviation of a child’s observed height / weight from the median value of the reference population, divided by the standard deviation of the group in the following way:

$$z \text{ score} = \frac{(\text{observed value}) - (\text{median reference value})}{\text{standard deviation of reference population}} \quad (6)$$

where the observed values are the child’s height /weight records, the reference group is defined by the child’s gender and age (in months), and the median and standard deviation for each group is calculated on an international scope and published by the WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study (MGRS)¹². The z score reflects the relative growth level of a child compared to children of the same cohort, and has an important advantage over the absolute height / weight measures and the percentile measures (World Health Organization, 1995). Prior research consistently finds that z scores reveal the long-term health and nutritional conditions, and low levels of z scores are often associated with early exposure to adverse medical events or inappropriate feeding practices.

4.1 Sample Description

Table 1 reports the sample summary statistics of the key variables; columns (1) – (3) represent the full sample, the urban and rural sub-samples, respectively.

[Insert Table 1 about Here]

The children in our sample are on average 9.9 years old, and girls account for 46.7%. The urban group is slightly older (10.1 years of age) with a higher female representation (48.4%). The average, negative height-for-age (-0.976) and weight-for-age (-0.568) z scores indicate that the Chinese children’s health is below the world growth standard. The average age of the sample children’s father and mother is 38 and 36.4, respectively, and their height and weight measures

¹²MGRS website <http://www.who.int/childgrowth/mgrs/en/>

are 166.3 cm / 61.9 kg for fathers and 155.7 cm / 54.3 kg for mothers. The statistics on the geographic distribution indicate that 27% of our sample is collected from provinces in eastern China (Jiangsu, Liaoning, Heilongjiang, and Shandong) and 43.2% and 28.5% are from central (Henan, Hubei and Hunan) and western China (Guangxi and Guizhou), respectively.

In terms of parent socio-economic variables, the average annual household income per capita is 2,766.5 *Yuan*, and the average approximate years of schooling is 8.5 for fathers and 6.9 for mothers, reflecting the gender difference in educational attainment. The majority of the sample parents (about 71.9% of fathers and 66% of mothers) work in a collective enterprise or the government sector (including state-owned enterprises). Since our data spans from 1991 to 2009, the full sample average does not reflect the dramatic ownership structure changes that have taken place in China's industrial sectors during the past decade, the transformation from the dominance of state-owned and collective enterprises to the dominance of private firms.

The environmental variables indicate that more than half of the families (61.6%) in our sample have access to tap water and only 24.8% have in-house flush toilets. The average rate of adult smoking (defined as the number of smoking adults as a percentage of community population above 18) is 33.5% in the sample communities, reflecting the high smoking prevalence among Chinese population. The average distance from the respondents' residence to the nearest health facility is 0.39 km, which reflects the fact that health care is relatively easily accessible in China.

Due to the urban-rural gap in the economic and infrastructural development, substantial differences exist in practically all dimensions between the two sub-samples, and so, most of the group differences are statistically significant (indicated by asterisks in Table 1). Among the outcome measures, the rural children are found to be both shorter (-1.07 vs. -0.73) and thinner (-0.64 vs. -0.37) than their urban counterparts, indicating poorer performance in physical development, overall health status, and nutrition intake. A comparison between the two groups' parents reveals the same pattern, with the rural parents having significantly lower values for both anthropometric indicators.

For the socio-economic variables, the urban-rural differential is even more noticeable. The urban households have an average annual per capita income of 3,886.7 *Yuan*, almost 1.6 times higher than the rural households (2,431.8 *Yuan*). The percentage of parents who received high

school education or above is 34.9 (father) and 28.9 (mother) in the cities and only 20.6 (father) and 12.4 (mother) in villages and towns. The sharp distinction in education attainment reflects the large gap in human capital accumulation and the “nurturing environment” of children between the two sectors. This gap is also present in the individual stock of social capital, which is partially measured by the parents’ employment ranks. In China, a job in the governmental sector (including SOE) or in foreign owned firms usually means higher social status and more social resources. In our sample, the parents who work in these two sectors account for 42.9% (father) and 35.4% (mother) in the urban group and only 18.7% (father) and 11.2% (mother) in the rural group, reflecting the disparity in yet another social economic dimension.

The rural households also lag behind with respect to environmental quality. Rural families’ sanitary conditions are distinctively worse: only 51.8% and 16.3% rural households have access to improved drinking water (tap water) and in-house flush toilets, while this percentage is 87.6% and 47.2% in the urban sample. A comparison of the distance between respondent's residence to the nearest health facility indicates that rural children on average live closer to a medical clinic than urban children (0.37 km vs. 0.4 km). However, this difference in distance is not matched by equal quality of health care accessible to the children. In fact, higher ranked hospitals (those beyond the county level) account for a much higher share in the nearest health facilities as reported by the urban sample (48.3% vs 35.4%), indicating that the urban residents are more likely to have better access to high quality care. Lastly, the community smoking prevalence, a proxy measure for indoor air pollution is about the same in urban and rural areas (33.4% vs. 33.6%) due to the large smoking population across the country.

All in all, Table 1 illustrates the urban-rural inequality in both children’s health outcomes and the nature and nurture factors that may contribute to these outcomes. Below, we will investigate further the sources of such differences by means of the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition method.

5. Empirical Results

5.1 Results of the Benchmark Model

We begin by looking at the results of the benchmark model. We estimate equation (1) by

OLS on the urban and rural samples, and report the results in Tables 2A and 2B, respectively. Several studies suggest that China faces the challenge of serious health inequality between its urban and rural population (World Health Organization, 2001). This inequality is in turn correlated with the urban-rural disparity in income, education, environment, and access to health care. The residential registration regime (the *hukou* system) which restricts internal migration exacerbates the health disparity (Liu, Hsiao and Eggleston, 1999; Gao et.al, 2001). Thus, it is important to examine whether and to what extent the health inequality is passed on from generation to generation, justifying the separate estimations on the urban and rural samples.

[Insert Table 2A and 2B about Here]

In Tables 2A and 2B, the coefficient estimates of the two key variables, MHealth and FHealth, are significant and positive in all models, indicating a positive effect of parents' health on their children's health as measured both by height-for-age z scores [columns (1) - (3)] and by weight-for-age z scores [columns (4) - (6)]. Introduction of the additional control variables, i.e., the socio-economic factors W_{it} [in column (2) and (5)], the environmental characteristics E_{it} and the health care related variables H_{it} [in column (3) and (6)], does not seem to significantly affect the statistical significance nor the magnitude of the estimates, indicating that the correlation is robust to different model specifications. These results imply a strong intergenerational health transmission in China among both the urban and rural families. The implied transmission elasticity is 6.05 - 11.67 for height measures and 1.94 - 4.61 for weight measures. A comparison of the results in Tables 2A and 2B indicates that the parent-to-offspring health transmission is stronger in rural China, with higher estimated elasticity in most models. The quantitative difference in the coefficient estimates is not large, however. Nevertheless, there is a difference in the equality of opportunity between the two sectors (section 5.3 will explore this inequality in more detail).

We next turn to the estimation results for the other control variables. Among the basic demographic characteristics, age has a significant and U-shaped effect on children's health status, with the estimated turning point at around eight years. The better development outcomes for younger children before this age may be a result of continued improvements in feeding practices and nutrition intake of newborns during the recent decade. Parental demographic variables (such

as the age of the father and mother) also have a significant impact on their children's health outcomes. Moreover, the region fixed effect is also evident: children living in the Eastern (Central) provinces are much healthier than those in Central (Western) China. This regional inequality in health is consistent with the uneven distribution of economic activities in China, where Eastern, coastal provinces have enjoyed rapid economic development since the 1980's, whereas the Western inland regions lag behind, resulting in unequal access to nutrition and other health care resources for children.

When the parental socio-economic variables are entered into the model, we are able to measure the impact of the family's accumulation of financial capital (wealth), human capital (education) and social capital (employment rank) on the children's health, of which the prior literature on the determination of health documented mixed evidence (Adams et.al, 2003; Adda, 2003; Currie, 1999; Cutler et al., 2011). In our study, the household income is found to have a positive influence on children's health status. The impact is stronger in the rural areas, with an estimated semi-elasticity of 0.069% on the height-for-age z scores and 0.038% on the weight-for-age z scores.

The effect of parents' educational attainment is more mixed. The coefficient estimates of father's education are mostly insignificant, whereas the mother's education seems to play a more important role for their offspring's health (most likely because mothers spend disproportionately more time with their children than fathers). In the urban areas, mothers with a college degree or above tend to have much healthier children compared to those with no formal schooling (the reference category), with a marginal effect of 0.53 on the weight-for-age z scores. In the rural areas, due to the relatively small sample size of college graduates, the most significant impact is from the middle school education: women who completed junior / senior high schools are found to have children with better health (with marginal effects of 0.12 and 0.14 on height-for-age and weight-for-age z scores respectively). The parental education effect testifies to the importance of nurturing factors in children's early age development, with better parental education leading to improved health of the offspring.

Parents' employment status also has a noticeable impact, and mothers' job choices again play a more important role relative to that of fathers. In particular, the rural mothers working for government or state-owned enterprises (SOEs) are found to have significantly healthier children

(with respect to both the height and weight z scores), while those working in a farm or collective enterprises tend to have children with poorer health outcomes. Since occupations in the government, SOE or foreign enterprises represents higher social status and more social capital in China, our findings indicate that the offspring's health can be affected by parents' social capital accumulation, which is an often ignored dimension in the studies on the health-SES relationship.

Prior studies also suggest that environmental conditions such as water sanitation and air pollution can play a vital role in adults' and children's health (Lee, Rosenzweig and Pitt, 1997; Chay and Greenstone, 2005). We therefore enter the household and community level environmental variables (*flush*, *tap* and *smoke*) in columns (3) and (6). Also introduced in these columns is the distance to the nearest health care facility, which represents the impact of the access to health care on children's health outcomes. As can be seen from Tables 2A and 2B, the coefficient estimates of these variables mostly do not differ significantly from zero, although in general their signs are positive, suggesting that better environmental quality contributes to better health among the urban and rural children.

5.2 The Random Effects Model with Household Heterogeneity

As discussed in section 3.2, unobserved family traits such as genetic characteristics and lifestyle choices can affect the health of both the parents and their children and hence give rise to endogeneity bias in the benchmark regression estimates. To eliminate the impact of such family specific and time-invariant heterogeneity, we exploit the longitudinal nature of the CHNS data and apply the random effects model as specified in equation (2). The quasi-demeaned transformation in the random effects model allows us to remove such family level fixed effects and to obtain consistent estimates of the elasticity of intergenerational health transmission. The estimation results are given in Table 3.

[Insert Table 3 about Here]

As in the benchmark model, the parental health variables in Table 3 attach significant and positive coefficient estimates in both the urban and rural samples and with respect to the height as well as the weight outcomes. This indicates that our findings on the parent-to-offspring health

transfer are robust to the elimination of unobserved family heterogeneity.¹³ Compared with Tables 2A and 2B, the magnitude of the transmission stays about the same for mothers but is slightly lower for fathers, suggesting that the family heterogeneity is likely to correlate positively with the parents' and children's health.

Furthermore, the signs and statistical significance of the other control variables (such as the demographic, socio-economic and environmental characteristics) are also in line with the estimates in the benchmark model. Notably, better health outcomes are observed among children in the Eastern regions, in families with higher income and with better educated / employed mothers. Controlling for the household fixed effects, access to health care services also play a significant role in determining children's health: children living closer to a hospital are found to have better (poorer) weight outcomes in the urban (rural) sample; the discrepancy is partially due to the rank and quality difference of health care facilities between the two sectors (see section 4.2).

5.3 The Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition Results

The separate estimations of the above models on the urban and rural samples demonstrated the intergenerational inequality of health between the two sectors in China. In the following, we examine further the underlying driving forces of the health inequality between the urban and rural children using the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition method; see Table 4.

[Insert Table 4 about Here]

The Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition categorizes the overall urban-rural disparity in children's health (measured by height-for-age z scores and weight-for-age z scores) into two components: the endowment effect which represents the observed difference in parental characteristics such as health, socio-economic status, living environment and access to health care; and the discrimination effect which represents the unobserved difference in the impact of the above parent characteristics on children's health outcomes. According to the top section of Table 4, both the endowment effect and the discrimination effect are statistically significant in explaining the overall disparity in children's health (the overall difference is 0.345 in the

¹³We have also estimated a corresponding random effects model with individual level heterogeneity, and obtained similar results.

height-for-age z scores and 0.236 in the weight-for-age z scores).

Of the overall urban-rural inequality, the “endowed disparity” from parents’ characteristics accounts for about 59% and 48% for children’s height and weight outcomes, respectively, and the remaining gap is attributable to the discrimination effect. This means that a large portion of children’s health inequality can be explained by the health and non-health endowment from their parents. Thus, the labor mobility restrictions due to the *hukou* regime and the associated urban-rural inequality in income, health, education and environment can have a long lasting impact not only on the current generation’s quality of life, but also on the accumulation of human capital of the offspring generations.

Next, in order to identify the detailed sources of the observed health disparity, we decompose the endowment effect further into the following components: parental health (MHealth_{it} and FHealth_{it}), parental socioeconomic status (income, education, employment variables), household environment, access to health care, demographic variables (child age and sex, parent age), and other factors (year and region fixed effects). According to the middle section of Table 4, parents’ health and their socio-economic status account for a dominant share of the total endowment effect. For example, parental health accounts for 25% of the endowed disparity in children’s height-for-age z scores and 56% in the weight-for-age z scores. Parental income, education and employment status jointly account for 75% and 96% of the endowment effect in the height and weight measures, respectively. This result implies that the majority of the overall inequality in children’s health (59% and 73% of the overall inequality in height and weight) is attributable to parents’ health and socio-economic factors, while the direct parent-to-offspring transmission of health accounts for 15% and 27%, respectively. In other words, if the rural parents were as healthy as the urban ones, the differences in their offspring’s health status would be reduced by 15% to 27% due to the *direct* (or endowed) intergenerational health inequality.

On the other hand, the discrimination effect reflects the urban-rural disparity in the elasticity of health transmission, and can be considered as the *indirect* intergenerational health inequality. In the bottom section of Table 4, we have decomposed the total discrimination effect into more detailed components, and find that most of the detailed discrimination effects are not statistically significant. This means that although the impact of parental characteristics on children’s health is

potentially heterogeneous between the urban and rural sectors (it accounts for 42% and 52% of the overall urban-rural disparity in height and weight z scores), the impact of each vector (particularly health and socio-economic status) does not differ significantly between the two sectors. Overall, the results of the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition imply that the disparity in parental health is an important determinant of the difference in their offspring's health, supporting the hypothesis of the intergenerational inequality of health in China.

5.4 Nature-Nurture Interactions

Next, we turn to the interactions between “nature” and “nurture” and explore their role in the intergenerational health transmission process. As discussed in section 3.4, heritable genetic traits such as height and weight are traditionally thought of as pure natural endowments, but have in recent medical studies been found to be correlated with “nurture” factors or individual choices (Currie, 2011). Specifically, the epigenome switches that determine gene expression through inheritance can be triggered by environmental factors, and thus parents' behaviors and choices can have a long-lasting impact on their offspring's health. If parents with better health choose to live in a “cleaner” environment or engage in healthier lifestyles, then the above mentioned intergenerational health transmission will be amplified by the nature-nurture interactions, as part of the parents' health capital is transferred to their offspring through the behavioral channel.

[Insert Table 5 about Here]

Table 5 reports the estimated nature-nurture interactions in China separately for the urban and rural samples. Each column has an outcome variable that represents one particular nurturing factor, and our focus is on the coefficient estimates of parent health indicators, i.e. β_m and β_f in equation (5). As shown in columns (1) – (5), parental health has a significant and positive effect on all socio-economic dimensions in both the urban and rural regressions. For example, healthier fathers and mothers (indicated by their height measures) tend to have higher incomes, higher educational attainment (measured by years of schooling) and higher ranked employment (measured by government, SOE or foreign sector jobs).

Similarly, from the results in columns (8) – (10), we may note that in both the urban and rural families, parents with better health are more likely to live in a cleaner environment with

improved drinking water, less indoor air pollution and better overall household hygiene. The results on health care related variables [column (11)] are less pronounced: the correlation between parents' health and the access to health care services (as measured by distance between residential locations to the nearest hospital) is not statistically significant. This may be due to the reason that the nearest health care facilities differ from the ones parents actually used during the prenatal or nursing periods, and thus plays a less important role in the nature-nurture interaction. Overall, the above findings suggest that there is a positive correlation between parents' health and their socio-economic status and environmental choices. Thus, parental health is likely to be transmitted to their offspring through several "nurturing" channels. The results support the "nature-nurture interaction" hypothesis, and imply that the intergenerational health transmission in China may be intensified by such interaction.

A comparison of the coefficient estimates between the urban and rural regressions in Table 5 reveals that the nature-nurture interaction is stronger in the urban sector. Healthier parents in the cities are more likely to provide a better nurturing environment to their children, which in turn strengthens the parent-offspring health correlation and tends to exacerbate the intergenerational health inequality.

6. Conclusions

As is well known, the Chinese economy is characterized by a high, and for almost three decades increasing, income inequality and recent research has, moreover, demonstrated that this is accompanied by a high degree of inequality of opportunity. The mechanisms giving rise to the high intergenerational income persistency is not well understood, but education and health are two factors often mentioned in the discussion. In this paper, we have examined the intergenerational inequality of health in China, focusing on children's health and the extent to which poor health is transmitted from parents to their offspring. Our econometric analyses show that parental health is strongly correlated with their offspring's health after controlling for the parents' socio-economic status (education, income and type of employment), demographic traits of parents and their children, environmental and health care factors, and unobserved household heterogeneity.

A considerable part of income inequality in China reflects the large income differences between urban and rural areas. This disparity is also present in children's health. According to our decomposition analysis, the bulk of the urban-rural child health differential is due to differences in urban and rural parents' education and income, but differences in parents' health also play a significant role. Thus, if there were no disparities between urban and rural parents' health, the inequality in their children's health would be reduced by 15-27 percent. We also find that nurture factors (environment and health care choices) are strongly correlated with nature factors, providing support to the notion that nature and nurture factors interact. These interactions are likely to amplify the intergenerational transmission of health.

Improving the health of its population and reducing the urban-rural disparity in health are one of the major challenges for China. Our study has shown that differences in children's health are largely explained by differences in parental socio-economic status and that the urban-rural health differential also reflects these differences. This implies that policies aiming at a reduction of the influence of parents' socio-economic resources on their offspring's health would not only lead to improvements in health in general, but also contribute to a reduction of the urban-rural health gap. Studies have shown that poor child health has strong negative effects on children's performance in early school years¹⁴ (especially in the rural areas) and hence their future accumulation of human capital. Consequently, this type of policies will have important spillover effects into the labor market.

¹⁴See e.g., Luo, Shi, Zhang, Liu, Rozelle, Sharbono, Yue, Zhao and Martorell (2012) and Shi, Chang, Su, Luo, Zhang and Rozelle (2012).

Table 1 Sample Descriptive Statistics of Selected Variables

Variable	Definition	Full sample	Urban	Rural
		(1)	(2)	(3)
hzsore	Height z score of child	-0.976 (1.225)	-0.729* (1.246)	-1.071 (1.204)
wzsore	Weight z score of child	-0.568 (1.190)	-0.371* (1.218)	-0.640 (1.172)
heightm	Mother's height (cm)	155.744 (5.800)	156.100* (5.969)	155.609 (5.729)
heightf	Father's height (cm)	166.306 (6.361)	166.851* (6.754)	166.097 (6.191)
weightm	Mother's weight (kg)	54.293 (8.444)	55.367* (8.564)	53.886 (8.362)
weightf	Father's weight (kg)	61.901 (9.755)	63.366* (10.310)	61.341 (9.476)
age	Child's age (year)	9.877 (4.780)	10.066* (4.816)	9.806 (4.764)
female	Child's gender (female=1)	0.467 (0.499)	0.484* (0.500)	0.461 (0.499)
agem	Mother's age (year)	36.357 (6.655)	36.452 (6.483)	36.321 (6.718)
agef	Father's age (year)	38.017 (7.165)	38.576* (6.937)	37.807 (7.238)
east	live in eastern China	0.270 (0.444)	0.241* (0.427)	0.285 0.452
middle	live in central China	0.432 (0.495)	0.437 (0.496)	0.438 0.496
prif	Primary school (father)	0.261 (0.439)	0.176* (0.381)	0.293 (0.455)
juf	Middle school (father)	0.427 (0.495)	0.408* (0.492)	0.433 (0.496)
senf	High school (father)	0.211 (0.408)	0.264* (0.441)	0.191 (0.393)
colf	College or above (father)	0.035 (0.183)	0.085* (0.280)	0.015 (0.123)
prim	Primary school (mother)	0.299 (0.458)	0.226* (0.418)	0.326 (0.469)
jum	Middle school (mother)	0.337 (0.473)	0.360* (0.480)	0.329 (0.470)
senm	High school (mother)	0.149 (0.356)	0.235* (0.424)	0.117 (0.321)
colm	College or above (mother)	0.020 (0.138)	0.054* (0.226)	0.007 (0.081)
farmf	Farmer (father)	0.090	0.046*	0.107

		(0.287)	(0.210)	(0.309)
collf	Collective enterprise (father)	0.468	0.290*	0.535
		(0.499)	(0.454)	(0.499)
govef	Government or SOE (father)	0.251	0.424*	0.186
		(0.434)	(0.494)	(0.389)
privf	Private enterprise (father)	0.094	0.101	0.091
		(0.287)	(0.302)	(0.288)
foref	Foreign enterprise(father)	0.002	0.005*	0.001
		(0.049)	(0.072)	(0.037)
farmm	Farmer (mother)	0.096	0.050*	0.114
		(0.295)	(0.218)	(0.318)
collm	Collective enterprise (mother)	0.486	0.305*	0.555
		(0.500)	(0.460)	(0.497)
govem	Government or SOE (mother)	0.174	0.344*	0.111
		(0.379)	(0.475)	(0.314)
privm	Private enterprise (mother)	0.060	0.073*	0.056
		(0.240)	(0.261)	(0.230)
forem	Foreign enterprise(mother)	0.004	0.010*	0.001
		(0.061)	(0.102)	(0.033)
income	Household per cap income (<i>Yuan</i>)	2766.508	3886.701*	2431.819
		(2.632)	(2.606)	(2.560)
tap	Tap water in household (1=yes)	0.616	0.876*	0.518
		(0.486)	(0.330)	(0.500)
flush	Flush toilet in household (1=yes)	0.248	0.472*	0.163
		(0.432)	(0.499)	(0.369)
smokep	Community smoking prevalence (%)	0.335	0.334	0.336
		(0.081)	(0.080)	(0.081)
hfdis	Distance of nearest health care facility (km)	0.385	0.403	0.377
		(0.919)	(0.857)	(0.940)
hfrank	Rank of nearest health care facility (1=beyond county level)	0.399	0.483*	0.354
		(0.490)	(0.500)	(0.478)
Obs	Sample size	16057	4398	11659

Note: (1) The statistics reported are the sample mean with standard deviation in parenthesis. (2) Asterisks (*) denote statistically significant difference between the urban and rural groups (at 5% level). (3) The annual household per capita income is measured in 2009 *yuan* and is calculated by dividing the total household income by number of people in the family (parents and children). (4) The community smoking prevalence is defined as the number of smoking adults as a percentage of community population above 18.

Table 2A OLS Regression Results (Urban Sample)

Variable	Urban Sample					
	hzscore			wzscore		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MHealth	0.048*** (0.004)	0.044*** (0.004)	0.046*** (0.004)	0.030*** (0.003)	0.026*** (0.003)	0.026*** (0.004)
FHealth	0.051*** (0.005)	0.045*** (0.005)	0.044*** (0.005)	0.027*** (0.004)	0.026*** (0.004)	0.026*** (0.004)
age	0.023 (0.021)	0.021 (0.021)	0.025 (0.021)	-0.233*** (0.042)	-0.233*** (0.042)	-0.228*** (0.043)
age ²	-0.002* (0.001)	-0.002* (0.001)	-0.002* (0.001)	0.015*** (0.004)	0.015*** (0.004)	0.014*** (0.004)
female	-0.023 (0.043)	-0.036 (0.043)	-0.046 (0.043)	-0.039 (0.054)	-0.036 (0.054)	-0.044 (0.055)
agef	0.014* (0.008)	0.010 (0.007)	0.009 (0.007)	0.023** (0.010)	0.024*** (0.009)	0.024** (0.009)
agem	0.005 (0.009)	0.007 (0.008)	0.007 (0.008)	-0.025** (0.011)	-0.023** (0.011)	-0.024** (0.011)
east	0.413*** (0.071)	0.313*** (0.072)	0.344*** (0.070)	0.666*** (0.086)	0.502*** (0.089)	0.513*** (0.089)
central	0.238*** (0.060)	0.183*** (0.059)	0.201*** (0.058)	0.386*** (0.076)	0.247*** (0.075)	0.262*** (0.077)
prif		0.078 (0.191)	0.021 (0.189)		-0.161 (0.198)	-0.145 (0.199)
juf		0.206 (0.192)	0.128 (0.189)		0.021 (0.194)	0.007 (0.195)
senf		0.105 (0.196)	0.043 (0.192)		-0.134 (0.196)	-0.160 (0.197)
colf		0.300 (0.209)	0.255 (0.206)		-0.035 (0.227)	-0.067 (0.232)
prim		-0.206** (0.088)	-0.212** (0.089)		-0.023 (0.137)	-0.030 (0.140)
jum		-0.134 (0.093)	-0.144 (0.093)		0.146 (0.142)	0.128 (0.147)
senm		-0.068 (0.103)	-0.094 (0.104)		0.237 (0.149)	0.203 (0.153)
colm		-0.089 (0.140)	-0.162 (0.140)		0.572*** (0.192)	0.531*** (0.199)
farmf		-0.087 (0.141)	-0.119 (0.138)		-0.023 (0.186)	-0.053 (0.187)
collf		-0.078 (0.087)	-0.058 (0.088)		-0.170 (0.123)	-0.169 (0.126)
privf		0.055 (0.098)	0.054 (0.100)		-0.073 (0.138)	-0.094 (0.143)

govef	0.020	-0.002	-0.018	-0.040		
	(0.084)	(0.085)	(0.112)	(0.113)		
foref	-0.126	-0.104	0.109	0.124		
	-0.087	-0.119	-0.023	-0.053		
farmm	0.113	0.164	-0.115	-0.083		
	(0.127)	(0.125)	(0.174)	(0.176)		
collm	-0.109	-0.072	-0.223**	-0.201**		
	(0.072)	(0.074)	(0.097)	(0.100)		
privm	0.179*	0.140	0.099	0.059		
	(0.095)	(0.097)	(0.132)	(0.146)		
govem	0.080	0.121*	-0.108	-0.062		
	(0.071)	(0.072)	(0.089)	(0.092)		
forem	0.261	0.187	-0.456	-0.558*		
	(0.180)	(0.186)	(0.287)	(0.292)		
lnincome	0.047*	0.044*	0.039	0.053		
	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.032)	(0.033)		
tap		0.052		-0.005		
		(0.066)		(0.088)		
flush		0.071		0.018		
		(0.051)		(0.065)		
smokep		0.105		-0.524		
		(0.293)		(0.368)		
hfdis		0.004		0.030		
		(0.020)		(0.029)		
Year dummies	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Obs	3,795	3,743	3,558	1,805	1,786	1,716

Notes: (1) regressions are based on the urban data. (2) ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively; robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. (3) MHealth and FHealth denote mother's health (heightm, weightm) and father's health (heightf, weightf) indicators, which correspond to the child health indicators (hzscore, wzscore).

Table 2B OLS Regression Results (Rural Sample)

Variable	Rural Sample					
	hzscore			wzscore		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MHealth	0.051*** (0.003)	0.046*** (0.003)	0.046*** (0.003)	0.025*** (0.002)	0.023*** (0.002)	0.024*** (0.002)
FHealth	0.043*** (0.003)	0.039*** (0.003)	0.039*** (0.003)	0.029*** (0.003)	0.030*** (0.003)	0.030*** (0.003)
age	0.024** (0.012)	0.023* (0.012)	0.022* (0.013)	-0.252*** (0.025)	-0.255*** (0.025)	-0.254*** (0.026)
age ²	-0.001* (0.001)	-0.001* (0.001)	-0.001* (0.001)	0.014*** (0.002)	0.015*** (0.002)	0.015*** (0.002)
female	-0.009 (0.028)	-0.002 (0.027)	-0.002 (0.028)	-0.129*** (0.034)	-0.120*** (0.033)	-0.121*** (0.034)
agef	0.009* (0.005)	0.007 (0.005)	0.008 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.005)	-0.011** (0.005)	-0.009* (0.005)
agem	-0.003 (0.006)	0.003 (0.006)	0.003 (0.006)	0.008 (0.006)	0.014** (0.006)	0.013** (0.006)
east	0.363*** (0.046)	0.330*** (0.045)	0.316*** (0.047)	0.640*** (0.054)	0.580*** (0.054)	0.546*** (0.057)
central	0.193*** (0.041)	0.189*** (0.040)	0.171*** (0.042)	0.331*** (0.048)	0.312*** (0.048)	0.292*** (0.050)
prif		0.126 (0.091)	0.129 (0.092)		-0.215 (0.135)	-0.192 (0.137)
juf		0.118 (0.095)	0.118 (0.095)		-0.251* (0.138)	-0.231* (0.139)
senf		0.155 (0.100)	0.139 (0.101)		-0.157 (0.142)	-0.136 (0.142)
colf		0.259* (0.126)	0.260* (0.129)		-0.138 (0.215)	-0.057 (0.192)
prim		0.068 (0.048)	0.067 (0.048)		-0.156** (0.072)	-0.180** (0.072)
jum		0.117** (0.053)	0.115** (0.054)		-0.036 (0.074)	-0.070 (0.074)
senm		0.139** (0.066)	0.139** (0.067)		-0.077 (0.088)	-0.103 (0.088)
colm		0.100 (0.156)	0.001 (0.163)		-0.062 (0.218)	-0.036 (0.240)
farmf		0.056 (0.085)	0.074 (0.087)		-0.012 (0.113)	-0.002 (0.113)
collf		-0.007 (0.071)	0.002 (0.072)		-0.101 (0.099)	-0.107 (0.098)
privf		0.024 (0.081)	0.041 (0.083)		-0.176* (0.105)	-0.168 (0.104)

govef	0.101	0.128*	-0.057	-0.055
	(0.073)	(0.075)	(0.100)	(0.100)
foref	-0.051	-0.130	-0.031	-0.171
	(0.241)	(0.238)	(0.417)	(0.426)
farm	-0.221***	-0.234***	-0.196**	-0.200**
	(0.066)	(0.067)	(0.088)	(0.091)
collm	-0.115**	-0.109**	-0.015	-0.023
	(0.051)	(0.053)	(0.064)	(0.066)
privm	0.031	0.020	0.055	0.032
	(0.069)	(0.072)	(0.092)	(0.094)
govem	0.133**	0.142**	0.174**	0.179**
	(0.062)	(0.064)	(0.072)	(0.074)
forem	0.486**	0.367*	-0.021	-0.190
	(0.205)	(0.200)	(0.295)	(0.247)
lnincome	0.062***	0.069***	0.025	0.038*
	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.020)	(0.020)
tap		-0.059*		-0.043
		(0.032)		(0.040)
flush		0.023		-0.028
		(0.042)		(0.055)
smokep		0.270		0.175
		(0.172)		(0.220)
hfdis		-0.021		-0.013
		(0.013)		(0.014)
Year dummies	yes	yes	yes	yes
Obs	9,776	9,610	9,191	4,878
				4,788
				4,580

Notes: (1) regressions are based on the rural data. (2)***, ** and * denote statistical significance at 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively; robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. (3) MHealth and FHealth denote mother's health (heightm, weightm) and father's health (heightf, weightf) indicators, which correspond to the child health indicators (hzscore, wzscore).

Table 3 Random Effects Regression Results

Variable	Urban Sample		Rural Sample	
	hzscore	wzscore	hzscore	wzscore
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
MHealth	0.044*** (0.004)	0.026*** (0.004)	0.044*** (0.003)	0.022*** (0.002)
FHealth	0.036*** (0.005)	0.023*** (0.004)	0.034*** (0.004)	0.030*** (0.003)
age	0.040* (0.021)	-0.234*** (0.043)	0.026** (0.012)	-0.232*** (0.025)
age ²	-0.002** (0.001)	0.015*** (0.004)	-0.001** (0.001)	0.013*** (0.002)
female	-0.051 (0.046)	-0.040 (0.056)	-0.011 (0.027)	-0.121*** (0.033)
agef	0.015** (0.007)	0.025** (0.010)	0.005 (0.005)	-0.008 (0.005)
agem	-0.001 (0.008)	-0.025** (0.011)	0.006 (0.006)	0.011* (0.006)
east	0.368*** (0.075)	0.551*** (0.090)	0.381*** (0.046)	0.535*** (0.054)
central	0.222*** (0.061)	0.284*** (0.078)	0.209*** (0.041)	0.302*** (0.049)
prif	-0.060 (0.174)	-0.095 (0.266)	0.104 (0.093)	-0.086 (0.121)
juf	0.101 (0.180)	0.089 (0.265)	0.087 (0.094)	-0.159 (0.123)
senf	0.044 (0.185)	-0.086 (0.265)	0.098 (0.098)	-0.054 (0.127)
colf	0.235 (0.200)	0.010 (0.288)	0.188 (0.147)	-0.000 (0.215)
prim	-0.166* (0.090)	-0.034 (0.148)	0.100** (0.044)	-0.150** (0.065)
jum	-0.109 (0.098)	0.126 (0.152)	0.168*** (0.049)	-0.050 (0.066)
senm	-0.068 (0.111)	0.174 (0.160)	0.208*** (0.066)	-0.061 (0.081)
colm	-0.110 (0.150)	0.502** (0.199)	0.100 (0.171)	-0.015 (0.243)
farmf	-0.100 (0.119)	-0.076 (0.183)	0.058 (0.080)	-0.036 (0.108)
collf	0.019 (0.080)	-0.060 (0.120)	-0.004 (0.068)	-0.125 (0.095)
privf	0.011 (0.088)	-0.017 (0.132)	0.041 (0.080)	-0.184* (0.101)

govef	0.034 (0.080)	0.019 (0.112)	0.076 (0.069)	-0.101 (0.096)
foref	0.187 (0.287)	0.151 (0.318)	-0.141 (0.230)	-0.265 (0.490)
farmm	0.250** (0.111)	0.009 (0.177)	-0.185*** (0.058)	-0.173* (0.089)
collm	-0.017 (0.065)	-0.195** (0.098)	-0.110** (0.047)	-0.019 (0.064)
privm	0.169* (0.090)	0.093 (0.140)	-0.010 (0.069)	0.032 (0.088)
govem	0.060 (0.065)	-0.061 (0.091)	0.105* (0.058)	0.212*** (0.071)
forem	-0.019 (0.162)	-0.589** (0.256)	0.219 (0.182)	-0.174 (0.261)
lnincome	0.037 (0.023)	0.035 (0.031)	0.045*** (0.014)	0.022 (0.020)
tap	0.030 (0.057)	-0.035 (0.082)	-0.020 (0.027)	-0.021 (0.036)
flush	0.080* (0.047)	0.020 (0.062)	0.009 (0.036)	-0.036 (0.052)
smokep	0.171 (0.273)	-0.568 (0.353)	0.232 (0.157)	0.121 (0.211)
hfdis	-0.003 (0.018)	0.050* (0.027)	-0.016 (0.012)	-0.028** (0.014)
Obs	3,558	1,716	9,191	4,580

Notes: (1) All regressions control for the household fixed effect. (2) ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at 1%, 5% and 10% level respectively; robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. (3) MHealth and FHealth denote mother's health (heightm, weightm) and father's health (heightf, weightf) indicators, which correspond to the child health indicators (hzscore, wzscore).

Table 4 Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition of Urban-rural Inequality in Child Health

Inequality decomposition		hzscore		wzscore	
		Estimated effects	Robust std.error	Estimated effects	Robust std.error
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Overall Urban-rural disparity		0.345***	(0.039)	0.236***	(0.047)
Total endowment effect		0.202***	(0.032)	0.114***	(0.037)
Total discrimination effect		0.144***	(0.031)	0.122***	(0.038)
Detailed endowment effects	Parent health	0.051***	(0.019)	0.064***	(0.018)
	Parent income	0.030***	(0.007)	0.019**	(0.008)
	Parent education	0.031***	(0.010)	0.027**	(0.012)
	Parent employment	0.091***	(0.012)	0.063***	(0.014)
	Environment	-0.002	(0.013)	-0.017	(0.017)
	Access to care	0.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.001)
	Demographic	0.004	(0.004)	-0.015*	(0.008)
	Year fixed effect	0.011**	(0.005)	0.005	(0.006)
	Region fixed effect	-0.015***	(0.005)	-0.030***	(0.011)
Detailed discrimination effects	Parent health	0.739	(1.022)	-0.115	(0.309)
	Parent income	-0.201	(0.252)	0.124	(0.306)
	Parent education	-0.286	(0.212)	0.318	(0.225)
	Parent employment	-0.036	(0.094)	-0.148	(0.133)
	Environment	0.051	(0.133)	-0.192	(0.168)
	Access to care	0.010	(0.010)	0.019	(0.014)
	Demographic	0.137	(0.217)	0.135	(0.270)
	Year fixed effect	-0.007	(0.045)	-0.034	(0.054)
Region fixed effect	0.020	(0.047)	-0.020	(0.057)	

Notes: (1) statistics reported are the estimated effects based on the two-fold Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition and the robust standard errors (in parentheses) computed using the delta method; (2) ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively;. (3) Detailed endowment / discrimination effects are grouped into the following dimensions: parent health (MHealthit and FHealthit), parent income (lnincome), parent education (prif, juf, senf, colf, prim, jum, senm, colm), parent employment (farmf, collf, privf, govof, foref, othef, farm, collm, privm, govem, forem, othem), household environment (tap water, flush toilet, community smoking prevalence), access to care (distance to nearest health facility), demographic factors (female, age, age², agef, agem), year fixed effect (y93, y97, y00, y04, y06, y09)and region fixed effect (east, central).

Table 5 Nature-Nurture Interaction in Intergenerational Health Transmission

Variable	income	gworkf	gworkm	eyf	eym	tap	flush	smokep	hfdis
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Urban Sample									
heightf	0.009*** (0.003)	0.012*** (0.002)	0.011*** (0.002)	0.070*** (0.014)	0.101*** (0.014)	0.003* (0.002)	0.007*** (0.002)	-0.001*** (0.000)	0.003 (0.003)
heightm	0.013*** (0.004)	0.005** (0.002)	0.004* (0.002)	0.095*** (0.016)	0.074*** (0.016)	0.004** (0.002)	0.007*** (0.002)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.002 (0.004)
Obs	3,977	3,994	3,997	3,849	3,813	4,031	4,031	4,031	3,830
weightf	0.011*** (0.002)	0.005*** (0.001)	0.004*** (0.001)	0.032*** (0.006)	0.037*** (0.006)	0.003*** (0.001)	0.005*** (0.001)	-0.000** (0.000)	0.000 (0.002)
weightm	0.002 (0.003)	0.001 (0.001)	0.000 (0.001)	-0.003 (0.007)	-0.001 (0.007)	0.001 (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)	0.000** (0.000)	-0.003 (0.002)
Obs	3,921	3,940	3,943	3,792	3,754	3,975	3,975	3,975	3,777
Rural Sample									
heightf	0.012*** (0.002)	0.006*** (0.001)	0.005*** (0.001)	0.054*** (0.010)	0.092*** (0.012)	0.006*** (0.002)	0.005*** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.002 (0.003)
heightm	0.004 (0.004)	0.006*** (0.002)	0.004*** (0.002)	0.028*** (0.016)	0.026** (0.016)	0.005*** (0.002)	0.003** (0.002)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.004)
Obs	10,381	10,385	10,409	10,240	10,127	10,573	10,573	10,573	10,099
weightf	0.009*** (0.001)	0.005*** (0.001)	0.004*** (0.001)	0.019*** (0.004)	0.024*** (0.005)	0.003*** (0.001)	0.005*** (0.001)	-0.000** (0.000)	-0.000 (0.001)
weightm	0.000 (0.002)	0.001* (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.003 (0.004)	0.002 (0.005)	0.002** (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.000 (0.000)	0.002 (0.002)
Obs	10,271	10,278	10,301	10,131	10,017	10,463	10,463	10,463	9,990

Notes: (1) All regressions control for the individual fixed effect. (2) All models contain individual level control variables such as age, age², female, agef, agem, region dummies and year dummies. (3) gworkf and gworkm are dummy variables, indicating if father or mother works in government, SOE or foreign enterprise; eyf and eym are the formal schooling years of father and mother, respectively. (4) ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively; robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

References

- [1]. Adams, P., M. Hurd, D. McFadden, A. Merrill and T. Ribeiro (2003), "Healthy, Wealthy, and Wise? Tests for Direct Causal Paths between Health and Socioeconomic Status", *Journal of Econometrics*, 112, 3-56
- [2]. Adda, J, Chandola, T and Marmot, M (2002), "Socio-Economic Status and Health: Causality and Pathways", *Journal of Econometrics*, 112, 57 - 63
- [3]. Akbulut, M. and A. Kugler (no date), *Intergenerational Transmission of Health Status in the U.S. among Natives and Immigrants*. University of Houston, Department of Economics, mimeo
- [4]. Almond, D. and J. Currie (2010), "Human Capital Development before Age Five", in O. Ashenfelter and D. Card (eds.), *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Volume 4B, 1315-1486
- [5]. Almond, D., L. Edlund, H. Li and J. Zhang (2010), "Long-term Effects of the 1959-61 China Famine: Mainland China and Hong Kong", in T. Ito and A. Rose (eds.), *The Economic Consequences of Demographic Change in East Asia*. University of Chicago Press, 321-350
- [6]. Banzhaf H. and R. Walsh (2008), "Do People Vote with Their Feet? An Empirical Test of Tiebout", *The American Economic Review*, 98, 843
- [7]. Becker, G. and N. Tomes (1979), "An Equilibrium Theory of the Distribution of Income and Intergenerational Mobility", *Journal of Political Economy*, 87, 1153-1189
- [8]. Bhalotra, S. and S. Rawlings (2012), "Gradients of the Intergenerational Transmission of Health in Developing Countries", forthcoming in *Review of Economics and Statistics*
- [9]. Björklund, A., T. Eriksson, M. Jäntti, O. Raaum and E. Österbacka (2002), "Brother Correlations in Earnings in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden Compared to the United States", *Journal of Population Economics*, 15, 757-772
- [10]. Björklund, A. and M. Jäntti (2009), "Intergenerational Mobility and the Role of Family Background", in: W. Salwerda, B. Nolan and T. Smeeding (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Economic Inequality*, 491-521. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- [11]. Björklund, A. and M. Jäntti (2012), "How Important Is Family Background for Labor-Economic Outcomes?", *Labour Economics*, 19, 465-474
- [12]. Björklund, A. and K. Salvanes (2011), "Education and Family Background: Mechanisms and Policies", in: E. Hanushek, S. Machin and L. Voessmann (eds.), *Handbook of Economics of*

Education, Volume 3, 201-247. Amsterdam: Elsevier

- [13]. Black, S. and P. Devereux (2011), "Recent Developments in Intergenerational Mobility", in: O. Ashenfelter and D. Card (eds.), *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Vol. 4, Part B, 1487-1541. New York: Elsevier
- [14]. Blanden, J., P. Gregg and L. Macmillan (2007), "Accounting for Intergenerational Income Persistence: Noncognitive Skills, Ability and Education", *Economic Journal*, 117: C43-60
- [15]. Blinder, A. (1973), "Wage Discrimination: Reduced Form and Structural Variables", *Journal of Human Resources*, 8, 436-455.
- [16]. Bowblis, J., H. Meng, and K. Hyer, (2013) "The Urban-Rural Disparity in Nursing Home Quality Indicators: The Case of Facility-Acquired Contractures", *Health Services Research*, 2, 47-69
- [17]. Bowles, S., H. Gintis and M. Groves (2005), "Introduction", in S. Bowles, S. Gintis and M. Groves (eds.), *Unequal Chances: Family Background and Economic Success*. New York: Russell Sage and Princeton University Press
- [18]. Bowles, S., H. Gintis and M. Osborne (2001), "The Determinants of Earnings: A Behavioral Approach", *Journal of Economic Literature*, 39, 1137-1176
- [19]. Case, A., A. Fertig and C. Paxson (2005), "The Lasting Impact of Childhood Health and Circumstance", *Journal of Health Economics*, 24, 365-389
- [20]. Chay, Kenneth and M. Greenstone (2005), "Does Air Quality Matter? Evidence from the Housing Market", *Journal of Political Economy*, 113, 376-424
- [21]. Chen, Y., and Li, H. (2009), "Mother's Education and Child Health: Is There a Nurturing Effect?", *Journal of Health Economics*, 28, 413-26
- [22]. Chen, Y., Xiaoyan, L. and L. Zhou (2010), *Child Health and the Income Gradient: Evidence from China*, IZA Discussion Paper No. 5182
- [23]. Chen, Y. and L. Zhou (2007), "The Long-Term Health and Economic Consequences of the 1959-1961 Famine in China", *Journal of Health Economics*, 26, 659-681.
- [24]. Corak, M. (2012), "Inequality from Generation to Generation: the United States in Comparison", forthcoming in: R. Rydcroft (ed.), *The Economics of Inequality, Poverty and Discrimination in the 21st Century*. ABC-CLIO
- [25]. Currie, J. (2009), "Healthy, Wealthy, and Wise: Socioeconomic Status, Poor Health in

- Childhood, and Human Capital Development”, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 47, 87-122
- [26]. Currie, J. (2011), “Inequality at Birth: Some Causes and Consequences”, *American Economic Review*, 101, 1-22
- [27]. Currie, J. and E. Moretti (2003), “Mother’s Education And The Intergenerational Transmission of Human Capital: Evidence From College Openings”, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118, 1495-1532
- [28]. Currie, J. and E. Moretti (2007), “Biology as Destiny? Short- and Long-run Determinants of Intergenerational Transmission of Birth Weight”, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 25, 231-264
- [29]. Currie, J. and M. Neidell (2005), “Air Pollution and Infant Health: What Can We Learn From California's Recent Experience?” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120(3), 1003-1030
- [30]. Currie, J. and Rosemary H. (1999), “Is the Impact of Shocks Cushioned by Socioeconomic Status? The Case of Low Birth Weight”, *American Economic Review*, 89, 245–250
- [31]. Currie, J. and T. Vogl (2012), *Early-Life Health and Adult Circumstance in Developing Countries*. NBER WP 18371
- [32]. Cutler, D., A. Lleras-Muney, and T. Vogl (2011), “Socioeconomic Status and Health: Dimensions and Mechanisms”, in S. Glied and P. Smith (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Health Economics*
- [33]. Deaton, A. (2003), “Health, Inequality, and Economic Development”, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 41, 133-158
- [34]. Dohmen, T., A. Falk, D. Huffman and U. Sunde (2012), “The Intergenerational Transmission of Risk and Trust Attitudes”, *Review of Economic Studies*, 79, 1-33
- [35]. Dunn, C. (2007), “The Intergenerational Transmission of Lifetime Earnings: Evidence from Brazil”, *B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 7(2), doi:10.2202/1935-1682.1782
- [36]. Eriksson, T., B. Bratsberg and O. Raaum (2005), *Earnings Persistence across Generations: Transmission through Health?* Memorandum 35/2005, Oslo University, Department of Economics
- [37]. Eriksson, T. and Y. Zhang (2012), “The Role of Family Background for Earnings in Rural China”, *Frontiers of Economics in China*, 7, 466-478
- [38]. Ermisch, J., M. Jäntti and T. Smeeding (eds.) (2012), *From Parents to Children. The Intergenerational Transmission of Advantage*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation

- [39].Gao, J., S. Tang, R. Tolhurst, and K. Rao (2001), “Changing Access to Health Services in Urban China: Implications for Equity”, *Health Policy and Planning*, 16, 302–312
- [40].Gong, C., A. Leigh and X. Meng (2012), “Intergenerational Income Mobility in Urban China”, *Review of Income and Wealth*, 58, 481-503
- [41].Gorgens, T., M. Xin and R. Vaithianathan (2012), “Stunting and Selection Effects of Famine: A Case Study of the Great Chinese Famine”, *Journal of Development Economics*, 97, 99-111
- [42].Grawe, N. (2004), “Intergenerational Mobility for Whom? The Experience of High and Low Earning Sons in International Perspective”, in M. Corak (ed.), *Generational Income Mobility in North America and Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 58-89
- [43].Greene W.H, (2011). *Econometric analysis* (7thed). Prentice Hall.
- [44].Hertz, T., T. Jayasundera, P. Piraino, S. Selcuk, N. Smith and A. Verashchagina (2008), “The Inheritance of Educational Inequality: International Comparisons and Fifty-Year Trends”, *B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 7(2), doi: 10.2202/1935-1682.1775
- [45].Jann B. (2005), *Standard Errors for the Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition*. 3rd Verman Stata Users Group Meeting, Berlin
- [46].Johnson R. and R. Schoeni (2011), “The Influence of Early-Life Events on Human Capital, Health Status, and Labor Market Outcomes over the Life Course.” *The B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 11(3), 3-57
- [47].Lee, L., M. Rosenzweig and M. Pitt (1997), “The Effects of Improved Nutrition, Sanitation, and Water Quality on Child Health in High Mortality Populations.”, *Journal of Econometrics*, 77, 209–35
- [48].Lefgren, L., M. Lindquist and D. Sims (2012), “Rich Dad, Smart Dad: Decomposing the Intergenerational Transmission of Income”, *Journal of Political Economy*, 120, 268-303
- [49].Lien D. and W. Evans (2005), “Estimating the Impact of Large Cigarette Tax Hikes: The Case of Maternal Smoking and Infant Birth Weight.” *Journal of Human Resources*, XL(2), 373-392
- [50].Liu, H., H. Fang and Z. Zhao (2012), *Urban-Rural Disparities of Child Health and Nutritional Status in China from 1989 to 2006*. IZA Discussion Paper No. 6528
- [51].Liu, Y., W. Hsiao and K. Eggleston (1999), “Equity in Health and Health Care: The Chinese Experience”, *Social Science and Medicine*, 41, 1085-1093

- [52].Luo, R., Y. Shi, L. Zhang, C. Liu, S. Rozelle, B. Sharbono, A. Yue, Q. Zhao and R. Martorell (2012), “Nutrition and Educational Performance in Rural China’s Elementary Schools: Results of a Randomized Control Trial in Shaanxi Province”, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 60, 735-772
- [53].Mangyo, E. (2008), “The Effect of Water Accessibility on Child Health in China.”, *Journal of Health Economics*, 27, 1343-56
- [54].Meng, X. and N. Qian (2009), *The Long Term Consequences of Famine of Survivors: Evidence from China’s Great Famine*. NBER WP 14917
- [55].Morduch J., and T. Sicular (2002), “Rethinking Inequality Decomposition, with Evidence from Rural China”, *Economic Journal*, 112, 93-106
- [56].Nilsson, P. (2008) “Does A Pint A Day Affect Your Child's Pay? The Effect of Prenatal Alcohol Exposure on Adult Outcomes”, *Centre for Microdata Methods and Practice Working Paper CWP 22/08*, The Institute for Fiscal Studies
- [57].Oaxaca, R. (1973), “Male-Female Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Markets”, *International Economic Review*, 14, 693-709
- [58].Quheng, D., B. Gustafsson and L. Shi (2012), *Intergenerational Income Persistency in Urban China*. IZA Discussion Paper No. 6907
- [59].Shi, Y., F. Chang, X. Su, R. Luo, L. Zhang and S. Rozelle (2012), “Parental Training, Anemia, and the Impact on the Nutrition of Female Students in China’s Poor Rural Elementary Schools”, *China Agricultural Economic Review*, 4, 151-167
- [60].Strauss J. and D. Thomas (1998), “Health, Nutrition and Economic Development”, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 36, 766-817
- [61].Shi L. and T. Sicular, eds. (2012), *Rising Inequality in China: Public Policy and the Pursuit of a Harmonious Society*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- [62].Solon, G. (1992), “Intergenerational Income Mobility in the United States”, *American Economic Review*, 82, 393-408
- [63].Solon, G. (1999), “Intergenerational Mobility in the Labor Market”, in: O. Ashenfelter and D. Card (eds.), *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Vol. 3, Part A, 1761-1800. New York: Elsevier
- [64].Thomas, D., V. Lavy, J. Strauss (1991), *Public Policy and Anthropometric Outcomes in the Cote d'Ivoire*. Yale - Economic Growth Center.

- [65]. World Health Organization (1995). Physical Status: the Use and Interpretation of Anthropometry. WHO Technical Report Series No.854.
- [66]. Zhang, Y. and T. Eriksson (2010), "Inequality of Opportunity and Income Inequality in Nine Chinese Provinces, 1989-2006", *China Economic Review*, 21, 607-616
- [67]. Zimmermann, D. (1992), "Regression toward Mediocrity in Economic Stature", *American Economic Review*, 82, 409-429