



**HAL**  
open science

# The role of gender inequality in the obesity epidemic: A case study from India

Valentina Alvarez-Saavedra, Pierre Levasseur, Suneha Seetahul

## ► To cite this version:

Valentina Alvarez-Saavedra, Pierre Levasseur, Suneha Seetahul. The role of gender inequality in the obesity epidemic: A case study from India. 2022. hal-03744694

**HAL Id: hal-03744694**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03744694>**

Preprint submitted on 4 Aug 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

**The role of gender inequality in the obesity epidemic:  
A case study from India**

Valentina ALVAREZ SAAVEDRA<sup>a</sup>, Pierre LEVASSEUR<sup>b</sup> and Suneha SEETAHUL<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> BSE, CNRS, Université de Bordeaux, France ;

<sup>b</sup> SADAPT, INRAE, AgroParisTech, Université Paris-Saclay, France;

<sup>c</sup> Department of Political Economy, University of Sydney, Australia.

**Abstract:** Recent empirical evidence emphasizes the higher prevalence of overweight and obesity for women, especially in developing countries. However, the potential link between gender inequality and obesity has rarely been investigated. Using longitudinal data from India (IHDS 2005-11), we implement Hausman-Taylor and fixed-effect models to estimate the effect of different dimensions of gender inequalities on female overweight. This study demonstrates that the form of gender inequality or women's mistreatment differently affects female bodyweight. Indeed, we show that some forms of women's mistreatments (such as perceived community violence and age difference with husband) increase the risk of female overweight, whereas more severe forms of abuse such as child marriage increase the risk of underweight. Moreover, we also find that higher decision-making power and autonomy about outings are risk factors of weight gain and obesity, especially in urban settings, perhaps indicating a higher exposure to urban obesogenic lifestyles. To conclude, our results suggest that, although improving women's status in society may be a key action to address the epidemic of obesity, policies must also target hazardous habits that emancipation may imply in urban (obesogenic) environments.

**Keywords:** India; Gender inequality; Obesity; Hausman-Taylor estimations; Fixed effects estimations.

**JEL codes:** I14 I15 J16

## 1) Introduction

The rising epidemic of obesity is one of the major contemporary global health challenges. This medical condition has proven to increase risks of non-communicable diseases (NCD) such as cardiovascular illness, diabetes or hypertension (Di Angelantonio et al., 2016), which led to 71% of worldwide deaths in 2016 (Bennett et al., 2018). Obesity is therefore directly associated with higher mortality, high decreases in the quality of life, and constitutes an important economic cost for countries (Cawley, 2015). Moreover, not only has the prevalence of overweight surpassed the prevalence of underweight around the world (Popkin, 2007), but alarmingly obesity levels have never decreased in any country so far (Ameye & Swinnen, 2019). In fact, by 2025 it is estimated that half of the worldwide population will be overweight, and one-fifth will be obese (NCD-Risk Factor Collaboration, 2016).

Although obesity tends to be perceived as a problem concerning high-income countries, the prevalence of obesity is rising in many low- and middle-income countries. This phenomenon has been referred to as the nutrition transition (Popkin, 1994, 1999), which occurs with the urbanization process and the shift from agrarian and physically demanding jobs to more sedentary lifestyles (Ameye & Swinnen, 2019; Kanter & Caballero, 2012). This process is accompanied by a westernization of diets that generates a global shift in dietary attitudes towards nutrient-poor food that is also high in fats and sugar (Siddiqui & Donato, 2020). The empirical literature observed gendered stylized facts in the occurrence of the nutrition transition and the obesity prevalence (Hansford, 2010). Indeed, women appear to be globally more affected by this epidemic (WHO, 2020; De Soysa & Lewin, 2019; Ferretti & Mariani, 2017; Garawi et al., 2014). Currently, there are around three obese women for two obese men worldwide (Wells et al., 2012). Furthermore, the gender gap in obesity prevalence appears to be much higher for developing countries, especially middle-income economies (Ameye & Swinnen, 2019), where women suffer from substantial levels of inequality and deprivation

(Dhar et al., 2019; Jayachandran, 2015). There are even extreme cases, such as South Africa, where the rate of obesity prevalence for women is five times higher than for men (Case & Menendez, 2009). Surprisingly, the gender obesity gap and the risk of malnutrition for women could be due to similar mechanisms (De Soysa & Lewin, 2019; Ferretti & Mariani, 2017), i.e. lower rights and liberties (including physical mobility) and lower access to economic resources, education, health, labour market and a healthy lifestyle (De Soysa & Lewin, 2019). Hence, improving women's status in society may be a key policy avenue to address the global obesity epidemic.

As the world's second most populated country, India is an interesting middle-income economy to study in terms of health and gender inequalities. Despite high levels of economic growth in the past few decades, India has one of the largest gender gaps in health, cumulating one of the highest rates of underweight population with a growing overweight population and low-quality diets with major micronutrient deficiencies (Kulkarni et al., 2017).<sup>1</sup> In urban India, the prevalence of overweight was around 31.3% for women in 2015-2016, against a prevalence of 26.6% for men (NFHS-4, 2017). Consequently, the country is experiencing an alarming increase in NCD prevalence such as type-2 diabetes (Agrawal et al., 2014) and hypertension (Gupta, 2004; Stroope, 2015). At the same time, Indian women suffer from high levels of inequality in socioeconomic opportunities and outcomes (Dhar et al., 2019), partly explained by the socially constructed gender roles with deep religious, cultural, and historical roots (Batra & Reio Jr, 2016). In India, social inequalities on the lines of gender emerge from childhood, which may have negative impacts on adult women's health and nutritional outcomes. Empirical evidence shows that boys receive more childcare time than girls, in addition to being breastfed longer and to being given vitamin supplementation (Barcellos et al., 2014). India is also an interesting case to study given that the female labour force participation has been declining between 2005 and 2020, dropping from 31.8% to 20.3% (World Bank, 2020), highlighting the

discrepancy between economic growth and women's economic empowerment and agency. Not only does this low and declining labour market participation rate implies lower financial empowerment for women, but a large share of women (ranging from 17% to 41% depending on studies) also face important forms of daily discrimination and violence such as domestic violence (Menon, 2020).

Given the particular context of India, this research aims to assess how gender inequalities affect female adult Body Mass Index (BMI, measured in  $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ). Even though gender and obesity are two well-studied topics in the economics and health literature, the potential link between gender inequality and obesity has rarely been investigated. Most previous studies are correlational and limited by the lack of longitudinal data allowing to control for time-invariant heterogeneity. On the one hand, cross-country studies report a positive association between gender inequality and gender obesity gap: countries with low gender inequality (almost exclusively high-income countries) being characterized by smaller gender differences in obesity rates (De Soysa & Lewin, 2019; Garawi et al., 2014; Wells et al., 2012).<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, country-specific studies analysing the association between within-country economic inequality (at the community level) and obesity find stronger positive associations for women than for men (Wells et al., 2012). However, the frontier between gender inequality and socioeconomic inequality in society is fuzzy, both effects being difficult to disentangle from each other. Analysing the gender inequality-obesity association at the individual level, while controlling for socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the household, would allow to disentangle both effects. Hence, this original study proposes to provide within-country micro-economic level evidence on the matter.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, gender inequality is not only expected to restrict female mobility (lack of freedom) and affect access to information and public services (lack of opportunity to care for oneself) but is also expected to have major socio-psychological consequences (lack of self-esteem and -confidence). We can reasonably assume that these

mechanisms change women's time allocation, physical activity, consumption patterns and thus their weight.

Using nationally representative longitudinal data for India from 2005 and 2012, we analyse the effect of gender inequality, measured at the individual level, on female BMI (and BMI-based clinical classification) by estimating two complementary panel data models (i.e., individual fixed effects and Hausman-Taylor estimators). Our main interest is to observe the relationship between gender inequality and overweight/obesity. Nevertheless, by construction, our analysis also sheds light on the relationship between gender inequality and weight in general (including underweight), allowing a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of the nutrition transition in India. To capture different dimensions of gender inequality, we consider several proxies of inequality disavouring women in society, including self-rated gender norms indicators (restricted mobility, decision-making power in the household, and community acceptance of domestic violence), and factual indicators (a wife's age of marriage, and the age difference with her husband).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 explains the methods, detailing the mechanisms through which gender inequality can affect women's weight. Section 3 reports the results, and Section 4 concludes.

## **2) Methods**

### *2.1. Data and sample*

This research relies on the India Human Development Survey (IHDS), which is a nationally representative panel survey collected by the University of Maryland and the National Council of Applied Economic Research. See Textbox A1 in the Appendix for detailed descriptions of the data source and our estimation sample.

### *2.2. Measuring women's nutritional status*

We mainly use individual BMI to measure women's nutritional status. This standard measure of general body fat is calculated as the weight divided by the squared height ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ). Height and weight data were collected by trained staff using weighing machines and stadiometers. Individual BMI can be classified into four nutritional ranges, following the international WHO classification: underweight ( $<18 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$ ), normal weight ( $18\text{-}25 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$ ), overweight ( $25\text{-}30 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$ ), and obesity ( $>30 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$ ). In addition to considering individual BMI as a continuous nutritional outcome, we alternatively test the relationship between gender inequality and the BMI-based clinical classification, especially underweight status (=1) and overweight/obesity status (=1).

### 2.3. Measuring gender inequality

The IHDS gender module contains rich data that allows us to create five indicators of gender inequality. First, we use the binary variable of *child marriage* as a factual measure of gender inequality disfavoring women, which is equal to 1 if an adult woman got married before 18 and 0 otherwise. In our subsample, in 2011-12, 51% of women were married before 18, as shown in Figure S1 available in online Supplementary Materials. Child marriage is a clear reflection of rooted gender inequality and is internationally recognized as a violation of human rights (Burn & Evenhuis, 2014; UNICEF, 2019).<sup>4</sup> We also constructed the variable of *age difference with husband* accounting for the age gap between spouses (age of the husband minus age of the wife). A large age gap generally implies that the younger spouse will have less decision-making power and/or autonomy in the marital relation (Carmichael, 2011). Evidence from the US found that time allocation behaviour is affected by the marital age gap, especially regarding the labour market participation: the older the husbands are compared to their wife, the lower the labour supply of married women (Shephard, 2019). In the sample, in 2011-12, 99% of women are younger than their husbands, 31% of women have an age difference of 6 to

10 years with their husband, and 7% of women have an age gap higher than 10 years (Figure S1 in online Supplementary Materials).

We complete these factual indicators with three measurements of gender norms previously used by the literature as proxies of gender inequalities in India (Choudhuri & Desai, 2020; Sinha et al., 2017; Stroope, 2015): (i) the need for a woman to ask permission to go out to her husband or another household member (*restricted mobility*); (ii) the woman's *decision-making* power in the household; (iii) the *community's acceptance of domestic violence* of husbands towards their wives (perceived by the respondent). These three indicators are constructed as following. First, the *restricted mobility* indicator is a 3-point composite index. This index results from the sum of the three-following binary-response variable about restricted permissions to go to health centres (=1), grocery shopping (=1) and visit a friend or family member (=1), calculated for each woman. The restricted mobility indicator takes the value 3 if a woman needs to ask permission for these three types of outings and 0 if no mobility restriction is imposed to her. In 2011-12, 46% of adult women declare that they need permissions to go out for those three reasons (Figure S2 in online Supplementary Materials). The *decision-making* indicator is a 5-point composite index summing the following tasks for which the woman "has the most say": cooking (=1), big purchases (=1), number of children (=1), seeking medical care for an ill child (=1), and children's marriage arrangement (=1). If this index is equal to 5, it means that a woman has a power of decision concerning all economic, health and food aspects in the household. In contrast, if this index equals 0, a woman has no decision-making power in the household. In 2011-12, 19% of women do not have a say in any of the five decisions, and 44% have most say in one type of decision, and for most of them it is about what to cook (Figure S2 in online Supplementary Materials). Finally, the *community acceptance of domestic violence* indicator is a 5-point composite index that sums if, in the community, the respondent perceives the use of physical violence of husbands towards their wife as usual, for the five following

reasons: a woman goes out without permission (=1), dowry was not respected by her family (=1), a woman neglects the house or the children (=1), a woman doesn't cook properly (=1), and a woman has an extramarital relationship (=1).<sup>5</sup> Since we do not have access to information about domestic violence in the household, we argue that the community acceptance of domestic violence works as a good proxy (Uthman et al., 2011). In 2011-12, 29% of women claim it is common in their community for husbands to beat up their wives for at least four of those reasons (Figure S2 in online Supplementary Materials).

As robustness checks, we also implemented a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) approach to create three continuous indices of *mobility restrictions*, *decision-making*, and *acceptance of community violence*. Each index relies on the first component of the PCA, with higher values reflecting higher levels of mobility restriction, acceptance of domestic violence, and decision-making power. Each index was standardized to vary between 0 and 1, allowing to measure each dimension with a continuous variable instead of an ordinal one.<sup>6</sup> We also created a synthetic index of multidimensional gender discrimination (i.e. simultaneously including information on mobility restrictions, decision-making, and acceptance of community violence), based on the first component predictions. The first component is particularly relevant to create a synthetic index because it clearly opposes several forms of gender discrimination (relative to domestic violence and mobility restrictions) against women's emancipation (measured by decision-making items). We standardized this index from 0-to-1. Tables and figures regarding this synthetic index PCA and related results are available in online Supplementary Materials (Tables S3, S4 and S5, and Figure S3).

#### *2.4. Assumptions about the tested associations*

Based on the literature, we are able to make several assumptions regarding potential links between our measurements of gender inequality and female BMI. For instance, an empirical study in India found that both female seclusion (veiling or limitation of social interactions with

non-sibling men) and lower decision-making increase the risk of hypertension, the latter being directly associated with overweight and obesity (Stroope, 2015). This means that women's restricted mobility and lack of decision-making power can be expected to have a positive relationship with BMI. Nonetheless, since India is experiencing increasing urbanization and incorporating western food habits, restricted mobility could also appear to "protect" women from an obesogenic environment. Such an environment promotes obesity by encouraging physical inactivity and unhealthy food choices (Swinburn et al., 1999). This also implies that having decision-making power and autonomy does not necessarily mean that women's attitudes will be healthier, since their new freedom will also expose them to a new and westernized environment.

Gender inequality can also encourage different acts of violence against women, which can have dramatic physical and mental health outcomes. In fact, women tend to be particularly vulnerable in terms of mental health, inducing depression, demoralization and reducing their self-esteem (De Soysa & Lewin, 2019; Stroope, 2015). Indeed, eating disorders and depression have proven to be more common for women (Garawi et al., 2014), and several studies found a significant relationship between depression and weight gain, through the neglect of their physical appearance and changes in their eating patterns (e.g. compensation by food) (Case & Menendez, 2009; Haukkala & Uutela, 2000). Trauma theory also claims that woman's experience of domestic violence may initiate immediate and long-lasting psychological symptoms which may affect her eating practices, activity levels, and general health care practices. For instance, evidence from Egypt show that exposure to domestic physical and sexual violence significantly increases the risk of female obesity (Yount & Li, 2011). The authors claim that domestic violence could lead to psychological after-effects leading to a compensation by food with an excess energy intake and/or a decrease in levels of physical activities leading to weight gain. However, evidence in this subject are ambiguous. Other studies found positive associations

between domestic violence and underweight status (Ackerson & Subramanian, 2008; Lentz, 2018).

### *2.5. Accounting for confounding variables*

Given the multiple mechanisms that have an impact on both gender inequalities and weight gain, our analysis includes potential confounders allowing us to disentangle the effect of gender inequality on the dependent variables by limiting the likelihood of an omitted variable bias.

Gender inequality arises from historical socially constructed male domination and female subordination in many aspects of life (Godelier, 1981), which makes socio-cultural norms one of the most important dimensions of gender inequality. The Indian society is characterized by caste which is a form of social structure finding its roots in historical and religious practices (Batra & Reio Jr, 2016). Religious personal laws are very common in India<sup>7</sup> and most of this laws imply that women have fewer rights than men (Parashar, 2008). As a result, many practices that arise from caste and religion, such as veiling and the restricting of women's mobility, decision-making power and access to resources can also have a direct relationship with women's access to physical activities, restraining their possibilities to participate in sportive or outdoor activities and limiting women's interactions (Stroope, 2015). Therefore, we control our estimations for caste and religion heterogeneity. We also respectively control for education and labour market participation by the highest education level achieved and a binary variable indicating if a woman is currently working or not.

### *2.6. Empirical models*

The relationship between gender inequality and BMI-based indicators might be prone to endogeneity issues (e.g., omitted variables bias or reverse causality) that could overstate or understate cross-sectional estimates (Wooldridge, 2010). First, omitted variables such as personal motivation, self-esteem or soft skills could be associated with both BMI and our gender inequality indicators. Women who have low self-esteem can be less preoccupied by

their appearance and weight, in addition to being prone to accept mobility restriction, lower decision-making power and even domestic violence. Hence, such a socio-psychological trouble may overstate the positive effect of gender inequality on obesity. Moreover, reverse causality can also be an issue: overweight and obesity could influence our gender inequality outcomes. For instance, one can assume that being overweight might delay age of marriage for a girl, and thus reduce the risk of child marriage, which could understate the real impact of child marriage on excess weight. Likewise, since the social stigma related to obesity is usually higher for women (Rothblum, 1992; Warin et al., 2011), women with high BMI might have their mobility or decision-making power more restrained by their husbands than thinner women, as well as suffering more from domestic violence; which could overstate the real impact of gender norms disfavours women on obesity.

To robustly analyse the relationship between gender inequality and BMI-based indicators, we use two complementary estimators: fixed effects (*within* model) and Hausman-Taylor (*hybrid* model) estimators. First, we perform fixed-effect model estimations at the individual level to neutralize potential time-invariant variations that could be related to changes in BMI and gender inequality and bias the results.

$$BMI_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 * Gender\ inequality_{it} + \beta_2 * X_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad [1]$$

In Eq.1, BMI-based indicators are factors of gender inequality indicators (i.e. *restricted mobility, decision-making power, and community acceptance of domestic violence*) for each adult woman  $i$  at a time  $t$  ( $t=1$  for 2005 and  $t=2$  for 2011).<sup>8</sup>  $X_{it}$  refers to individual and household characteristics such as age categories (18-30, 31-40, 41-50), educational dummies (incomplete primary, primary, incomplete secondary, secondary, high secondary and graduate), caste/religion, employment status, marital status, number of children, and logarithm of per capita income.<sup>9</sup> Finally,  $\varepsilon_{it}$  represents the time-varying error term. Since only a within-individual variation is considered in within fixed-effect estimations, potential differences across

individuals are ignored. Therefore, we also tested random-effects estimations, which combines both within and across individual estimations. However, conducting a Hausman test to identify which of both models (fixed effect or random effect) is the most appropriate, we concluded that random effects estimations were inconsistent and fixed effects should be preferred (Baltagi et al., 2003). Hence, we only report fixed-effect estimations.

We complement the fixed effect estimations with Hausman-Taylor estimations, which has the advantage of combining fixed and random effects with a structural instrumentation approach. Hence, in addition to consider within- and between-variations across individuals, this hybrid estimator structurally constructs instruments using solely the strictly exogenous variables from the model (Hausman & Taylor, 1981). This means that there is no need to search for valid external instruments to solve endogeneity problems. Another advantage of the Hausman-Taylor estimator is that it allows to integrate time-invariant variables in addition to time-varying variables. Hence, we can analyse additional indicators of gender inequality such as child marriage or age difference with husband, and control for further characteristics that do not change across time such as area of residence.

$$BMI_{it} = \alpha + \gamma_1 * Gender\ inequality_{it} + \gamma_2 * X_{it} + \gamma_3 * Z_i + v_i + e_{it} \quad [2]$$

The Hausman-Taylor estimator splits time-varying and time-invariant variables into two sets of variables: ones assumed to be exogenous and others assumed to be endogenous. *Gender inequality*<sub>it</sub> represents an endogenous time-varying variable correlated with  $v_i$ .  $X_{it}$  identifies exogenous time-varying explanatory variables such as age categories, educational dummies, caste/religion<sup>10</sup>, marital status, employment status and the logarithm of per capita income.  $Z_i$  represents all time-invariant explanatory variables like area (rural or urban) and state of residence. State fixed effects account for heterogeneities across states, such as different levels of area income and development.  $v_i$  and  $e_{it}$  represent unobservable random variables that have an impact on BMI but are independent from each other:  $v_i$  represents unobservable time-

invariant individual effect distributed independently across individuals, with zero mean and constant variance ( $\sigma_v^2$ ). The error term  $e_{it}$  is also assumed to be uncorrelated with the independent variables, with zero mean and constant variance ( $\sigma_e^2$ ) conditional on *Gender inequality* $_{it}$ ,  $X_{it}$  and  $Z_i$ .

### 3) Results

#### 3.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table A1 in the Appendix presents the summary statistics for each variable considered in the study. We observe a clear increase in the rates of overweight and obesity between 2005 and 2012 among Indian women (from 16% and 3% to 27% and 7%, respectively). While *child marriage* and *decision-making* power indicators remain practically unchanged between both waves, the *age difference with husband*, *restricted mobility*, and *community acceptance of domestic violence* indicators increase in the same period (respectively from 5.28 to 5.40 years, from a score of 1.94/3 to 1.99/3 and from a score of 2.09/5 to 2.45/5).

Table A1 also shows that most of gender inequality indicators decrease with age, except for the *age difference with husband*. Moreover, women living in urban areas have higher levels of *decision-making* and lower levels of *restricted mobility* than women living in rural settings. Likewise, the share of *child marriage* and *community acceptance of domestic violence* are higher in rural areas than in urban areas. Nonetheless, spouses have a higher age difference in urban settings. Table A1 also exhibits socioeconomic differences according to gender inequality. Each indicator of gender inequality is the strongest among the low-income group, except once again for the *age difference with husband*. Finally, gender inequality tends to be lower among religious minorities (Christian, Sikh and Jain) and to a lesser extent among higher castes.

#### 3.2. Econometric estimates

Fixed effects (Eq.1) and Hausman-Taylor (Eq.2) estimates are presented in Table 1. Estimates show that several measures of gender inequality result in significant weight changes between 2005 and 2011 for Indian adult women. These results are globally consistent when comparing time fixed-effect and Hausman-Taylor estimates. However, the direction of the effect (positive or negative) clearly depends on the indicator of gender inequality considered.

First, both *age difference with husband* and *community acceptance of domestic violence* are significantly associated to weight gain by women, increasing the risk of overweight and decreasing the risk of underweight. Second, the *decision-making* power index is positively correlated with weight gain and overweight. Third, there is a significant reduction in overweight risks for higher levels of *mobility restriction* (lower autonomy). Finally, *child marriage* lead women to lose weight during the period, increasing the risk of underweight.

In a nutshell, our findings highlight a complex relationship between gender inequality and female BMI. While some aspects of gender discrimination (such as *domestic violence* and *age difference with husband*) tend to be associated with weight gain and overweight (as assumed by the literature), it seems that women's emancipation (measured by *decision-making*) also increases both risks, perhaps because of a higher exposure to an obesogenic environment as explained earlier. Likewise for similar reasons, an increase in *mobility restrictions* reversely decreases the risk of female overweight, suggesting that a lack of autonomy could have a "protective effect" against hazardous weight gain.<sup>11</sup> In contrast, it appears that some forms of gender inequality, certainly the worse forms, like *child marriage*, result in a significant weight loss and a higher underweight risk.

**Table 1: Regressions of female bodyweight on gender inequality and covariates – whole sample**

	BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )		Underweight (dummy)		Overweight (dummy)	
	Fixed Effects	Hausman-Taylor	Fixed Effects	Hausman-Taylor	Fixed Effects	Hausman-Taylor
<b>Married when minor (dummy)</b>		-0.140*** (0.057)		0.021*** (0.007)		0.002 (0.007)
Observations		40,746		40,746		40,746
Number of households		23,087		23,087		23,087
Within R-square		0.045		0.011		0.025
Between R-square		0.217		0.095		0.156
Overall R-square		0.189		0.075		0.126
<b>Age difference with husband (in years)</b>		0.053*** (0.010)		-0.002** (0.001)		0.005*** (0.001)
Observations		39,904		39,904		39,904
Number of households		22,375		22,375		22,375
Within R-square		0.046		0.011		0.026
Between R-square		0.220		0.096		0.159
Overall R-square		0.191		0.075		0.128
<b>Restricted mobility index †(0-to-3 score)</b>	-0.019 (0.018)	-0.023 (0.018)	-0.002 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.002)	-0.004** (0.002)	-0.005*** (0.002)
Observations	40,720	40,720	40,720	40,720	40,720	40,720
Number of households	23,082	23,082	23,082	23,082	23,082	23,082
Within R-square	0.053	0.045	0.012	0.010	0.031	0.025
Between R-square		0.217		0.095		0.155
Overall R-square		0.189		0.075		0.126
<b>Decision-making index †(0-to-5 score)</b>	0.052*** (0.018)	0.061*** (0.018)	0.000 (0.002)	0.000 (0.002)	0.008*** (0.002)	0.009*** (0.002)
Observations	40,702	40,702	40,702	40,702	40,702	40,702
Number of households	23,076	23,076	23,076	23,076	23,076	23,076
Within R-square	0.052		0.012		0.031	
Between R-square						
Overall R-square						
<b>Community acceptance of domestic violence †(0-to-5 score)</b>	0.067*** (0.013)	0.059*** (0.013)	-0.004*** (0.002)	-0.003** (0.002)	0.005*** (0.002)	0.004** (0.002)
Observations	40,536	40,536	40,536	40,536	40,536	40,536
Number of households	23,050	23,050	23,050	23,050	23,050	23,050
Within R-square	0.052		0.012		0.031	
Between R-square						
Overall R-square						
Control variables	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Individual FE	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
State FE	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses: \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1. Standard errors were clustered at a household level for robustness. \*Since HT model specification does not report R-squared values, we computed those obtained in a random model specification.

Source: Authors' calculations from IHDS I-II database.

Table 2 presents Hausman-Taylor estimates for specific subsamples of rural/urban and poor/non-poor women.<sup>12</sup> This table emphasizes important heterogeneity regarding urban and rural areas and socioeconomic status which offer a better understanding of the results from Table 1. First, Table 2 shows a stronger positive association between *decision-making* power and female BMI in urban areas compared to rural areas. Consistently, we also find effects that are exclusively significant for non-poor women. The positive effects of *community acceptance of domestic violence* and *age difference with husband* on female BMI are only significant for non-poor women and are stronger in urban areas than in rural areas. Finally, for *child marriage*, we detect a significant and negative effect on female BMI for rural and non-poor samples only. Control variables also provide consistent results in accordance with the literature on the determinants of BMI in India (Kulkarni et al., 2017; Siddiqui & Donato, 2020). Full regression tables of Eq.1 and Eq.2 are available in online Supplementary Materials (Tables S6 and S7). As expected, age is positively correlated to female BMI, since we exclusively focus on relatively young women (aged 18 to 50), and living in urban area increases female BMI. Moreover, as found in Kulkarni et al. (2017), women with a high level of completed education have a higher BMI on average than less educated women, whereas working women tend to have a lower BMI than unemployed women. Regarding the caste and religious hierarchy in India, our results show nonlinear associations with female BMI (Kulkarni et al., 2017; Siddiqui & Donato, 2020). Compared to higher Hindu castes, Muslim women have a higher BMI, while intermediate and lower castes (OBC and SC/ST) exhibit a lower BMI. Likewise, per capita income follow a U-shape association with female BMI. It appears that women are significantly thinner among middle-income households compared to women from poorer and richer households. This result is in accordance with the empirical literature that finds a relative protection of the upper middle class in middle income countries such as China and Mexico (Bonfond & Clément, 2014; Levasseur, 2015).

**Table 2: Hausman-Taylor regressions of female BMI on gender inequality and covariates – by subsamples**

<b>Dep. Var.: Female BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	<b>Rural</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Not Poor</b>
<b>Married when minor (<i>dummy</i>)</b>	-0.128*	-0.182	0.274	-0.180***
	(0.066)	(0.111)	(0.209)	(0.071)
Observations	27,365	13,381	7,102	33,629
Number of individuals	15,585	7,502	6,080	20,984
R-squared*:				
- <i>Within</i>	0.040	0.060	0.048	0.045
- <i>Between</i>	0.172	0.140	0.099	0.209
- <i>Overall</i>	0.149	0.126	0.095	0.187
<b>Age difference with husband (<i>in years</i>)</b>	0.050***	0.061***	0.015	0.052***
	(0.012)	(0.020)	(0.034)	(0.013)
Observations	26,825	13,079	6,930	32,960
Number of individuals	15,117	7,258	5,912	20,399
R-squared*:				
- <i>Within</i>	0.041	0.061	0.048	0.046
- <i>Between</i>	0.175	0.145	0.101	0.211
- <i>Overall</i>	0.151	0.129	0.097	0.188
<b>Restricted mobility index (<i>0-to-1 score</i>)</b>	-0.015	-0.040	-0.041	-0.032
	(0.022)	(0.033)	(0.070)	(0.022)
Observations	27,346	13,374	7,099	33,606
Number of individuals	15,579	7,503	6,075	20,978
R-squared*:				
- <i>Within</i>	0.040	0.059	0.047	0.045
- <i>Between</i>	0.172	0.140	0.099	0.210
- <i>Overall</i>	0.149	0.126	0.095	0.187
<b>Decision-making index (<i>0-to-1 score</i>)</b>	0.057***	0.070***	0.084	0.069***
	(0.021)	(0.034)	(0.066)	(0.022)
Observations	27,342	13,360	7,097	33,590
Number of individuals	15,580	7,496	6,073	20,964
R-squared*:				
- <i>Within</i>	0.040	0.059	0.049	0.045
- <i>Between</i>	0.172	0.140	0.099	0.210
- <i>Overall</i>	0.149	0.127	0.095	0.188
<b>Community acceptance of domestic violence (<i>0-to-1 score</i>)</b>	0.046***	0.086***	0.053	0.060***
	(0.015)	(0.024)	(0.046)	(0.015)
Observations	27,238	13,298	7,064	33,457
Number of individuals	15,555	7,495	6,043	20,937
R-squared*:				
- <i>Within</i>	0.040	0.060	0.050	0.045
- <i>Between</i>	0.172	0.139	0.100	0.209
- <i>Overall</i>	0.149	0.126	0.096	0.187
Control variables	YES	YES	YES	YES
State FE	YES	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses: \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1. Standard errors were clustered at a household level for robustness. \*Since HT model specification does not report R-squared values, we computed those obtained in a random model specification.

Source: Authors' calculations from IHDS I-II database.

#### **4) Discussion**

Obesity and related comorbidities are alarmingly increasing in low- and middle-income countries. This global issue has shown to be especially worrying for women who are disproportionately affected by this epidemic. Hence, understanding the role of gender inequality in the emergence of obesity among women in developing countries such as India appears as an important research question to prevent this global epidemic. Based on a longitudinal dataset and applying complementary econometric approaches, we provide evidence on the complex relationship between gender inequality and obesity.

First, our results confirm that some indicators of gender inequality measured at the individual level lead to hazardous weight gain among Indian women, even when controlling for a comprehensive set of demographic and socioeconomic factors (and also for individual time-invariant characteristics). Indeed, commonness of domestic violence in the community and higher age difference between spouses increase both female BMI and overweight risk. According to the literature, gender norms and inequality have important psycho-social consequences for women. In Bangladesh, Lentz (2018) shows that women living in violence contexts may choose to eat less or lower quality foods to avoid domestic violence episodes. Hence, our study suggests that this type of precautionary mechanism to avoid violence leading to inadequate feeding behaviours may in some contexts cause weight gain and overweight. In addition, domestic violence towards women is associated with major mental health disorders like depression, anxiety, posttraumatic stress disorders, and loss of self-esteem and self-confidence (Trevillion et al., 2012). In some conditions, mental illness can result in compulsive snacking, overeating, risky non-food intakes (e.g. alcohol, tobacco, and narcotics), reduction in mobility and physical activity, leading to weight gain (Brunner et al., 2007; Yount & Li, 2011). Recent studies show that (negative) emotions are related to risky attitudes, namely in terms of health (Meier, forthcoming), which may also explain unhealthy food choices for women facing

domestic violence. Consequently, public policy interventions, oriented to reduce domestic violence against women and its acceptance, may improve women's health status, including mental health but also nutritional health.

Another contribution of this study relies on the result regarding women's empowerment and autonomy. Indeed, we surprisingly find that a higher decision-making power and low levels of restricted mobility are both associated with female weight gain and overweight in India, especially among urban areas and privileged social groups for the former. This innovative finding is likely to highlight a higher exposure to obesogenic environments and behaviours associated with women's emancipation and empowerment. In other words, women's lack of autonomy and restricted mobility may have a "protective effect" against Western lifestyles and food consumptions related to weight gain such as eating more outside, higher access to high-calorie processed food, or higher attendance to fast-food outlets and bars. Moreover, increasing empowerment and autonomy for any individual does not necessarily mean that their actions and decisions will be healthier. Indeed, cross-country evidence from 190 countries over a period of 30 years show that women's political empowerment (measured considering women's civil liberties, civil society participation, and political participation) is positively associated with increasing BMI in both high and low income countries (Fox et al., 2019). Even though the study does not use a measure of decision-making in the household, the authors declare that it correlated highly with other women's empowerment measures. Higher levels of empowerment would counteract the exposure to an obesogenic environment if women were more likely to exercise, but in the case of India, gender norms are still very entrenched when it comes to women engaging in physical exercise (Mathews et al., 2016). Consequently, since Indian women are not culturally invited to engage in physical activity, empowering in obesogenic (urban) contexts might encourage the adoption of a sedentary way of living and unhealthy consumptions associated with weight gain. Further research should deepen the analysis to

understand how and why an increase in autonomy and empowerment can rise the levels of overweight and obesity, for more precise policy recommendations.

Finally, our results show that child marriage decreases female BMI and increases the risk of underweight. One can assume that child marriage implies strong mental health troubles and lead women to lose weight because of exacerbated levels of violation of human rights (as observed for high levels of domestic violence in Bangladesh by Lentz, 2018). In India, child marriage is extremely concerning: one in three of the world's child brides live in this country and still 7% of Indian married women are married before 15 (UNICEF, 2019). Hence, limiting child marriage appears as a concrete action to counter the female malnutrition, but also mental depression. An interesting research avenue would be to better explore the heterogeneity in child marriage and its effects on female health and nutritional status. For instance, assessing the impact of the 2006 Prohibition of Child Marriage Act on the prevalence of female malnutrition in India can be a good entry point.

To conclude, this article contributes to understanding how global nutritional issues and gender inequality are connected. As demonstrated, several dimensions of gender inequality disfavours women have negative impacts on women's mental health and nutrition, including domestic violence and social restrictions (Case & Menendez, 2009). These factors may affect women's mobility and free access to physical activity and health care services, and lead women to neglect their own bodies and aspirations. Moreover, gender inequality occurring in urban areas leads to a stronger and significant effect on weight gain, considering that the process of urbanization is concomitantly associated with the introduction of westernized lifestyles and overweight-related diets (Wells et al. 2012). Surprisingly, women's lack of freedom, autonomy and decision-making power may reduce the exposure to urban and obesogenic environments, and paradoxically "protect" women against weight gain. These results prove that public health policy should systematically consider gender inequality as one of the main drivers of risky

nutritional behaviours when anti-obesity programs are implemented. A methodological and policy relevant contribution of this paper is to point out that the use of compound indicators to measure the impact of gender inequality on health outcomes such as BMI may hide more nuanced mechanisms that can only be unveiled by looking at specific dimensions of gender inequality.

## REFERENCES

- Ackerson, L. K., & Subramanian, S. V. (2008). Domestic Violence and Chronic Malnutrition among Women and Children in India. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *167*(10), 1188–1196. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwn049>
- Agrawal, S., Millett, C. J., Dhillon, P. K., Subramanian, S. V., & Ebrahim, S. (2014). Type of vegetarian diet, obesity and diabetes in adult Indian population. *Nutrition Journal*, *13*(1), 89.
- Ameye, H., & Swinnen, J. (2019). Obesity, income and gender: The changing global relationship. *Global Food Security*, *23*, 267–281. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2019.09.003>
- Baltagi, B. H., Bresson, G., & Pirotte, A. (2003). Fixed effects, random effects or Hausman–Taylor?: A pretest estimator. *Economics Letters*, *79*(3), 361–369.
- Barcellos, S. H., Carvalho, L. S., & Lleras-Muney, A. (2014). Child gender and parental investments in India: Are boys and girls treated differently? *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, *6*(1), 157–89.
- Batra, R., & Reio Jr, T. G. (2016). Gender inequality issues in India. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *18*(1), 88–101.
- Bennett, J. E., Stevens, G. A., Mathers, C. D., Bonita, R., Rehm, J., Kruk, M. E., Riley, L. M., Dain, K., Kengne, A. P., & Chalkidou, K. (2018). NCD Countdown 2030: Worldwide trends in non-communicable disease mortality and progress towards Sustainable Development Goal target 3.4. *The Lancet*, *392*(10152), 1072–1088.
- Bonnefond, C., & Clément, M. (2014). Social class and body weight among Chinese urban adults: The role of the middle classes in the nutrition transition. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), *112C*, 22–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.04.021>

- Brunner, E. J., Chandola, T., & Marmot, M. G. (2007). Prospective effect of job strain on general and central obesity in the Whitehall II Study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 165(7), 828–837. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwk058>
- Burn, J. M., & Evenhuis, M. (2014). *'Just Married, Just a Child': Child Marriage in the Indo-Pacific Region*.
- Carmichael, S. (2011). Marriage and power: Age at first marriage and spousal age gap in lesser developed countries. *The History of the Family*, 16(4), 416–436.
- Case, A., & Menendez, A. (2009). Sex differences in obesity rates in poor countries: Evidence from South Africa. *Economics & Human Biology*, 7(3), 271–282.
- Cawley, J. (2015). An economy of scales: A selective review of obesity's economic causes, consequences, and solutions. *Journal of Health Economics*, 43, 244–268.
- Choudhuri, P., & Desai, S. (2020). Gender inequalities and household fuel choice in India. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 121487.
- Collaboration, N. R. F. (2016). Trends in adult body-mass index in 200 countries from 1975 to 2014: A pooled analysis of 1698 population-based measurement studies with 19· 2 million participants. *The Lancet*, 387(10026), 1377–1396.
- De Soysa, I., & Lewin, O. L. (2019). Gender empowerment, inequalities and the prevalence of adult female obesity: An empirical analysis using new data, 1990–2013. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 47(8), 796–807.
- Dhar, D., Jain, T., & Jayachandran, S. (2019). Intergenerational transmission of gender attitudes: Evidence from India. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 55(12), 2572–2592.
- Di Angelantonio, E., Bhupathiraju, S. N., Wormser, D., Gao, P., Kaptoge, S., de Gonzalez, A. B., Cairns, B. J., Huxley, R., Jackson, C. L., & Joshy, G. (2016). Body-mass index and

- all-cause mortality: Individual-participant-data meta-analysis of 239 prospective studies in four continents. *The Lancet*, 388(10046), 776–786.
- Ending Child Marriage: A profile of progress in India*. (2019, February 28). UNICEF DATA. <https://data.unicef.org/resources/ending-child-marriage-a-profile-of-progress-in-india/>
- Ferretti, F., & Mariani, M. (2017). Gender discrimination, gender disparities in obesity and human development. *Heliyon*, 3(3), e00263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2017.e00263>
- Fox, A., Feng, W., & Asal, V. (2019). What is driving global obesity trends? Globalization or “modernization”? *Globalization and Health*, 15(1), 32. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-019-0457-y>
- Garawi, F., Devries, K., Thorogood, N., & Uauy, R. (2014). Global differences between women and men in the prevalence of obesity: Is there an association with gender inequality? *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 68(10), 1101–1106.
- Godelier, M. (1981). *The origins of male domination*. New Left Review.
- Gupta, R. (2004). Trends in hypertension epidemiology in India. *Journal of Human Hypertension*, 18(2), 73–78.
- Hansford, F. (2010). The nutrition transition: A gender perspective with reference to Brazil. *Gender & Development*, 18(3), 439–452.
- Haukkala, A., & Uutela, A. (2000). Cynical hostility, depression, and obesity: The moderating role of education and gender. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 27(1), 106–109.
- Jayachandran, S. (2015). The roots of gender inequality in developing countries. *Economics*, 7(1), 63–88.
- Kanter, R., & Caballero, B. (2012). Global gender disparities in obesity: A review. *Advances in Nutrition*, 3(4), 491–498.

- Kulkarni, V. S., Kulkarni, V. S., & Gaiha, R. (2017). “Double Burden of Malnutrition” Reexamining the Coexistence of Undernutrition and Overweight Among Women in India. *International Journal of Health Services*, 47(1), 108–133.
- Lentz, E. C. (2018). Complicating narratives of women’s food and nutrition insecurity: Domestic violence in rural Bangladesh. *World Development*, 104, 271–280.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.11.019>
- Levasseur, P. (2015). Causal effects of socioeconomic status on central adiposity risks: Evidence using panel data from urban Mexico. *Social Science & Medicine*, 136–137, 165–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.05.018>
- Mathews, E., Lakshmi, J. K., Ravindran, T. K. S., Pratt, M., & Thankappan, K. R. (2016). Perceptions of barriers and facilitators in physical activity participation among women in Thiruvananthapuram City, India. *Global Health Promotion*, 23(4), 27–36.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1757975915573878>
- Meenakshi, J. V. (2016). Trends and patterns in the triple burden of malnutrition in India. *Agricultural Economics*, 47(S1), 115–134.
- Meier, A. N. (n.d.). Emotions and Risk Attitudes. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20200164>
- Menon, S. (2020). The effect of marital endowments on domestic violence in India. *Journal of Development Economics*, 143, 102389.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2019.102389>
- Parashar, A. (2008). Gender inequality and religious personal laws in India. *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 14(2), 103–112.
- Popkin, B. M. (1994). The nutrition transition in low-income countries: An emerging crisis. *Nutrition Reviews*, 52(9), 285–298.

- Popkin, B. M. (1999). Urbanization, lifestyle changes and the nutrition transition. *World Development*, 27(11), 1905–1916.
- Popkin, B. M. (2007). The world is fat. *Scientific American*, 297(3), 88–95.
- Rothblum, E. D. (1992). The stigma of women's weight: Social and economic realities. *Feminism & Psychology*, 2(1), 61–73.
- Sciences (IIPS), I. I. for P., & ICF. (2017). *National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4), 2015–16: India*. IIPS Mumbai.
- Shephard, A. (2019). *Marriage market dynamics, gender, and the age gap*.
- Siddiqui, Z., & Donato, R. (2020). The dramatic rise in the prevalence of overweight and obesity in India: Obesity transition and the looming health care crisis. *World Development*, 134, 105050. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105050>
- Sinha, A., McRoy, R. G., Berkman, B., & Sutherland, M. (2017). Drivers of change: Examining the effects of gender equality on child nutrition. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 76, 203–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.03.007>
- Stroope, S. (2015). Seclusion, decision-making power, and gender disparities in adult health: Examining hypertension in India. *Social Science Research*, 53, 288–299.
- Swinburn, B., Egger, G., & Raza, F. (1999). Dissecting obesogenic environments: The development and application of a framework for identifying and prioritizing environmental interventions for obesity. *Preventive Medicine*, 29(6), 563–570.
- Trevillion, K., Oram, S., Feder, G., & Howard, L. M. (2012). Experiences of domestic violence and mental disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS One*, 7(12), e51740.
- Uthman, O. A., Moradi, T., & Lawoko, S. (2011). Are individual and community acceptance and witnessing of intimate partner violence related to its occurrence? Multilevel

structural equation model. *PloS One*, 6(12), e27738.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0027738>

Warin, M., Moore, V., Zivkovic, T., & Davies, M. (2011). Telescoping the origins of obesity to women's bodies: How gender inequalities are being squeezed out of Barker's hypothesis. *Annals of Human Biology*, 38(4), 453–460.

Wells, J. C. K., Marphatia, A. A., Cole, T. J., & McCoy, D. (2012). Associations of economic and gender inequality with global obesity prevalence: Understanding the female excess. *Social Science & Medicine*, 75(3), 482–490.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.03.029>

WHO. (2020). *Controlling the global obesity epidemic*. World Health Organisation Geneva.

Wooldridge, J. M. (2010). *Econometric analysis of cross section and panel data*. MIT press.

Yount, K. M., & Li, L. (2011). Domestic violence and obesity in Egyptian women. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, 43(1), 85–99.

## APPENDIX

### **Textbox A1. Data source description**

The IHDS survey was conducted in two waves: one in 2005-06 and one in 2011-12 respectively covering 41,554 and 42,152 households residing in urban and rural areas across 33 Indian states. The primary sampling unit (PSU) are villages and urban blocks from which the households were selected. In the last wave, 85% of the household were re-interviewed. 2,114 households were added in the second wave to refresh the sample. This survey is the only nationally representative panel dataset available for India, which makes it a valuable asset for our study. Another advantage of this survey is that it was conducted through face-to-face interviews, organized into two separate questionnaires for households and for women, with women interviewing women and men interviewing men. The subset of question from which we created some of the gender inequality variables are from the women's questionnaire, which is specifically responded by ever-married women from 15 to 49 years old. In the analyses, we consider an unbalanced panel sample, with individuals interviewed at one or both waves. To avoid confounders like menopause or other age-related hormonal issues, we restrict our sample to women between 18 and 50 years old in 2011-12. Our final sample is composed of 23,307 women in both years.

**Table A1: Summary Statistics**

	Married under 18 ( <i>binary</i> )		Age difference with husband ( <i>years</i> )		Decision-making power ( <i>0-1 score</i> )		Restricted mobility ( <i>0-1 score</i> )		Community acceptance of violence ( <i>0-1 score</i> )		Overweight prevalence (%)		Obesity prevalence (%)	
	2005	2011	2005	2011	2005	2011	2005	2011	2005	2011	2005	2011	2005	2011
<b>All subsample</b>	0.52	0.51	5.28	5.40	1.45	1.44	1.94	1.99	2.09	2.45	0.16	0.27	0.03	0.07
<b>Age</b>														
18-30	0.52	0.55	5.11	5.24	1.22	1.27	2.06	2.08	2.16	2.54	0.09	0.17	0.02	0.03
31-40	0.53	0.50	5.33	5.24	1.55	1.44	1.90	2.02	2.09	2.45	0.18	0.26	0.04	0.06
40-50	0.51	0.51	5.52	5.62	1.70	1.51	1.81	1.97	1.95	2.43	0.24	0.31	0.05	0.08
P-value ( $\chi^2$ )	0.006	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.039	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
<b>Urban</b>														
Urban	0.41	0.39	5.59	5.68	1.59	1.52	1.80	1.98	1.79	2.25	0.27	0.42	0.06	0.12
Rural	0.58	0.57	5.15	5.28	1.39	1.41	2.01	2.00	2.22	2.53	0.11	0.20	0.02	0.04
P-value ( $\chi^2$ )	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
<b>Education</b>														
None	0.68	0.68	5.06	5.14	1.42	1.42	2.03	2.02	2.31	2.59	0.10	0.18	0.02	0.04
1-4	0.57	0.57	5.71	5.71	1.49	1.48	1.91	1.92	2.27	2.49	0.14	0.22	0.03	0.06
Primary														
6-9	0.54	0.52	4.99	5.16	1.44	1.47	1.98	2.04	1.97	2.36	0.19	0.30	0.04	0.08
Secondary	0.42	0.42	5.64	5.87	1.46	1.46	1.90	1.97	1.96	2.40	0.19	0.32	0.04	0.08
Higher	0.25	0.24	5.64	5.72	1.52	1.40	1.82	1.99	1.76	2.30	0.26	0.41	0.06	0.13
Secondary	0.14	0.16	5.61	5.57	1.42	1.47	1.78	1.94	1.57	2.11	0.26	0.42	0.05	0.12
Graduate 15+	0.05	0.06	4.84	4.90	1.61	1.57	1.62	1.90	1.30	1.96	0.36	0.51	0.09	0.15
P-value ( $\chi^2$ )	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
<b>Per capita Income</b>														
1 <sup>st</sup> tercile	0.64	0.62	5.12	5.12	1.37	1.37	2.05	2.01	2.43	2.61	0.08	0.16	0.01	0.03
2 <sup>nd</sup> tercile	0.56	0.56	5.25	5.40	1.43	1.46	2.00	2.01	2.19	2.49	0.12	0.23	0.02	0.05
3 <sup>rd</sup> tercile	0.41	0.40	5.42	5.60	1.53	1.48	1.83	1.97	1.77	2.29	0.24	0.38	0.05	0.10
P-value ( $\chi^2$ )	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
<b>Poverty line</b>														
Poor	0.64	0.61	5.04	5.11	1.34	1.40	2.01	2.00	2.19	2.55	0.08	0.14	0.01	0.03
No Poor	0.49	0.50	5.35	5.46	1.48	1.45	1.93	1.99	2.06	2.42	0.18	0.29	0.04	0.08
P-value ( $\chi^2$ )	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.197	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
<b>Caste</b>														
High caste	0.42	0.40	5.32	5.56	1.45	1.42	1.82	1.94	1.82	2.23	0.22	0.35	0.05	0.10
OBC	0.54	0.55	5.39	5.44	1.43	1.43	1.96	2.04	2.18	2.55	0.13	0.24	0.03	0.06
SC/ST	0.60	0.60	5.17	5.28	1.49	1.44	1.98	2.03	2.22	2.53	0.11	0.22	0.02	0.05
Muslim (w/o caste)	0.57	0.54	5.47	5.57	1.40	1.49	2.02	1.96	2.20	2.60	0.18	0.32	0.04	0.08
Christian, Sikh, Jain (w/o caste)	0.15	0.10	4.44	4.59	1.49	1.46	1.78	1.94	1.52	2.07	0.36	0.51	0.09	0.17
P-value ( $\chi^2$ )	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
<b>Employed</b>														
Yes	0.61	0.58	5.25	5.31	1.54	1.46	2.01	2.01	2.29	2.58	0.10	0.19	0.02	0.04
No	0.46	0.46	5.31	5.48	1.39	1.43	1.90	1.98	1.95	2.33	0.21	0.34	0.04	0.09
P-value ( $\chi^2$ )	0.006	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Notes: Descriptive statistics for our sample: non-pregnant ever-married women between 18 and 49 years old in 2005. Pearson's chi-square test results are presented (H0 is the independence hypothesis across groups).

Source: Authors' calculations from IHDS I-II database.

---

<sup>1</sup> The co-occurrence of these three nutritional issues is referred as the Indian triple burden of malnutrition (Meenakshi, 2016).

<sup>2</sup> Most of the studies that analyse the association between gender inequality and obesity use multidimensional indexes based on levels of empowerment, health, life expectancy, economic status, access to rights, education, among others, like the Gender Inequality Index (GII) or the Global Gender Gap (GGG) (De Soysa & Lewin, 2019; Wells et al., 2012). Some of them also try to capture discriminatory social institutions such as early marriage, son preference or violence like the OECD Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) (Garawi et al., 2014).

<sup>3</sup> To our knowledge, only Sinha et al. (2017) propose a within-country study investigating the relationship between local gender inequality and child starvation. They find that higher gender equality (measured at the state level) in India increases the probability of normal growth.

<sup>4</sup> In 1929, the Child Marriage Restraint Act (CMRA) of India prohibited child marriage of girls below 15 years old. In 1978, the legal age of marriage increased to 18 years old for women. However, child marriages continued to take place. To address this issue, the government passed the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act in 2006 and defined the legal age for marriage as 18 for women and 21 for men. An important decline is observed, and child marriage passed from 47% in 2006 to 27% in 2017 but it is still dramatically high (UNICEF).

<sup>5</sup> Note that the wording of the question explicitly asks respondents from the women module to report community-level acceptance rather than personal experiences: “I would now like to ask you some questions about your community, NOT about your own family. In your community is it usual for husbands to beat their wives in each of the following situations?”.

<sup>6</sup> Details of the PCAs available upon request.

<sup>7</sup> Religious personal laws are laws applied to a certain group of people based on religion and culture. They started from the colonization period in order to “save” their religious laws (Parashar, 2008).

<sup>8</sup> Since the age of marriage and age difference with the husband are time-invariant variables, we cannot use the child marriage nor the age difference dummy as indicators of gender inequality when fixed-effects estimations are considered.

<sup>9</sup> Per capita income was calculated dividing the total household income by the number of persons in the household.

---

<sup>10</sup> Education and caste are time-varying in our sample, given that there are 6 to 7 years gap between both waves of the survey (see Tables S1 and S2 in online Supplementary Materials).

<sup>11</sup> Additional regressions (presented in Table S5 in online Supplementary Materials) looking at the effect of the multidimensional gender inequality index on weight reflect the fact that some of the dimensions of gender inequality may cancel each other out on average. Indeed, the Hausman-Taylor regression coefficients are non-significant and close to zero in magnitude. Only the fixed effect estimations show a significant and positive effect of the gender inequality index on BMI and a significant negative effect on the probability of being underweight.

<sup>12</sup> According to the Indian poverty line.