The Income Gradient in Health: New Evidence from Kenya

Boris Houenou

School of Economic Sciences Washington State University

PNREC, Bend, OR May 24th, 2017

Outline

Introduction and Motivation

Background

Research Questions

Contributions

Methods

Data

Empirical Model and Identification

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Results

Conclusions

Understanding the income gradient on health: Why it matters, especially in low income countries?

- Country differences in health outcomes is striking: For instance, maternal mortality is 500 (90)times higher in South Soudan (Kenya) compared to Sweden
- Africa has the highest disease burden in the world, the health outcomes are inefficient and healthcare access remains am important issue

Understanding the income gradient on health: Why it matters, especially in low income countries?

- Low income \leftrightarrow poor health \rightarrow less education \rightarrow low earnings
- Exploring mechanisms to attenuate gradient to reduce the health outcomes discrepancies that depend on income level

Background

- Two levels of studies: micro and macro levels
- Developed countries exhibit an income gradient on health that steepens as children get older, Case et al (2002), Chen, Martin and Matthews (2006), Currie et al (2007), Currie (2003)
- But evidence for the gradient of young adults is mixed, either decreasing or increasing, Case, et al (2002), Chen, Martin and Matthews (2006)
- Education reduces the gradient significantly in developed countries, Case, et al (2002)

Background

- Other social economic status components have limited effect if at all. (Case et al, 2002)
- Chronic disease conditions (Asthma for example) matter to the behavior of the gradient. (Case et al, 2002)
- Income does not protect against health shock but attenuates it, Currie (2003)
- At aggregate level, neither the within group income inequality nor the between groups income inequality has an effect on average health, but their ratio does, Deaton (1999)

Research questions

- Is there a statistically significant income gradient on health in Kenya?
- What is the slope and magnitude of the income gradient
- Do household characteristics impact the income gradient on health?

- Are there other mechanisms that impact the income gradient on health?
- How do our results differ from published studies in developed countries?

Contributions

- Examines the income gradient in health in a developing country context
- Evidence from a unique panel data set from Kenya
- Explores new mechanisms, such as nutrition, breastfeeding, water, and sanitation
- Uses actual symptoms to construct health status instead of parent-reported children's health status ordered on a scale

Methods

- ▶ We follow Case et al (2002)
- We use stepwise regression approach to test the effect of new included variables on the slope of the relationship between "children's syndromes" and parental income

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

We then compare the estimates to the baseline model results

Specification test and standard errors computation

- Random vs fixed effects: Hausman's test
- Use robust standard errors (computed by sandwich covariance estimation using score functions)

Study area

Western Kenya



◆□ > ◆□ > ◆豆 > ◆豆 > ̄豆 = のへで

Kenya data

- Data are from two sources in western Kenya: the Human Population-Based Infectious Disease Surveillance (PBIDS) and the Socio-Economic Survey (SES). See Thumbi et al (2015).
- About 7,700 observations on 1,600 households collected quarterly from 2013 to 2015

Descriptive stats

Kenya data

Distribution of the aggregate symptoms of most common diseases in the area for the age group 0-14 years old



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲注▶ ▲注▶ 注目 のへで

Regression analysis

- $\bullet \ H_{it} = \alpha + \theta_i + \beta_1 Income_{it} + \sum_{i=2}^n \beta_i Z_{it} + \epsilon_{it}$
- E(ϵ_{it}) = 0, E(ϵ_{it}ϵ'_{jt}) = 0, Cov(Income_{it}, θ_i) = 0 and Cov(ϵ_{it}, θ_i) = 0
 Children's heterogeneity is uncorrelated with parental income and with the residuals

Results

The slope of the relationship between the parental income and the "children's syndromes" is statistically significant



Income Gradient on Health of Children (gradual age groups)



◆□ > ◆□ > ◆豆 > ◆豆 > ̄豆 _ のへぐ

Results (continued)

▶ tablea 🔶 tablea

- ▶ As children get older the gradient steepens up to age 11
- The gradient drops in most case after 11 years old, compared to 17 or 18 years old in the US, Canada and UK
- "Child labor" or earlier independence of children in Kenya compared to children in US, Canada and UK may be at play in this result

Results (continued): Parental education effect

▶ tablea

- Parental education reduces the gradient by 17 percent
- Parental education effect on the gradient is statistically significant, even though the magnitude is lower than the 50 percent estimated in the US (Case et al, 2002)

Results (continued): Parental occupation effect

▶ tablea

- Father's occupation outside of agriculture has a statistically significant reduction effect on the gradient
- The magnitude of the result is about 20 percent
- Conditioned on being educated (at least high school), parental occupation reduces the gradient by 3 percent only

Results (continued): Parental social status effect

▶ tablea

The father 's status in the community significantly reduces the income gradient on "children's syndromes" by 16 percent

 Conditioned on being educated (at least high school), parental status actually increases the gradient by 1 percent Results (continued): Parental wealth level effect

▶ tablea

- There is a statistically significant effect of the parental wealth on "children's syndromes"
- Parental wealth level significantly increases the income gradient on "children's syndromes" by about 5 percent

Wealth and income are not necessarily collinear

Results (continued): Food and nutrients intake effect



- No nutrient individually affects the gradient
- Combined, carb, fat and protein have a statistically significant effect on the gradient
- If energy intake is associated with the above nutrients, the effect on the gradient is 25 percent in reduction
- Conditioned on going to at least high school, children exposes to balanced diet have 9 percent gradient reduction
- Testing jointly the difference in estimates, we find that a including carb, fat and protein estimates are different from the estimates of the energy intake only

Results (continued): Water and sanitation effect

▶ tablea

 Decent water consumption and sanitation has statistically significant reduction effect on the gradient the gradient

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

 Decent water consumption and sanitation decrease the gradient by about 12 percent Results (continued): Community aggregate income effect

▶ tablea

- Community aggregate income has a statistically significant reduction effect on the gradient
- Community aggregate income reduces the gradient by about 12 percent

Conclusions

- Kenyan data exhibit income gradient on health that steepens up to 11 years old
- None of tested mechanisms downsize the gradient in the proportion estimated by Case et al (2002) with US data
- Education, social status and occupation have limited effect of different magnitude on the gradient, suggesting that social economic status might not be a unified concept

Conclusions

- Nutrition is more effective at reducing the gradient in Kenya
- Energy intake combined with nutrients has a larger effect, but does not remove the gradient
- Community aggregate income effect is limited and should not be conducive to a transfer policy to correct for the gradient



Thank You 😊

Table1. Descriptive Statistics of main varia	DICS				
Variables	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Morbidity(Bundle of Symptoms)	2985	2.89	3 25	0	22
Fever Symptoms (Counts)	2985	0.71	1.01	ō	6
Gastric Disorder Symptoms (Counts)	2985	0.069	0.31	ō	4
Children's Age(Years)	2985	7.62	4 07	ō	14
Parental Agricultural Income(\$)	2975	35.93	136.97	-341 11	3111 11
Log Parental Agricultural Income(\$)	1420	3 69	1 44	-5.01	8.04
Parental Agricultural Income1(\$)	2975	24.04	141.82	-662.98	3110
Household Off Farm Earnings(\$)	2974	111.66	233 57	0	1733 33
Parental Off Farm Earnings(\$)	2974	102.89	222.03	õ	1666.67
Full Income ² (\$)	2975	24.04	141.82	-662.98	3110.00
Full Income(\$)	2983	138 41	268.25	-341.11	3277 78
Household Wealth(\$)	2985	6715 73	7319.27	0	55938.89
Livestock Production Income ³ (\$)	2974	-9.22	46.45	-810.67	558 667
Livestock Production Income(\$)	2974	2.67	14.19	-50	566.667
Crop Production Income(\$)	2247	44 04	155.06	-333 33	3111 11
Energy Intake	2979	1298 39	1244 53	0	24499 47
Fat Intake	2979	32.94	86.34	ō	2517.48
Carb Intake	2979	196 51	183 38	ō	5585 52
Protein Intake	2979	43.35	69.58	õ	3296 94
Gender	2985	0.5	0.50	0	1
Sibling	2985	0.02	0.15	ō	i
Father's Age(Years)	2585	48.28	13 39	17	88
Mother's Age(Years)	2898	41.15	13 30	15	88
Maternal Education(>= Secondary School)	2985	0.13	0.33		1
Father's Education(>= Secondary School)	2985	0.19	0.55	ů.	i
Father's Occupation(Salaried)	2985	0.07	0.25	ő	i
Mother's Occupation(Salaried)	2985	0.03	0.16	ō	i
Father's Social Status(Noble/High Social Status)	2985	0.17	0.37	0	1
Mother's Social Status(Noble/High Social Status)	2985	0.05	0.22	ů.	i
In-door Toilet	2974	0.005	0.02	ő	i
Decent Drinkable Water (Tap Water)	2985	0.32	0.47	ō	i
Community Average Income ⁴ (\$)	2985	22.07	21.38	-10.15	165.47
Community Average Income(\$)	1104	25.65	0.001	25.650	25.66
Breastfeed	2985	0.26	0.44	20.000	20.00
Vaccination	2985	0.006	0.078	0	i
Reporting same illness as in last quarter	2985	0.043	0.20	0	i

Table1: Descriptive Statistics of main variables

Estimates

▲ Gradient

Income Gradient on Children's Health and effects of other Household Characteristics on the	Gradient
meetine of datent of emarch of realth and encets of other nousehold enaracteristics of an	. or a different

Age groups	s (Years)	Income gradient	Parental education effect on the income gradient on health	Parental occupation effect on the income gradient on health	Parental social status effect on the income gradient on health	Parental wealth effect on the income gradient on health	Nutrition effect on the income gradient on health	Nutrition and energy intake effect on the income gradient on health	Breastfeeding effect on the income gradient on health	Sanitation effect on the income gradient on health	Community Average income effect on the income gradient on health
Policy targeted age	0-10	-0.0903***	-0.0957***	-0.0943***	-0.0943**	-0.0822*	-0.0928**	-0.0929**	-0.115***	-0.0969***	-0.0979***
	0-5	-0.0986**	-0.0825*	-0.0846*	-0.0851*	-0.0788	-0.0817*	-0.0845*	-0.0937**	-0.0858*	-0.0842*
	0-2	-0.0615	-0.0373	-0.0464	-0.041	-0.064	-0.0433	-0.0587	-0.0854	-0.0319	-0.0389
Gradual	3-6	-0.0928***	-0.0766**	-0.0746**	-0.0774**	-0.0979*	-0.0702**	-0.0701**	-0.0939**	-0.0812**	-0.0812**
age	7-11	-0.102**	-0.128**	-0.125**	-0.119**	-0.113*	-0.131**	-0.130**	-0.150***	-0.128**	-0.130**
	12-14	-0.0439	0.0221	0.029	0.0147	-0.0672	0.000937	-0.00559	0.044	0.0348	0.0212

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