

Komlos, John; Brabec, Marek

Working Paper

The trend of BMI values among US adults

CESifo Working Paper, No. 2987

Provided in Cooperation with:

Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

Suggested Citation: Komlos, John; Brabec, Marek (2010) : The trend of BMI values among US adults, CESifo Working Paper, No. 2987, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/39025>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

The Trend of BMI Values among US Adults

John Komlos
Marek Brabec

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 2987
CATEGORY 3: SOCIAL PROTECTION
MARCH 2010

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- *from the SSRN website:* www.SSRN.com
- *from the RePEc website:* www.RePEc.org
- *from the CESifo website:* www.CESifo-group.org/wp

The Trend of BMI Values among US Adults

Abstract

Background: The trend in the BMI values of the US population has not been estimated accurately because time series data are unavailable and because the focus has been on calculating period effects.

Object: To estimate the trend and rate of change of BMI values by birth cohorts stratified by gender and ethnicity born 1882-1986.

Methods: We use loess additive regression models to estimate age and trend effects of BMI values of US-born black and white adults measured between 1959 and 2006. We use all the NHES and NHANES survey data.

Results: The increase in BMI was already underway among the birth cohorts of the early 20th century. The rate of increase was fastest among black females; for the three other groups under consideration, the rates of increase were similar. The generally persistent upward trend was punctuated by upsurges, particularly after each of the two World Wars. That the estimated rate of change of BMI values increased by 71% among black females between the birth cohorts 1955 and those of 1965 is indicative of the rapid increases in their weight.

Conclusion: We infer that transition to post-industrial weights was a gradual process and began considerably earlier than hitherto supposed.

JEL-Code: I10, N00.

Keywords: BMI, US, NHANES, obesity, overweight, semiparametric modeling.

John Komlos
Department of Economics
University of Munich
Ludwigstrasse 33/IV
Germany - 80539 Munich
John.Komlos@gmx.de

Marek Brabec
Department of Nonlinear Modeling
Institute of Computer Science
Pod Vodárenskou vřží 2
Czech Republic - 182 07 Prague 8
mbrabec@cs.cas.cz

Introduction

While descriptive statistics pertaining to the increasing prevalence of obesity among the US population have been extensively reported (Ogden et al., 2004, 2008; Flegal et al., 1998), the long-run trend in BMI values has yet to be identified convincingly. The extant studies tend to imply that the epidemic appeared suddenly, but tend to be imprecise on its beginnings. Troiano and Flegal (1998) reflect the mainstream view well in suggesting that, “Overweight prevalence increased over time, with the largest increase between NHANES II and NHANES III,” surveys, that is to say, in the 1980s (Anderson et al., 2003; Rashad et al., 2006).¹ Moreover, as dozens of studies, Ogden et al. (2006) point out that, “between 1980 and 2002, obesity prevalence doubled in adults aged 20 years or older.”² In short, the emphasis has been on the 1980s as a pivotal point in the history of the obesity epidemic.

To be sure, there are some indications that the roots of the obesity pandemic do reach further back in time than the 1980s (Carson, 2009, Cuff, 1993; Coclanis and Komlos, 1995; Komlos, 1987). Flegal et al. (2002, p. 1724) suggest that recent developments “may also be viewed as part of a longer-term trend for increases in body size in affluent and well-nourished societies.” They infer from the first national survey that the epidemic must have begun earlier than the common wisdom supposes: “Even as long ago as 1960, almost 50% of men and more than 40% of women were overweight, and 11% of men and 16% of women were obese (p. 1727, Carson 2009).” Nonetheless, in our view such snapshots hardly permit an unambiguous depiction of trends.³

However, note that all these studies refer to period effects (measurement years) and overlook birth-cohort effects. Insofar as it is not at all clear from the cross-sectional evidence when the measured weight status was reached, the focus on period effects does not lead to convincing trend estimates. Weight gains could have accumulated at anytime between birth

and measurement. To be sure, current BMI values reflect current nutritional status, but the current level may have been reached prior to measurement and then retained unchanged. In fact, it could have been acquired at an early age (in terms of z-score), putting the individual on a trajectory that led to her current status.

In contrast to the consensus in the literature, we estimate trends by birth cohorts, because BMI at the time of measurement reflects the cumulative weight gains during the life course. After all, birth cohorts experienced similar social, economic, and technological changes; this cannot be said of measurement cohorts. For example, those measured in 1960 have been exposed to television viewing for different lengths of time during their lives. In contrast, all those born in 1960 have had access to TV viewing all their lives, regardless of when they were measured. Another reason to consider birth cohorts is that life-style habits and weight status acquired early in childhood tend to persist into adulthood (Freedman et al., 2005).

Actually, one can consider period effects as the upper bound for the time when the weight gains occurred, whereas birth-cohort effects provide the lower bound. Thus, neither approach can be considered to be superior to the other. In the absence of longitudinal data, that is to say, with cross sectional data sets such as the ones we are about to analyse, both approaches have a legitimate place in scientific inquiry, even if neither approach is fully specified because of collinearity (period – age = cohort). However, a considerable technical advantage of the birth-cohort approach is that instead of having only 5 data points from the cross-sectional surveys (1959-2006), from which merely 4 differences can be calculated, we obtain data continuously for the 104 years from 1882-1986.⁴ Furthermore, the birth-cohort approach also enables us to calculate the annual rate of change of BMI values, whereas the period-effect approach does not.

However, several studies broke new ground recently in the analysis of obesity trends. Burkhauser, Cawley, and Schmeiser (2009) analyzed an alternative measure of obesity (skin-fold thickness) and infer that an increase in obesity is already evident among cohorts measured in the 1970s, that is to say, earlier than generally supposed. Komlos et al. (2009, p. 158) using birth cohorts to analyze trends in children's BMI values, go further, concluding that "it appears highly unlikely that the obesity pandemic appeared suddenly in the 1980s among American children as conventional analysis would suggest...but has rather manifested itself slowly and persistently for an extended period of time beginning at least ...in the 1950s, but possibly earlier." This conclusion is in line with the fact that many of the technological and life-style innovations that are frequently associated with an obesogenic environment -- fast-food restaurants, automobiles, TV, radio, and labor-saving household devices -- predated the 1980s, in some cases by many decades.

In addition to the period trends reported up to now, and the cohort trends about to be estimated, a third approach to the analyses is the age-period-cohort models (Hobcraft, Menken, Preston 1982; Holford, 1992). This class of models attempt to solve the problem of collinearity (as age, period, and cohort are linearly related: $\text{period} - \text{age} = \text{birth cohort}$). Reither et al. (2009) use such a model on data from the National Health Interview Surveys. They "demonstrate that both secular change and birth cohort membership have independently contributed to elevated odds of obesity." Their study differs from ours in several ways: a) they analyze obesity while we analyze mean BMI values; b) in order to decompose the trend into a period and cohort effects in spite of the identification problem and the concomitant collinearity they need to make several crucial assumptions, the plausibility of which is difficult to ascertain independently. It is not clear the extent to which their results are sensitive to these assumptions; c) they use a sample that relies on self-reported weight and height, while we use

measured values. Although they adjust for the inaccuracies associated with such data by increasing BMI values by about 1 unit, the possibility that errors remain cannot be ruled out. This is particularly the case, because the extent of mis-reporting varies by education, and because their dependent variable is dichotomous, namely individuals with BMI>30. Consequently, errors in the individual BMI values can lead to mis-classification of individuals into the obese/non-obese category. Another example of such models is provided by Sassi et al. (2009). They also use the same data set as Reither et al. (2009) and arrive at similar conclusions, without, however, controlling for race or correcting for the fact that the data are self-reported.

We do not use an APC (Age, Period, Cohort) model because we have little faith in their validity. It is not clear which one we should choose (frequentist or Bayesian), and with no guarantee that their results would be consistent. The Bayesian approach tries to solve the indeterminacy in the data by imposing prior assumptions on the model which appears somewhat arbitrary (the validity of the conditions remains an open question). We prefer the simpler approach we employ here – cohort effects share an attribute with period effects in that they provide an accurate bound estimate of the trend in BMI values (lower and upper bounds respectively). Thus, our main goal is to fill a lacunae in the literature by estimating the lower bound trend, i.e., trends of the BMI values by birth cohorts of US adults stratified by gender and ethnicity in greater detail and somewhat more convincingly than has been done up to now. A considerable advantage of this approach is that it enables us to calculate the rate of change of the trend.

Data and Method

We estimate for the first time the long-term trends in the BMI values (kg/m^2) of adults continuously for the birth cohorts 1882-1986 stratified by gender and ethnicity on the basis of

surveys collected between 1959 and 2006 by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). We concatenate all the National Health Examination and National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys.⁵ We recalculate the survey weights provided in the data sets according to the formula given in Korn and Graubard (1999)⁶ and use these weights throughout the analysis. We limit the analysis to US-born adults - those above the age of 19 - (white male, white female, black male, and black female are fitted separately). In order to ensure comparability over time and to reduce uncontrolled heterogeneity⁷ (Rosenbaum 2005) (through immigration, for example) we confine our analysis to non-Hispanic blacks and non-Hispanic whites. (Henceforth, we drop the designation non-Hispanic for the sake of brevity.) (N =4976 Black Women, 14,083 white women, 4,135 black men, and 12,651 white men).⁸

We estimate the following additive semi-parametric loess models, which enable us to estimate the shape of the trend flexibly by the data, rather than determining it ex ante:⁹

$$(1) \text{BMI}_{ik} = \mu_k + lo_k(\text{Age}_{ik}) + lo_k(\text{Birth_yr}_{ik}) + lo_k(\text{PIR}_{ik}) + \sum_{m=1}^3 \alpha_m(E_{imk}) + \varepsilon_{ik}$$

where: BMI_{ik} is the BMI value for the i -th individual of k -th stratum ($k=1, 2, 3, 4$

corresponding to white males, white females, black males, and black females). $lo_k(\cdot)$ is the smooth nonparametric term (Wood, 2006). It is estimated by (locally linear) loess, for each stratum separately via backfitting algorithm (as is usual in the context of GAM, or generalized additive models, Hastie and Tibshirani, 1990; Wood, 2006). Actual fitting was done in R.¹⁰ PIR is the poverty-income ratio¹¹ (Fisher, 1992). E_{imk} is the level of education in three categories: without a high-school degree, with a high-school degree, and with some college education.

ε_{ik} is a random term with zero mean and variance given by survey weights (as their reciprocals).¹²

Admittedly, there is a limitation to estimating trends by birth cohorts, insofar as ages are

not evenly distributed during the period considered. At the beginning of the period we have only older ages in the sample, while toward the end we have mainly younger adults. In other words, cohort and age effects are correlated, making attempts to attribute changes to one or the other variables fragile. This sample composition implies that we should consider the estimates particularly at the ends as preliminary, and subject to revision as more data become available. Furthermore, this hurdle prevents us from testing for interaction effects.

Nonetheless, we have chosen to include these observations at the beginning and end of the period under consideration insofar as they do enable us to provide some conjectures regarding past and future developments. Our reference to dates pertain to dates of birth rather than to dates of measurement.

Results

We estimated model (1) after selecting it among several possibilities based on crossvalidation optimization (with respect to the span parameter) and checked its performance using residual analysis and 1000 bootstrap resamples (each having the same number of observations as the original data set).¹³ We report the estimated functions of eq. (1) graphically (calibrating the levels for a person of age 50 with a high-school degree and PIR value of 2). For some of the estimated functions we also report their annual rate of change.¹⁴

The trend of increasing BMI values, which began among those born in the late-19th and early-20th centuries, has been most rapid among black females (Figure 1) throughout the century. We calculate the derivative of the BMI function in Figure 1 to obtain Figure 2. The results indicate a quite synchronous acceleration after World War I among three of the four groups considered. Black females are the exception whose BMI values was already

increasing more rapidly than that of the other three groups even at the beginning of the period considered. The upswing among black females, which began somewhat later (in the late 1920s), was smaller and shorter, but their rate of change remained above that of the other three groups throughout the century. Moreover, the rapid increase in the rate of change tended to be temporary and was reversed during the Great Depression and World War II. However, the reversal was also delayed among black women. During the war the rate of change was only slightly above zero among men, both black and white. However, among women, both white and black, the rate of change remained at about 0.1 and 0.14 points per annum, even during the war. A decade after the end of the war, black BMI values began to accelerate extremely rapidly. Among black females the rate of change of BMI values increased from circa 0.14 points per annum in 1955 to circa 0.24 points by 1965 (a 71% jump), while among black men it almost quadrupled, from about 0.04 points per annum c. 1950 to 0.15 in 1965. However, by c. 1965-1970 the rate of change leveled off in all groups although among black females the level was at an extremely high level of 0.25 points; in fact, the only further change in BMI values was a decline among black men (Figure 2).

Figures 1 and 2 about here

The age effects are quite substantial, and are largest among black females (Figure 3). The peak is reached near age 60-70 in all four groups; after that a decline is evident except among black males, whose BMI values stagnate after reaching a plateau.¹⁵ The income (PIR) effects differ the most among the four groups (Figure 4). Black females in the low- and medium-income ranges are the heaviest group, but a rapid weight decline accompanies an increase in income. The BMI values of white males increases to about a PIR value of 3 or so and then declines somewhat. The BMI of black males differs from that of white males only in that, after having reached a PIR value of about 3, it does not decline. Among white females,

9

the BMI value decreases from the very beginning of the income range, but not linearly. Lastly, the education effect is small and not as anticipated: BMI does not decline systematically with level of educational attainment (Figure 5). The possible reason is that these effects are net of income.

Figures 3 - 5 about here

Iso-BMI lines depict combinations of age and birth cohorts with a constant BMI value at increments of one unit (Figure 6). Their advantage is that they enable us to see simultaneously the effect of two of the independent variables on BMI, rather than only one of them as in the other figures. We note that both age and cohort effects are important even if the latter appear to be more influential. For instance, a 30-year-old black women born in 1920 had a BMI value of 21, whereas by about 1940 this would become the BMI value of a 20-year-old. A comparison of white and black women's contour maps indicates that the "hill of obesity" is much steeper among the latter as the closer are the lines the more rapidly do the BMI values rise. One also notes the substantial differences in the age effects. Thus, such two-dimensional contour maps do provide visual insights that are not easily gained by one dimensional ones.

Figures 6 and 7 about here

In an alternate specification (as a sensitivity analysis) we divide the white male sample into two groups, in order to estimate eq. (1) separately for those who were born before and those who were born after 1940. We report only the graph for the estimated time trend, which indicates that the degree of difference between the two models is not substantial (Figure 8). The estimate of the function is shifted up slightly after 1940. The only major difference appears in the period prior to 1900: the second model estimates constant BMI values for

those two decades.

Figure 8 about here

Discussion

Our primary goal has been to estimate long-run trends in mean BMI values of US adults by birth cohorts between 1882 and 1986 stratified into four ethnic and gender groups (net of age effects).¹⁶ This is the first analysis of BMI trends in which all the NHANES samples have been concatenated, thereby providing a long-range perspective by birth cohort. The NHANES BMI data are the most accurate insofar as they are based on measured values rather than self reported ones as in most other surveys.

The lack of longitudinal data renders the determination of the secular trend in BMI values rather difficult. The lack of clear idea of when the obesity epidemic began renders the analysis of its causes challenging. The disadvantage of cross-sectional data is that a person's weight at a point in time, does not reveal when that weight was reached. Insofar as current BMI is a cumulative measure of weight gains from birth to date of measurement, period effects arguably provide an upper bound for the time when the current weight was reached, whereas birth-cohort effects provide a lower bound insofar as the weight status could have been reached at any time between birth and measurement. Just when the weight gains actually occurred during the life cycle, however, remains uncertain. So far research has concentrated on the (upper bound) period effects. Our aim has been to fill the lacunae in the literature by estimating the (lower bound) birth cohort trends.

Our birth-cohort approach indicates that the transition to a post-industrial BMI values occurred gradually throughout the 20th century and possibly started much earlier than hitherto supposed, with black women outpacing the other three groups from the very beginning (Figures 1 and 2). However, the rate of change in BMI values was anything but continuous.

Rather, the general upward trend was punctuated by upsurges, particularly after each of the two World Wars. The birth cohorts of the 1920s experienced a rapid increase in BMI values. Notably, this generation was among the first to experience the introduction of radio broadcasting and the rapid spread of automobiles. During the Great Depression and World War II, however, the rate of increase decelerated and reached almost zero among men, both black and white. Indicative of the rapid increases after the war, in striking contrast, among black females the rate of change in BMI values increased by 71% between 1955 and 1965, while among black men it nearly quadrupled between ca. 1950 and 1965. However, by circa 1965-70 the rate of change reached a plateau, although among black women the plateau was at a very high level of 0.25. The only subsequent change was a decline in BMI values among black men (Figure 2).¹⁷

The limitation of our study is that we do not control for period effects. However, similar limitations apply to all studies published hitherto which calculated trends using measurement years, i.e., period effects: they failed to control for birth cohort effects. To be sure, some researchers recently have become aware of this issue and explore birth cohort effects of the obesity epidemic using an alternative statistical strategy, by attempting to decompose age, period, and cohort (APC) effects. However, this approach is based on hard-to-verify assumptions. In this sense, the decomposition of (originally perfectly collinear) the three effects comes at a relatively large price. This well-known problem is particularly acute for the NHANES data sets under scrutiny on account of the fact that not all combinations of birth year and age are available. Therefore, we do not attempt to produce APC decomposition in which we do not place sufficient trust to begin with.

Sassi et al. (2009) and Reither et al. (2009) estimate such period-age-cohort models. In spite of the considerable differences in estimation techniques employed, as noted in the

introduction, and in the different data set used, there are several similarities between their results and ours. Both studies also find that cohort effects were substantial although they infer that their significance declined during the first half of the 20th century. Reither et al. find that birth cohort effects of the probability of obesity increased after 1955, and that they were particularly rapid among black women, increasing by some 62% between the birth cohorts of 1955 and 1975. However, there were differences as well. They find that overall period effects were more important than cohort effects: they “are principally responsible for the obesity epidemic in the U.S. population.”

Sassi et al. (2009) do not stratify their results by ethnicity or gender. Nonetheless, they are in agreement with the latter study in that they also argue that cohort effects of obesity were declining in the first half of the 20th century (p. 24) without providing a convincing explanation for this finding. They also find an upturn in the cohort effects but slightly later than Reither et al. (2009) do. Sassi et al. also analyse trends in overweight (Reither et al. do not) and find that the cohort effects have a similar trend to that of obesity with the difference that the upswing of the early 1960s is much attenuated. However, we do not learn how sensitive their results are to the various assumptions made.

Our study, its limitations notwithstanding, demonstrates in the least that the widespread belief that the American obesity pandemic appeared suddenly in the 1980s is based on weak evidential basis and on its surface rather implausible. Rather, our analysis indicates that the transition manifested itself gradually though persistently over an extended period of time, beginning among those born immediately after the First World War. Thus, the transition to a post-industrial lifestyle and the associated increases in BMI values may well have spanned the entire 20th century. The rate of change in the BMI values was punctuated by upsurges among the 1920s birth cohort as well as among the generation born watching

television.

Evidently the BMI values of all four (gender/ethnic) groups considered here accelerated in the 1920s as well as in the 1950s, at the time when calorie-saving technological changes were most obvious. Of course, changes in dietary habits including the anchoring of a fast-food culture in the social fabric reinforced and greatly acerbated the trend toward increasing weight. The decade of the 1950s is particularly noteworthy, for the acceleration in BMI values of US children and adolescents during this decade accompanied the introduction and rapid spread of television and of fast food culture¹⁸ (Chou et al., 2004, 2008; Komlos et al., 2009, Powell et al., 2007).

Identifying the causes of this long-run trend are outside of the scope of this study, but we do note that the “creeping” nature of the epidemic, as well as its persistence, does suggest that its roots have been embedded deep in the social fabric and are nourished by a network of disparate sources, slowly changing as the 20th-century US population responded to a vast irresistible impersonal socio-economic and technological forces. The most obviously persistent among these were the major labor-saving technological changes of the 20th century, chiefly the industrial processing of food and with it the spread of fast-food eateries and the associated culture of consumption, the rise of an automobile-based way of life, the introduction of radio and television broadcasting,¹⁹ the increasing participation of women in the work force, and the IT revolution which taken together virtually defined American society in the 20th-century (Anderson, Butcher, and Levine, 2003; Bleich et al., 2008; Cutler, Glaeser, and Shapiro, 2003; Lakdawalla, Philipson, and Bhattacharya, 2005; Lakdawalla, Philipson, 2009; Philipson and Posner, 2008; Popkin, 2004). The decline in the rate of increase in BMI values during the Great Depression of the 1930s and World War II reflects the decline in income which slowed the adoption of the labor saving technologies and must have induced

people to eat less often away from home.

Moreover, psychological aspects of what has been called "the age of Milton Friedman" (Shleifer, 2009), featuring an increase in income inequality and a decrease in economic safety nets, put additional stress on the population that was conducive to weight gain (Ulijaszek and Offer, 2009). To make matters worse, government policy favored corporations over the public interest implying that consumer protection was limited (Ruskin and Schor, 2005). The food industry spent trillions to convince people to consume and there was insufficient countervailing power to offset this psychological program. Combined with increasing affluence, a sedentary lifestyle, changes in dietary habits that included eating more outside of the home and eating unhealthy foods such as snacks, multitasking that meant eating ready-made food while watching television, these developments reinforced one another and led to the cultural transformation associated with the post-industrial nutritional revolution (Cutler et al., 2003; Hamermesh, 2010, Philipson and Posner, 2003, 2008; Lin et al., 2001). For example, the share of total food expenditures spent on eating outside of the home increased from 24% in 1950 to 45% in 1995 (Offer 2001, 2006, pp. 147, 149; Guthrie et al., 2002).²⁰

As the BMI values of the four ethnic/gender groups considered here are distinct from one another to some extent, so too the technological, dietary, and lifestyle changes enumerated above seem to have had distinctly different effects on each of the four groups. The reasons for these differences are outside of the scope of the current study as is the deep analysis of the causes of the trend. While the early increases in BMI probably brought about an improvement in biological well-being for a large portion of the population, the rapid increases after the Second World War soon raised too many BMI values into the danger zone.


Insofar as BMI values have been increasing gradually over a century, researchers

attempting to understand the causes of the pandemic need to redirect their focus from the 1980s and thereafter to much longer run processes of social, technological, economic and cultural change. The finding also implies that policies to attenuate or reverse the trend will have to reach deep into the social fabric and take into consideration that such socio-economic forces generally change at glacial pace.

Acknowledgement

The work was partly supported by the Institutional Research Plan of the Czech Republic AV0Z10300504 'Computer Science for the Information Society: Models, Algorithms, Applications'.

Figure 1. Trend of BMI values by birth cohorts of US-born White and Black Adults



Note: Calibrated at PIR = 2 for those with a High School Diploma born in 1950.

Figure 2. Rate of Change of BMI Values by birth cohort in Figure 1.





Figure 3. BMI Values by Age of US-born White and Black Adults



Note: Calibrated at PIR = 2 for those with a High School Diploma born in 1950.

Figure 4. BMI values by PIR of US-born White and Black Adults




Figure 5. BMI values by level of Education of US-born White and Black Adults




Figure 6. Iso-BMI lines for given age birth cohort combinations, White Females.




Figure 7. Iso-BMI lines for given age birth cohort combinations, Black Women





Figure 8. Trend of of BMI values of White Men estimated separately for before and after 1940 birth cohorts



References

- Anderson PM, Butcher KF, Levine PB. 2003. Economic Perspectives on childhood obesity. *Econ Perspec* (Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago), 3:30-48.
- Bleich S, Cutler D, Murray C, Adams A. 2008. Why is the Developed World Obese?. *Annual Rev of Public Health* 29:273-295.
- Burkhauser RV, Cawley J, Schmeiser MD. 2009. The Timing of the Rise in U.S. Obesity Varies With Measure of Fatness. *Economics and Human Biology* 7:307-318.
- Carson SA. 2009. Racial differences in body mass indices of men imprisoned in 19th century Texas. *Economics and Human Biology* 7: 121-127.
- Chou SY, Grossman M, Saffer H. 2004. An economic analysis of adult obesity: results from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System. *Journal of Health Economics* 23:565-587.
- Chou SY, Rashad I, Grossman M. 2008. Fast-Food Restaurant Advertising on Television and Its Influence on Childhood Obesity. *Journal of Law and Economics* 51:599-618.
- Cleveland WS. 1979. Robust Locally Weighted Regression and Smoothing Scatterplots. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 74:829-836.
- Cleveland WS, Devlin SJ. 1988. Locally Weighted Regression: An Approach to Regression Analysis by Local Fitting. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 83:596-610.
- Coclanis P, Komlos J. 1995. Nutrition and Economic Development in Post-

Reconstruction South Carolina: an Anthropometric Approach. *Soc Sci Hist* 19:91-116.

Cuff T. 1993. The Body Mass Index Values of Mid-Nineteenth-Century West Point Cadets: A Theoretical Application of Waaler's Curves to a Historical Population. *Hist Meth* 26:171-82.

Cutler DM, Glaeser EL, Shapiro JM. 2003. Why Have Americans Become More Obese?. *J of Econ Perspectives* 17:93-118.

Fisher, GM. 1992. The development and history of the poverty thresholds. *Soc Sec Bull* 55:3-14.

Flegal KM, Carroll M, Ogden C, Johnson C. 2002. Prevalence and Trends in Obesity Among US Adults, 1999-2000. *J of the Am Med Ass* 288: 1723-27.

Flegal, KM, Carroll M, Kuczmarski RJ, Johnson C. 1998. Overweight and obesity in the United States: prevalence and trends, 1960-1994. *Int J of Obesity* 22:39-47.

Freedman DS, Khan LK, Serdula MK, Dietz WH, Srinivasan SR, Berenson G. 2005. The relation of childhood BMI to adult adiposity: the Bogalusa Heart Study. *Pediatrics* 115:22-27.

Guthrie J, Lin Biing-Hwan, Brazao E. 2002. Role of Food Prepared Away from Home in the American Diet, 1977-78 versus 1994-96: Changes and Consequences. *J. of Nutrition Education and Behavior* 34:140-150.

Hamermesh D. 2010. Incentives, time use and BMI: The roles of eating, grazing and goods. *Econ and Hum Biol* 8:2-15.

Hastie T, Tibshirani RM. 1990. Generalized additive models. Chapman and Hall. London.

Helmchen LA, Henderson R. 2004. Changes in the distribution of body mass index of white US men, 1890–2000. *Ann of Hum Biol* 31:174–181.

Hobcraft J, Menken J, Preston S. 1982. Age, period, and cohort effects in demography: a review. *Pop Index* 48(1): 4-43.

Holford TR. 1992. Analysing the temporal effects of age, period and cohort. *Stat Meth Medical Research* 1:317-37.

Komlos J. 1987. The Height and Weight of West Point Cadets: Dietary Change in Antebellum America. *J of Econ Hist* 47: 897-927.

Komlos J, Baur M. 2004. From the Tallest to (One of) the Fattest: The Enigmatic Fate of the Size of the American Population in the Twentieth Century. *Econ and Hum Biol* 2:57-74.

Komlos, J, Breitfelder A, Sunder M. 2009. The transition to post-industrial BMI values among US children. *Am J of Hum Biol* 21:151-160.

Korn EL, Graubard BI. 1999. *Analysis of Health Surveys*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Lakdawalla D, Philipson T, Bhattacharya J. 2005. Welfare-Enhancing Technological Change and the Growth of Obesity. *Am Econ Rev* 95:253–257.

Lakdawalla D, Philipson T. 2009. The growth of obesity and technological change. *Econ and Hum Biol*. 7: 283-293.

Lin Biing-Hwan, Guthrie J, Frazao E. 2001. American Children's Diets not Making the Grade. *Food Review* 24:8-17.

Norton K, Dollman J, Martin M, Harten N. 2006. Descriptive epidemiology of childhood overweight and obesity in Australia: 1901-2003. *Int J of Pediatric Obesity* 1:232-238.

Offer A. 2001. Body-Weight and Self-Control in the USA and Britain since the 1950s. *Soc Hist of Medicine* 14:79-106.

Offer A. 2001. *The Challenge of Affluence: Self-control and Well-being in the USA and Britain since 1950*. Oxford University Press.

Ogden CL, Carroll MD, McDowell MA, Flegal KM. 2007. Obesity among adults in the United States -- no change since 2003-2004. *NCHS Data Brief no 1*: 1-8.

Ogden CL, Carroll MD, Curtin LR, McDowell MA, Tabak CJ, Flegal KM. 2006. Prevalence of overweight and obesity in the United States, 1999-2004. *J of the Am Med Ass* 295:1549-1555.

Ogden CL, Carroll MD, Flegal KM. 2008. High Body Mass Index for Age Among US Children and Adolescents, 2003-2006. *J of the Am Med Ass* 299:2401-2405.

Ogden CL, Fryar CD, Carroll MD, Flegal M. 2004. Mean Body Weight, Height and Body Mass Index, United States 1960-2002. *Advance Data from Vital and Health Statistics*, No. 347, October 27, US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control for Health Statistics.

Philipson T, Posner, R. 2003. The Long Run Growth of Obesity as a Function of Technological Change. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 46:87-108.

Philipson T, Posner, R. 2008. Is the Obesity Epidemic a Public Health Problem? A Decade of Research on the Economics of Obesity. NBER Working Paper 14010.

Popkin BM. 2004. The Nutrition Transition: Worldwide Obesity Dynamics and Their Determinants. *Int J of Obesity* 28:S2-S9.

Powell LM, Szczypka G, Chaloupka FJ, Braunschweig CL. 2007. Nutritional Content of Television Food Advertisements Seen by Children and Adolescents in the United States. *Pediatrics* 120:576-583.

Rashad I, Grossman M, Shin-Yi Chou. 2006. *The Super Size of America: An Economic*

Estimation of Body Mass Index and Obesity in Adults. *Eastern Econ J* 32:133-148.

Reither EN, Hauser RM, Yang Y. 2009. Do Birth cohorts matter? Age-period-cohort analyses of the obesity epidemic in the United States. *Soc Sci & Med* 69:1439-1448.

Roelants M, Hauspie R, Hoppenbrouwers K. 2009. References for growth and pubertal development from birth to 21 years in Flanders, Belgium. *Ann of Hum Biol* 36:680-694.

Rosenbaum PR. 2005. Heterogeneity and Causality: Unit Heterogeneity and Design Sensitivity in Observational Studies. *The Am Statistician* 59: 147–152.

Sassi F, Devaux M, Cecchini M, Rusticelli E. 2009. The obesity epidemic: analysis of past and projected future trends in Selected OECD countries. *OECD Health Working Papers* No. 45.

Shleifer A. 2009. The Age of Milton Friedman. *J of Econ Literature* 47: 123–135.

Sunder M. 2004. The height of Tennessee convicts: another piece of the “antebellum puzzle. *Econ and Hum Biol* 2:75-86.

Troiano RP, Flegal KM. 1998. Overweight Children and Adolescents: Description, Epidemiology, and Demographics. *Pediatrics* 101:S497-504.

Offer A, Ulijaszek S. 2009. Obesity: the welfare regime hypothesis. Workshop 27/28 November 2009, University of Oxford.

Wood SN. 2006. *Generalized additive models: an introduction with R*. Chapman Hall, CRC Press.

Yatchew A. 1998. *Nonparametric regression techniques in economics*. *J of Econ Lite* 36:669-721.

Endnotes

¹ The upswing in excess weight is said to have begun in Australia in the 1970s (Norton et al.,

2006).

² See also http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/hestat/overweight/overweight_adult.htm.

³ It is also seldom mentioned that the BMI values in the US are among the highest in the developed world (Komlos and Baur 2004).

⁴ NHANES Continuous is counted in this regard as one survey insofar as the number of observations 1999-2006 is similar to that of NHANES III.

⁵ National Health Examination Surveys: (NHES I: 1959-62, and the National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys: (NHANES I: 1970-75, NHANES II: 1976-80, NHANES III: 1988-94, and Current NHANES 1999-2006). Heights and weights in the surveys are actual measurements. Four surveys were conducted between 1959 and 1994 and another 4 between 1999 and 2006. Because the latter 4, composing the Current NHANES, were so close in time and because the number of observations are we consider the Current NHANES as one survey, making a total of 5 effective surveys.

⁶ The survey weights were recalculated separately for the four ethnic/gender combinations using formula 8.2-4 (p. 282).

⁷ The US-born criterion cannot be applied to NHES I. For NHES II and III we assume that those with a birth certificate were US-born. Information on Hispanic ethnicity is available only for NHANES III and Current NHANES. Lack of information in earlier surveys does not constitute a major problem, though, inasmuch as Hispanics were not oversampled before NHANES III.

⁸ About 4-5% of individuals with missing values are excluded from the analysis.

⁹ Hence, there is no need to assume, for example, that the BMI values increased linearly or as a polynomial (Yatchew, 1998). The loess smoother is not fully determined, as the span has

to be set. The larger the span, the smoother the fit and vice versa, as in kernel smoothing. In fact, the span determines how many of nearest points are used in smoothing a particular observation, as a proportion of the sample size. The span was optimized over a set of discrete values via crossvalidation. Crossvalidation uses sums of squared residuals obtained from model fitted without an observation in question across all observations. The optimum span is 0.45, close to the default value of 0.5 provided in R. (Cleveland, 1979; Cleveland and Devlin, 1988). The same span was used for all of the estimates. We use the Akaika information criterion for model selection. AIC works better with GAM than does such alternatives as Nagelkerke's coefficient of determination. We also do bootstrapped estimation of confidence intervals (pointwise), although we do not report these for lack of space.

¹⁰ (<http://cran.at.r-project.org/>), using the GAM package written by T. Hastie. GAM models have been used extensively in biology as a search in the *pub med* data base reveals. See, for example, Reolants, Hauspie and Hoppenbrouwers (2009). However, we were not able to find any publications that used GAM to estimate BMI trends.

¹¹ Admittedly PIR is not a perfect measure of real income insofar as it, for example, does not control for regional variation in housing prices and does not include such government transfers as food stamps. Nonetheless, it does control for household size and for inflation.

¹² We proceed as if it were distributed normally, without actually insisting on its normality. This leads to quasi-likelihood estimation (or generalized estimation equation).

¹³ Residual RMSE was 4.6, 5.7, 5.7 and 7.3 for white male, white female, black male and black female strata, respectively. To be sure, the way we bootstrapped the data leads to a slight underestimation of the variability. In particular, in the bootstrap process, we took into consideration the survey weights, i.e. heteroscedastic variances, but not the correlations

implied by the hierarchical, that is to say, the complex survey design. We believe that the major features of the standard error are captured by our bootstrap procedure and hence that its results are suitable for the visual appreciation of the magnitude of the estimation error.

¹⁴ We also estimated the model without the PIR and education effects to find that the difference in the results from the ones reported here is inconsequential. Hence, these are not included here for lack of space.

¹⁵ In order to obtain a notion of the accuracy of the estimates, note that the bootstrapped estimates of the confidence interval was about 0.3 BMI points at age 30. We do not report these for the lack of space.

¹⁶ Although we control for income and education in the results reported above, we also did the analysis without these variables and found only minor changes in the results. We do not report these results for lack of space.

¹⁷ Ogden et al. (2007, 2008) have also noted that BMI values have not changed significantly in the most recent surveys.

¹⁸ To illustrate the spread of fast food culture consider that White Castle, the first drive-in restaurant, was founded in 1921. McDonald started operation in the late 1940s, Kentucky Fried Chicken in 1952, Burger King in 1954, Pizza Hut in 1958, Taco Bell in 1962, and Subway in 1962.

¹⁹ Television viewing has an additional effect because food and drink commercials increase food and drink consumption, and therefore obesity rates (Chou et al., 2007; Powell et al., 2007).

²⁰ “The per-capita number of fast-food restaurants doubled between 1972 and 1997” (Chou et al., 2004, 568), and the calories available for consumption increased by some 20% in the

late 1980s and 1990s. In turn, the consumption of high-calorie foods was associated with the increase in the number of hours worked by mothers (Anderson, Butcher and Levine, 2003).

CESifo Working Paper Series

for full list see www.cesifo-group.org/wp

(address: Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany, office@cesifo.de)

- 2925 Erkki Koskela and Jan König, Profit Sharing, Wage Formation and Flexible Outsourcing under Labor Market Imperfection, January 2010
- 2926 Gabriella Legrenzi and Costas Milas, Spend-and-Tax Adjustments and the Sustainability of the Government's Intertemporal Budget Constraint, January 2010
- 2927 Piero Gottardi, Jean Marc Tallon and Paolo Ghirardato, Flexible Contracts, January 2010
- 2928 Gebhard Kirchgässner and Jürgen Wolters, The Role of Monetary Aggregates in the Policy Analysis of the Swiss National Bank, January 2010
- 2929 J. Trent Alexander, Michael Davern and Betsey Stevenson, Inaccurate Age and Sex Data in the Census PUMS Files: Evidence and Implications, January 2010
- 2930 Stefan Krasa and Mattias K. Polborn, Competition between Specialized Candidates, January 2010
- 2931 Yin-Wong Cheung and Xingwang Qian, Capital Flight: China's Experience, January 2010
- 2932 Thomas Hemmelgarn and Gaetan Nicodeme, The 2008 Financial Crisis and Taxation Policy, January 2010
- 2933 Marco Faravelli, Oliver Kirchkamp and Helmut Rainer, Social Welfare versus Inequality Concerns in an Incomplete Contract Experiment, January 2010
- 2934 Mohamed El Hedi Arouri and Christophe Rault, Oil Prices and Stock Markets: What Drives what in the Gulf Corporation Council Countries?, January 2010
- 2935 Wolfgang Lechthaler, Christian Merkl and Dennis J. Snower, Monetary Persistence and the Labor Market: A New Perspective, January 2010
- 2936 Klaus Abberger and Wolfgang Nierhaus, Markov-Switching and the Ifo Business Climate: The Ifo Business Cycle Traffic Lights, January 2010
- 2937 Mark Armstrong and Steffen Huck, Behavioral Economics as Applied to Firms: A Primer, February 2010
- 2938 Guglielmo Maria Caporale and Alessandro Girardi, Price Formation on the EuroMTS Platform, February 2010
- 2939 Hans Gersbach, Democratic Provision of Divisible Public Goods, February 2010

- 2940 Adam Isen and Betsey Stevenson, Women's Education and Family Behavior: Trends in Marriage, Divorce and Fertility, February 2010
- 2941 Peter Debaere, Holger Görg and Horst Raff, Greasing the Wheels of International Commerce: How Services Facilitate Firms' International Sourcing, February 2010
- 2942 Emanuele Forlani, Competition in the Service Sector and the Performances of Manufacturing Firms: Does Liberalization Matter?, February 2010
- 2943 James M. Malcomson, Do Managers with Limited Liability Take More Risky Decisions? An Information Acquisition Model, February 2010
- 2944 Florian Englmaier and Steve Leider, Gift Exchange in the Lab – It is not (only) how much you give ..., February 2010
- 2945 Andrea Bassanini and Giorgio Brunello, Barriers to Entry, Deregulation and Workplace Training: A Theoretical Model with Evidence from Europe, February 2010
- 2946 Jan-Emmanuel De Neve, James H. Fowler and Bruno S. Frey, Genes, Economics, and Happiness, February 2010
- 2947 Camille Cornand and Frank Heinemann, Measuring Agents' Reaction to Private and Public Information in Games with Strategic Complementarities, February 2010
- 2948 Roel Beetsma and Massimo Giuliodori, Discretionary Fiscal Policy: Review and Estimates for the EU, February 2010
- 2949 Agnieszka Markiewicz, Monetary Policy, Model Uncertainty and Exchange Rate Volatility, February 2010
- 2950 Hans Dewachter and Leonardo Iania, An Extended Macro-Finance Model with Financial Factors, February 2010
- 2951 Helmuth Cremer, Philippe De Donder and Pierre Pestieau, Education and Social Mobility, February 2010
- 2952 Zuzana Brixiová and Balázs Égert, Modeling Institutions, Start-Ups and Productivity during Transition, February 2010
- 2953 Roland Strausz, The Political Economy of Regulatory Risk, February 2010
- 2954 Sanjay Jain, Sumon Majumdar and Sharun W. Mukand, Workers without Borders? Culture, Migration and the Political Limits to Globalization, February 2010
- 2955 Andreas Irmen, Steady-State Growth and the Elasticity of Substitution, February 2010
- 2956 Bengt-Arne Wickström, The Optimal Babel – An Economic Framework for the Analysis of Dynamic Language Rights, February 2010

- 2957 Stefan Bauernschuster and Helmut Rainer, From Politics to the Family: How Sex-Role Attitudes Keep on Diverging in Reunified Germany, February 2010
- 2958 Patricia Funk and Christina Gathmann, How do Electoral Systems Affect Fiscal Policy? Evidence from State and Local Governments, 1890 to 2005, February 2010
- 2959 Betsey Stevenson, Beyond the Classroom: Using Title IX to Measure the Return to High School Sports, February 2010
- 2960 R. Quentin Grafton, Tom Kompas and Ngo Van Long, Biofuels Subsidies and the Green Paradox, February 2010
- 2961 Oliver Falck, Stephan Heblich, Alfred Lameli and Jens Suedekum, Dialects, Cultural Identity, and Economic Exchange, February 2010
- 2962 Dimitrios Koumparoulis and Apostolis Philippopoulos, The Current Version of the Bank of Greece Econometric Model, February 2010
- 2963 Frederick van der Ploeg and Cees Withagen, Is There Really a Green Paradox?, February 2010
- 2964 Ingo Vogelsang, Incentive Regulation, Investments and Technological Change, February 2010
- 2965 Jan C. van Ours and Lenny Stoeldraijer, Age, Wage and Productivity, February 2010
- 2966 Michael Hoel, Climate Change and Carbon Tax Expectations, February 2010
- 2967 Tommaso Nannicini and Roberto Ricciuti, Autocratic Transitions and Growth, February 2010
- 2968 Sebastian Brauer and Frank Westermann, A Note on the Time Series Measure of Conservatism, February 2010
- 2969 Wolfram F. Richter, Efficient Education Policy – A Second-Order Elasticity Rule, February 2010
- 2970 Tomer Blumkin, Yoram Margalioth and Efraim Sadka, Taxing Children: The Redistributive Role of Child Benefits – Revisited, February 2010
- 2971 Chang Woon Nam and Georg Wamser, Application of Regionally Varying Additionality Degrees in the Practice of EU Cohesion Policy, February 2010
- 2972 Ali Bayar, Frédéric Dramais, Cristina Mohora, Masudi Opese and Bram Smeets, Modeling Russia for Climate Change Issues, February 2010
- 2973 Magnus Söderberg, Informal Benchmarks as a Source of Regulatory Threat in Unregulated Utility Sectors, March 2010

- 2974 Piotr Wdowiński and Marta Malecka, Asymmetry in Volatility: A Comparison of Developed and Transition Stock Markets, March 2010
- 2975 Frans van Winden, Michal Krawczyk and Astrid Hopfensitz, Investment, Resolution of Risk, and the Role of Affect, March 2010
- 2976 Hyun-Ju Koh and Nadine Riedel, Do Governments Tax Agglomeration Rents?, March 2010
- 2977 Johann K. Brunner and Susanne Pech, Optimum Taxation of Bequests in a Model with Initial Wealth, March 2010
- 2978 Guglielmo Maria Caporale and Nicola Spagnolo, Stock Market Integration between three CEECs, Russia and the UK, March 2010
- 2979 Florian Englmaier, Ales Filipi and Ravi Singh, Incentives, Reputation and the Allocation of Authority, March 2010
- 2980 Konstantinos Angelopoulos, George Economides and Apostolis Philippopoulos, What is the Best Environmental Policy? Taxes, Permits and Rules under Economic and Environmental Uncertainty, March 2010
- 2981 Frederick van der Ploeg, Rapacious Resource Depletion, Excessive Investment and Insecure Property Rights, March 2010
- 2982 Wolfram F. Richter and Christoph Braun, Efficient Subsidization of Human Capital Accumulation with Overlapping Generations and Endogenous Growth, March 2010
- 2983 Francesco Cinnirella, Marc Piopiunik and Joachim Winter, Why Does Height Matter for Educational Attainment? Evidence from German Pre-Teen Children, March 2010
- 2984 Bernard Van Praag, Well-being Inequality and Reference Groups – An Agenda for New Research, March 2010
- 2985 Francesca Barion, Raffaele Miniaci, Paolo M. Panteghini and Maria Laura Parisi, Profit Shifting by Debt Financing in Europe, March 2010
- 2986 Alexander Haupt and Magdalena Stadejek, The Choice of Environmental Policy Instruments: Energy Efficiency and Redistribution, March 2010
- 2987 John Komlos and Marek Brabec, The Trend of BMI Values among US Adults, March 2010