NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

THE IMPACT OF EARLY OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE ON HEALTH BEHAVIORS

Inas Rashad Kelly
Dhaval M. Dave
Jody L. Sindelar
William T. Gallo

Working Paper 16803
http://www.nber.org/papers/w16803

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
February 2011

The authors gratefully acknowledge funding from the National Institute of Aging (R01 AG027045). Maureen Canavan provided excellent research assistance. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

The Impact of Early Occupational Choice On Health Behaviors
Inas Rashad Kelly, Dhaval M. Dave, Jody L. Sindelar, and William T. Gallo
NBER Working Paper No. 16803
February 2011
JEL No. I0

ABSTRACT

Occupational choice is a significant input into individuals' health investments, operating in a manner that can be either health-promoting or health-depreciating. Recent studies have highlighted the potential importance of initial occupational choice on subsequent outcomes pertaining to morbidity. This study is the first to assess the existence and strength of a causal relationship between initial occupational choice at labor entry and subsequent health behaviors and habits. We utilize the Panel Study of Income Dynamics to analyze the effect of first occupation, as identified by industry category and blue collar work, on subsequent health outcomes relating to body mass index, obesity, alcohol consumption, and physical activity in 1999-2005. Our findings suggest that initial occupations described as craft, operative, and service are related to higher body mass index and obesity later in life, while labor occupations are related to higher probabilities of smoking later in life. Blue collar work early in life is associated with increased probabilities of obesity and smoking, and decreased physical activity later in life, although effects may be masked by unobserved heterogeneity. Few effects are found for the effect of initial occupation on alcohol consumption. The weight of the evidence bearing from various methodologies, which account for non-random unobserved selection, indicates that at least part of this effect is consistent with a causal interpretation. These estimates also underscore the potential durable impact of early labor market experiences on later health.

Inas Rashad Kelly
Queens College / CUNY
Economics Department
300 Powdermaker Hall
65-30 Kissena Boulevard
Flushing, NY 11367
and NBER
Inas.Kelly@qc.cuny.edu

Dhaval M. Dave
Bentley University
Department of Economics
175 Forest Street, AAC 195
Waltham, MA 02452-4705
and NBER
ddave@bentley.edu

Jody L. Sindelar
Yale School of Public Health
Yale University School of Medicine
60 College Street, P.O. Box 208034
New Haven, CT 06520-8034
and NBER
jody.sindelar@yale.edu

William T. Gallo
CUNY School of Public Health
Hunter College / CUNY
425 E. 25th Street, Rm. 817 W
New York, NY 10010
william.gallo@hunter.cuny.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

Working is an activity that occupies much of many individuals' lives. According to the 2005 American Time Use Survey, employed individuals spend an average of 7.5 hours a day working. A sizeable economics literature has established that early labor market history, including occupational choice, influences job mobility and income trajectories (Oreopoulos and von Wachter 2006; Light 2005). Economic resources have, in turn, been shown to affect health outcomes (Smith 1999). The presence of a compensating wage differential, wherein individuals routinely trade off job safety and higher wages, and the presence of substantial heterogeneity in health care access across occupation and industry classes, further implicate occupational choice as a significant input into health investments.[1]

This interplay of various reinforcing and competing mechanisms suggests that work-life can be both health-promoting and also health-depreciating. Moreover, it may impact health investments and health outcomes directly, for instance through occupational hazards or job strain, as well as indirectly, through health care coverage, income, and peer influences. Given these numerous plausible pathways, a number of studies have examined the association between job conditions and health (Case and Deaton 2005; Theorell 2000), though most have been limited by potential selection bias and are unable to draw stronger conclusions regarding causality. Using the Health and Retirement Survey, Gueorguieva et al. (2009) conduct a more careful analysis and uncover significant gaps in baseline health by occupation that persist over time.

Most of the extant literature has also focused on contemporaneous effects rather than the cumulative durable impact of early labor market choices. This is surprising given that the

[1] See Viscusi and Aldy (2003) for a review of the literature on the value of a statistical life derived from the tradeoff between wages and job safety.

economic paradigm, which views health as a capital stock determined by lifetime investments, choices, and constraints (Grossman 1972), imparts a significant role to early investments and resources. Furthermore, the impact of economic resources and other choices may be most acute during childhood or early adulthood, when health levels and pathways are being established. The importance of a lifetime budget constraint implies that additional economic resources may not have a quantitatively large impact on the current health capital stock, especially as the individual gets older (Smith 1999). Even if health behaviors or health utilization respond to current changes in circumstances, effects on health capital may not be realized until later in the working life-course, suggesting that the cumulative or durable impact of labor market choices may be more salient than contemporaneous effects.

A budding literature and, in particular, three seminal studies (Fletcher and Sindelar 2009; Fletcher et al. 2009; Sindelar et al. 2007) have recently pointed to potentially important effects of initial occupational choice on subsequent health status, with substantial heterogeneity across socio-demographic groups. These analyses, however, have been limited to self-rated health and the incidence of heart attacks. The reduced-form approach in these studies also obfuscates potential pathways and interim effects on health inputs. We attempt to address these gaps, and in the process make significant contributions to the emerging focus on the importance of early occupational choice for subsequent health, and to the broader economics literature on the lasting effects of early circumstances on health and labor outcomes.

This study is the first to assess the existence and strength of a causal relationship between initial occupational choice at labor entry and subsequent health behaviors and habits, such as smoking, drinking, physical activity, and body mass index, all of which are important proximate inputs into later health status. Health habits are often established relatively early in life (Fletcher

and Sindelar 2009) and therefore more likely to respond to early labor market choices. The focus on health behaviors also underscores potential pathways through which initial labor market choices may eventually have lasting effects on health; the identified impact of initial occupation on later health outcomes (for instance, heart attacks, as studied in Sindelar et al. 2007) is more plausibly indicative of a causal link if effects on intermediate health behaviors and inputs are also evident. We also undertake an exploratory analysis of potential mediators and pathways, including income trajectories, health insurance, work hours, and other factors, through which early occupational choice may have durable effects on subsequent health habits. Identifying these pathways can be important in targeting public policy interventions that may moderate potentially adverse effects on health behaviors and overall health status.

The empirical analysis is based on the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), a nationally-representative longitudinal data set that contains information on over 65,000 individuals spanning as much as 36 years of their lives. The PSID contains extensive information on pre-labor market conditions and family characteristics, as well as typically-unobserved measures such as individuals' risk tolerance, which allows us to account for potential selection bias. We further employ a series of methodologies to disentangle causal effects, including a standard instrumental variables-based strategy; an innovative approach proposed by Altonji et al. (2005) that permits causal inference without the need for exclusion restrictions or other strong restrictive assumptions; and a novel approach proposed by Lewbel (2007) that generates internal instrumental variables in the presence of heteroscedastity. This direct focus on accounting for selection bias and sorting out causality is another contribution that we make over much of the literature. Understanding the interplay over the life-course among early labor

market choices and health investments is important to the development of effective policies and programs to improve health at older ages.

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. Section II discusses potential mechanisms through which initial occupational choice may influence health behaviors, and also places our study within the context of the extant literature. Section III describes our empirical strategies for accounting for potential selection bias, followed by a description of the data sources in Section IV. Section V presents and discusses the estimates from our multivariate analyses. Section VI concludes with some implications for public policy.

II. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The objective of this study is to assess the extent to which first occupation impacts subsequent health behaviors among older adults. This question can be framed within the human capital model for the demand for health (Grossman 1972). Grossman combines the household production model of consumer behavior with the theory of human capital investment to analyze an individual's demand for health capital. Individuals invest in health up to the point where the marginal benefit equates the supply price of health capital at each age. The basic insight of this paradigm is that health is a capital stock and health behaviors and other inputs are investments in that stock. For a rational utility maximizing agent with a lifetime horizon, today's health stock will be a function of the entire history of health investments including current and past health behaviors, incomes, and health endowments.

Occupational choice, in general, is expected to be an input into health production and affect health outcomes and behaviors through a variety of channels. Aspects of work can have both direct and indirect effects on health, which may be health-promoting or health-depreciating. Direct effects include occupational exposure to health and safety hazards, job strain and stress

related to working conditions, and injury risks. Often a compensating wage differential is present wherein the individual is trading off job safety for higher wages, particularly in unskilled jobs. Thus, occupational choice is also a form of direct investment in health.[2] The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) reports 4.1 non-fatal workplace injuries and illnesses among 100 equivalent full-time workers in 2008.[3] This national all-industry average masks considerable heterogeneity; the rate is much higher among larger firms and among state and local government employers. Certain private industries such as crop and animal production, food/beverage and tobacco manufacturing, wood and primary metal manufacturing, hospitals, and nursing and residential care facilities also exhibit far higher rates of occupational illness and injury.

Job strain associated with working conditions may also have direct adverse effects on mental and physical health. In a comprehensive review of the literature on job stress, Michie and Williams (2003) find that long hours worked, work overload and pressure, and the effects of these conditions on personal lives are key factors associated with psychological ill health and sickness absence. Depression and mental illness, in turn, have been found to causally impact participation in unhealthy behaviors such as smoking, drinking, and illicit drug use (Saffer and Dave 2005).

Indirect effects of occupational choice on health can occur via shifts in income and wealth constraints, health insurance coverage, shifts in time constraints, and influences through workplace peers. For instance, initial occupational choices affect occupational mobility, tenure and experience, and income trajectories over one's lifetime (Light 2005); these shifts in

[2] See Cropper (1977) for a formal introduction of occupational choice in Grossman's human capital framework for the demand for health capital.
[3] Industry-specific non-fatal workplace injury and illness rates are available at: http://www.bls.gov/iif/oshsum.htm.

economic resources would in turn be expected to impact health. While the direction of causality is not well-established, a sizeable literature documents a strong association between income or wealth and a variety of health outcomes including mortality and morbidity (Smith 1999). Ettner (1996), in an attempt to disentangle causality, applies an instrumental variables-based methodology to three large-scale nationally representative data sets. She estimates the structural impact of income on health and concludes that increases in income significantly improve mental and physical health, but also increase the prevalence of alcohol consumption.

The prevalence of uninsured individuals also varies substantially across occupation and industry classes, which in turn may mediate the impact of occupational choice on health. For instance, among non-professional and non-managerial occupations, almost half of all non-elderly workers in agriculture are uninsured, 40% of such workers in construction are uninsured, and 25% of workers in the wholesale and retail trade lack insurance.[4] Summarizing the results from the Rand Health Insurance Experiment, Newhouse (2004) concluded that higher coinsurance rates and lack of access to care reduced health care utilization, and while for "most people enrolled in the RAND experiment, who were typical of Americans covered by employment-based insurance, the variation in use across the plans appeared to have minimal to no effects on health status … for those who were both poor and sick – people who might be found among those covered by Medicaid or lacking insurance – the reduction in use was harmful, on average." McWilliams et al. (2007) similarly find that compared with previously insured adults, previously uninsured adults reported significantly improved health trends after becoming eligible for Medicare at age 65. Numerous studies have also shown that physician advice and interventions are successful in influencing patient behaviors such as smoking, drinking, exercise, and diet

[4] See *Health Insurance Coverage in America, 2008*, accessed at The Kaiser Family Foundation website: http://facts.kff.org/chartbook.aspx?cb=57.

(Dave and Kaestner 2009; U.S. Preventive Services Task Force 2004, 2003). Subsequently, lack of access to primary care due to interruptions in health insurance may lead to unhealthy lifestyles. Hadley (2003), in a review of the literature, likewise concludes that, while all studies have methodological issues, research over the past 25 years makes a compelling case that having health insurance and greater health care utilization would improve the health of the uninsured.

Data from the American Time Use Surveys (ATUS) indicate that work-related physical activity (measured in equivalent metabolic units) varies substantially across occupations, being expectedly largest in mining, agriculture, construction, and manufacturing jobs, and lowest among management and administrative jobs. Leisure-time physical activity also varies across occupations, often in inverse relation to work-related activity, suggesting some substitution between the two types driven by time constraints. This heterogeneity in physical activity across jobs, combined with differential effects of work-related versus leisure-time physical activity, would be expected to impact body mass index and subsequent health status, ceteris paribus.

As much of life is spent working, social influences through workplace peers may also impact individuals' health behaviors. Moon and Kim (2001), for instance, estimate prevalence of cigarette smoking by occupation and industry in the U.S., using data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. They document considerable differences across occupations and industries. Smoking prevalence is highest among material movers, construction laborers, and vehicle mechanics and repairers, and lowest among teachers. Among industry groups, the construction industry had the highest prevalence of cigarette smoking. Powell et al. (2005) conclude that peer effects have a significant impact on youth smoking behavior and that there is a strong potential for social multiplier effects. Thus, with respect to initial occupation, health

behaviors of young adults and youth may be especially susceptible to peer influences at the workplace.

Prior Studies

Given these plausible mechanisms, numerous social scientists have studied the empirical relationship between work status, job characteristics, and health.[5] For instance, the longitudinal Whitehall studies examine the health of civil servants in London, focusing on how occupation affects health (Marmot and Smith 1997; Marmot and Bobak 2000; Marmot 2001). In general, these studies find that occupational status, job insecurity, and stress, among other factors, impact various dimensions of health, including coronary heart disease, self-reported health status, various morbidities, and health behaviors.

This literature, however, has largely ignored any potential durable impact of occupational choice. Three recent studies address this gap and acknowledge the importance of early occupational choice; these studies are the first to empirically investigate how initial occupation and job characteristics may have a cumulative impact on subsequent health status. Fletcher et al. (2009) match job characteristics from the Dictionary of Occupational Titles to individual records from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) to investigate the cumulative impact of job characteristics on self-rated health status. They construct five-year cumulative measures of job characteristics, and find that individuals working in jobs with high physical demands or harsh conditions experience declines in their health, with stronger adverse effects for females and older workers. This is consistent with Fletcher and Sindelar (2009) who also find that a blue-collar occupation at labor force entry is associated with subsequent decrements in self-reported health status. Sindelar et al. (2007) aggregate three-digit occupational codes into ten broad categories and consider the effects of early occupation choice on self-rated health status and ever having a

[5] See Theorell (2000) for a review of this literature.

heart attack. They also confirm that first-occupation has a durable impact on later health, though the impact varies by health measure and the degree of control for other observables.

Contributions

Our study adds to this emerging literature on the importance of early occupational choice on subsequent health and fits within the broader economics literature on lasting effects of early circumstances on health and labor outcomes. The studies noted above make a seminal contribution to this literature, though the focus thus far has been on self-rated health status and on the incidence of heart attacks. This study investigates the impact of first occupation on a host of subsequent health behaviors including smoking, drinking, physical activity, and body mass index, all of which are important proximate inputs into health. The focus on health behaviors is warranted for at least two reasons. First, durable effects on health behaviors (that is, investments in health) may be relatively more apparent and easier to identify statistically in a consistent manner than effects on indicators of the health stock. Second, the focus on health behaviors also underscores potential pathways through which initial labor market choices may eventually have lasting effects on health. We also undertake a first step in directly investigating channels of effect, including shifts in income, hours worked, and other potential mediators through which initial occupational choice may influence health behaviors. Earlier studies have generally implemented a reduced-form approach, which does not inform the "black box" that links early occupation to subsequent health. Uncovering evidence of plausible mechanisms also adds to the weight of the evidence bearing on whether the link represents a causal effect.

Furthermore, since occupational choice may be sticky over one's lifetime, the durable effect of first occupation is often confounded with the contemporaneous effect of current occupation in the prior studies. We are careful to distinguish between these two effects. We also

draw upon the other studies to address the issue of causality for comparison, but also supplement our analyses with other methodologies to account for non-random unobserved selection. In summary, this study provides the first empirical estimates for the lasting durable impact of first occupation on subsequent health behaviors for the general population and across demographic groups, while paying careful attention to potential bias from unobserved selection, potential channels of effect, and potential confounding between durable and contemporaneous effects.

III. METHODOLOGY

The above discussion suggests that early labor market choices can be a significant input into an individual's health production function. In general, empirically identifying the causal effect of occupation on health behaviors is complicated by two issues. The first is what we refer to as structural endogeneity, wherein in addition to occupation affecting health outcomes and behaviors, the causality may also run in reverse; health, and specifically private information on the respondent's health, may drive occupational choices and work decisions. Our focus on initial occupational choice and its impact on subsequent adult health investments bypasses this simultaneity concern. The second, what we refer to as statistical endogeneity, wherein an individual's early labor market choices and subsequent health investments may depend on a common set of unobserved factors (for instance, family history or risk tolerance), is a more relevant concern for this study.

Consider the following linear specifications of the structural production function for health behaviors (H_{it}) and initial occupational choice (O_{it-1}):[6]

$$(1) \qquad H_{it} = \beta_1 O_{it-1} + \beta_2 X_i + \beta_3 \mu_i + \varepsilon_{it}$$

$$(2) \qquad O_{it-1} = \alpha_1 X_i + \alpha_2 Z_{it-1} + \alpha_3 \mu_i + \mu_{it}$$

[6] The health-investment production function is based on Grossman (1972), extended to include occupational choice as an input into health investment. The occupational choice model is based on the theory of human capital investment (for example, see Borjas 2004; Boskin 1974).

Equation (1) is a production function for health behaviors (H_{it}) at adulthood, which is a function of occupational choice at labor market entry (O_{it-1}), observable characteristics such as age, gender, race, and education (X_i), and unobservable characteristics pertaining to the individual, such as family background, tolerance towards risk, and the rate of time preference (μ_i). Equation (2) postulates the determinants of occupational choice at labor market entry. The vector Z_{it-1} represents observed and unobserved variables specific to the occupation decision, such as parental occupation, initial labor market conditions, or private information regarding expected costs and benefits associated with the occupational choice, which may not directly impact the individual's subsequent health status (conditional on own and parental income or wealth, and other investments). The vector μ_i denotes common unobserved determinants of occupational choice that may also influence health. The subscripts refer to the i^{th} individual in time period *t*, and *t-1* denotes initial labor market entry or earlier periods.

Our objective is to estimate β_1 in order to assess the existence and strength of a possible causal relationship between first occupation and health behaviors. However, single equation methods applied to equation (1) may not yield causal information due to the presence of non-random selection into different occupations and investments in health – that is, correlation between μ_i and O_{it-1} ($\alpha_3 \neq 0$). Our estimation strategy proceeds in a stepwise fashion. Initially, we ignore the statistical endogeneity and estimate equation (1) using a standard regression model. We begin with a parsimonious set of covariates, and then estimate models with an expanded set of covariates including state fixed effects, family history, risk tolerance, and employment information, some of which are typically unobserved in other data sets. Estimating both the basic and the extended models allows us to evaluate how much of the association between early occupational choice and later health behaviors appears to be driven by omitted

individual heterogeneity. If the magnitude of the marginal effect of first occupation is highly sensitive to the inclusion of the additional covariates and typically-unobserved factors, then it is likely that factors that remain unobserved also play some role in this relationship.[7] This assumption is reasonable if one is using a multi-purpose, secondary data set, where the information collected on respondents may not include all information relevant to the outcome under study (Altonji et al. 2005). In cross-sectional data, which generally would not contain information on pre-labor entry characteristics and family history, unobserved factors are likely to be rather influential, whereas this may not be the case in a rich longitudinal data set such as the PSID, which includes measures of parental investments and family history as well as measures of the respondent's tolerance towards risk.

We refer to this problem as selection on observables and selection on unobservables (Altonji et al. 2005). We use these terms to acknowledge that respondents are not randomly sorted into occupations and health. Selection on observables refers to observed factors (such as age, gender, and race) that are correlated with both initial occupation and subsequent health behaviors. Selection on unobservables refers to possible factors that are not available in our data set, and will therefore influence the marginal effect of initial occupation.

The degree of selection on the observables can be gauged by comparing the estimated coefficients on first occupation from the parsimonious and extended models. The degree of selection on the unobserved characteristics cannot be measured directly with non-experimental data. However, we can bound this latter effect, allowing us to draw inferences regarding the unbiased relationship between first occupation and later health behaviors.

[7] The direction and magnitude, however, is unknown, depending on the nature of the joint distribution of the observed and unobserved characteristics.

Thus, the next step in our empirical strategy relies on an innovative approach proposed by Altonji et al. (2005), comprising two parts. The first step involves obtaining estimates of the effect of first occupation on health behaviors from a bivariate probit regression model in which the correlation between unobserved variables is fixed at various levels. This part of the analysis allows us to assess how sensitive estimates of the effect of first occupation are to the potential problem of correlated unobservables. The second step computes the amount of sorting into first occupation and adult health behaviors on observed variables, and obtains estimates of the effect of first occupation under the assumption that the degree of sorting on unobserved variables is equal to the degree of sorting on observed variables.

Specifically, alternately defining healthy behaviors and first occupation as dichotomous indicators (described below), application of the bivariate probit model assumes that ε_i and μ_i are distributed bivariate normally with a correlation of ρ and unit variances.[8] First, we estimate a bivariate probit model without any identifying assumptions but with a constrained correlation coefficient, ρ. We constrain ρ to be 0.10 initially and then examine the effects of increasing ρ in increments of 0.10 to 0.20, 0.30, 0.40 and 0.50. Since it is also plausible that unobserved factors common to both blue collar work and health behaviors are negatively correlated, we then constrain ρ to be -0.10, increasing incrementally (in absolute value) to -0.20, then -0.30, -0.40, and -0.50. In this way, we impose on the model increasingly greater amounts of correlation between unobservables, and examine whether or not the effect of first occupation on health behaviors is robust to such changes. This analysis allows one to determine the threshold of selection on unobservables, if any, at which first occupation no longer has a statistically significant effect on health behaviors.

[8] The model is estimated using maximum likelihood (Evans and Schwab 1995; Goldman et al. 2001).

Altonji et al. (2005) argue that if the observable determinants of an outcome are truly just a random subset of the complete set of determinants, selection on observable characteristics must be equal to selection on unobservable characteristics. This assertion of equal selection is unlikely to be true, and in fact, given our specialized longitudinal data set, we would expect selection on observable factors to be greater than selection on unobservable factors. Thus, estimates obtained under the assumption of equal selection are likely biased downwards, and represent a lower-bound estimate. The upper bound effect is the estimate from the naïve single equation extended model that assumes no additional selection on unobservable variables.

The advantage of the Altonji et al. (2005) procedure is that it allows researchers to assess the possible existence and strength of a causal relationship without requiring the use of identifying assumptions that are often not credible – for example, the existence of valid instruments in an instrumental variables context or other ad hoc exclusion restrictions. As a result, without any other identifying assumptions, researchers can estimate the degree of sorting on unobservable factors using the observed data, and identify a lower bound on the causal parameter estimate.

We also supplement our analyses with additional robustness checks in order to add to the weight of the evidence on the issue of causality. While instrumental variables-based methodologies are difficult to implement in practice, owing to the challenges in identifying plausible exclusion restrictions, we follow Fletcher and Sindelar (2009) in using parental occupation (conditional on parental income and education) and early state labor market conditions as instrumental variables (IV) for first occupational choice. Diagnostic tests are consistent with the identifying assumption that these measures have no direct impact on future health behaviors (outside of their impact through occupational choice), and that these measures

are significant predictors of first occupation. These estimates should, nevertheless, be interpreted with caution. This part of the analysis does, however, allow us to place our findings on health behaviors within the context of the sparse, but important, prior studies that have considered health outcomes. If these prior estimates on health outcomes are plausibly causal, then we should also see commensurate effects on health behaviors, which are proximate inputs into later health. This analysis further allows us to compare our lower and upper bound estimates derived under minimal identifying restrictions with those derived under a more standard IV approach.

Lewbel (2007) presents an IV technique that is useful when valid external instruments are weak or not available. This procedure relies on the presence of heteroscedasticity in the error term of the first-stage equation, which is tested using a Breusch-Pagan (1979) test. The Lewbel IV procedure uses $(X - \bar{X}) * \widehat{u_2}$ as the identifying instruments, where X is a vector of independent variables that may include all independent variables or a subset of them, and $\widehat{u_2}$ is the predicted residual from the first-stage (occupational choice) regression. Therefore, we also implement an instrumental variables analysis where we exploit the heteroscedastic nature of the residuals to generate internal instruments. As validation for this technique, we consistently find evidence of heteroscedasticity in our samples.

As a final step, we implement an exploratory analysis of potential mediators to inform the strength of the specific mechanisms underlying the impact of first occupation on later health behaviors. The estimated specifications thus far only include exogenous socioeconomic and predetermined factors so as not to "over-control" for factors that may be potential pathways. In alternate analyses, we re-estimate specification (1) by incorporating household income, hours worked, and current occupational status to gauge the extent to which the estimated effect (if any) of first occupation on subsequent health behaviors can be explained by these mediators.

IV. DATA

The Panel Study of Income Dynamics was begun in 1968 and covers a representative sample of U.S. individuals (men, women, and children) and the family units in which they reside. By the end of the 2003 survey, the PSID had collected information from over 65,000 individuals spanning as much as 36 years of their lives. Starting in 1997, the surveys were conducted biennially. Between 1968 and 1972, data collection took place through in-person interviews using paper and pencil questionnaires. Thereafter, most interviews were telephone interviews or, starting in 1993, computer assisted telephone interviews.[9] Comprehensive information on health behaviors, labor market characteristics, and demographic characteristics are readily available in the PSID. In our analysis, we use years 1999-2005, yet we exploit the longitudinal nature of the data set by thoroughly utilizing information from prior years, particularly regarding labor market characteristics. Information on the head of the household and spouse are used due to the sparse information on health behaviors for other family members.

Health Outcomes

Body Mass Index: Self-reported weight and height are available in the PSID in the 1986, and 1999-2005 waves, for the head of the household and the wife. The body mass index, or BMI, is calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in squared meters. Other measures of adiposity have been shown to be superior to BMI (Burkhauser and Cawley 2008; Wada and Tekin 2010). However, they tend to be costly and are not routinely measured in physical examinations. BMI is a nationally representative figure that provides a reliable approximation of weight changes over time. Results are not sensitive to applying an adjustment procedure to correct for potential under-reporting of BMI based on observable characteristics, as employed in Chou, Grossman and Saffer (2004).

[9] Source: http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/Guide/Overview.html.

Obesity: Obesity is defined by the National Institutes of Health as having a BMI of 30 kg/m2 or greater. According to data from the National Institutes of Health, the percentage of individuals 18 years of age or older classified as obese has risen in the United States from 12.7% in the 1960s to 31.7% in 2004. Obesity carries many risks for a host of disorders, including heart disease, hypertension, stroke, cancer, and depression (Must et al. 1999; Mokdad et al. 2003). A variety of economic causes have been explored, including reductions in job strenuousness (Philipson 2001; Lakdawalla and Philipson 2009), technological innovation in food processing and preparation (Cutler, Glaeser, and Shapiro 2003), the growing availability of restaurants and the increased labor force participation of females (Chou, Grossman, and Saffer 2004; Rashad, Grossman, and Chou 2006), urban sprawl (Ewing et al. 2003), and time preference for the present (Komlos, Smith, and Bogin 2004; Smith, Bogin, and Bishai 2005; Zhang and Rashad 2008).

Alcohol Consumption: For 1999-2005, the PSID asks the head of the household and their spouse (if any) to report on the average number of drinks consumed per day. The responses are categorical (less than one a day; 1-2 drinks; 2-4 drinks; or 5 or more drinks a day), which we convert to the midpoints of each category (Powers and Xie 2008); we convert the "less than one a day" category into 0.5 drinks and the "five or more a day" category to 5.5 drinks. Alcohol consumption – and particularly abuse – can have adverse effects on labor market productivity, morbidity, mortality, and economic growth (Cesur 2009). Yet some studies have shown that moderate drinking has a positive effect on wages, largely operating through social networking channels (Berger and Leigh 1988; French and Zarkin 1995; Hamilton and Hamilton 1997; McDonald and Shields 2001; Tekin 2004; Bray 2005). Other studies conclude that the positive

relationship between moderate drinking and earnings mostly represents unobserved selection bias (Saffer and Dave 2005; Dave and Kaestner 2002).

Smoking: The PSID asks questions on smoking by the head of the household and the spouse in 1986, and again in the years 1999-2005. We construct a dichotomous indicator for current smoking as the outcome measure. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, tobacco use, which can lead to lung, larynx, esophageal, and oral cancers, is the nation's most preventable cause of disease, disability, and death.[10]

Physical Activity: In 1999-2005, the PSID asks heads of households and their spouses to report on the frequency of light and heavy physical activity. The questions are: "How often do you participate in light physical activity – such as walking, dancing, gardening, golfing, bowling, etc.?" and "How often do you participate in vigorous physical activity or sports – such as heavy housework, aerobics, running, swimming, or bicycling?" Individuals report on their frequency of participation and a reference time unit, which we standardize to an average weekly frequency. Physical activity has been shown to be an important factor in keeping morbidity and mortality at bay, and most Americans do not engage in sufficient amounts of physical activity (USDHHS 1996; Pratt et al. 1999).

First-Occupation Variables

In order to accurately capture information on first occupation, we defined two alternative measures pertaining to first occupation. The first is based on recall and is asked in 1997-2005: "Thinking of your first full-time regular job, what kind of work did you do?" Three-digit occupation codes from the 1970 Census of Population are provided. From these we derived 16 occupational categories: Craft, Operative, Transport, Labor, Farmer, Manager, Sales, Clerical, Craft, Operative, Transport, Labor, Farmer, Service, Private, and Professional. A dichotomous

[10] See http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/ for more information.

variable is further defined as equal to 1 if the category is one of Craft, Operative, Transport, Labor, or Farmer, and 0 otherwise, denoted as "blue-collar" occupation. We use the most recent recall (1997) prior to 1999, as well as recalls from the 2003 and 2005 surveys, which use occupational codes based on the 2000 Census.

The second measure is based on the first occupation reported by the individual in the PSID, starting from 1968. This measure, by using reported information at the time of first occupation, minimizes potential recall bias. Since only one-digit occupation codes were initially coded, we created the following 8 occupational categories based on these one-digit codes: Craft, Operative, Labor, Farmer, Manager, Self-Business, Clerical, and Professional. A dichotomous indicator representing blue-collar work is further defined to reflect the following occupations: Craft, Operative, Labor, or Farmer. Models also control for years since first occupation, defined as the difference between the current survey year and the year of first-reported occupation, to capture the effect of time duration since initial labor-market entry.

Individual Characteristics

All models control for individual characteristics pertaining to gender, race/ethnicity, education, age, marital status, and employment status.[11] Alternate models also control for parental characteristics including the educational status of the mother and father and whether the family was poor.[12]

A module probing the individual's tolerance towards risk is administered to a subset of individuals in 1996. Measures of risk aversion are obtained from a series of questions involving

[11] In our initial specifications, we do not control for mediating factors such as household income and hours worked, which may represent mechanisms through which initial occupation affects health behaviors. Models reported in Table 11 assess the importance of these mediators.

[12] Parental education is categorical: (1) grades 0-5, (2) grades 6-8, (3) grades 9-11, (4) grade 12, (5) 12 grades + non-academic training; R.N., (6) some college, no degree; associate's degree, (7) college baccalaureate degree and no advanced degree mentioned; normal school; RN with 3 years of college, and (8) college, advanced or professional degree; some graduate work.

the willingness to choose different levels of lifetime income with varying probabilities. The module has undergone considerable testing in order to minimize misunderstandings and additional complications in interpretation, and to ensure consistency with the economist's concept of risk preference. Barsky et al. (1997) provide a detailed analysis of the survey instrument. Answers to the questionnaire separate the individuals into four distinct categories of risk preference, ranging from the most risk tolerant to the most risk averse.[13] Almost half (48.6%) of the respondents can be classified in the most risk-averse category, with 31.8 percent divided equally among the second and third most risk-averse groups , and 19.6 percent comprising the least risk-averse categories. Barsky et al. (1997) validate such a module of risk tolerance from the Health and Retirement study, and show that it is related to behaviors (insurance, portfolio allocation, migration, risky health behaviors, self-employment) that would be expected to vary with an individual's propensity to take risks. Since the PSID respondents only partake in the risk module once, the measure of risk tolerance is time-invariant. This is not, however, a concern, since studies have shown that personality traits associated with risk tolerance are generally stable, have a biogenic basis, and have some constancy across various situations (Howard et al., 1997; Menza et al., 1991). Individuals' propensity for risk-taking is typically unobserved in other datasets, and represents an important source of non-random selection into outcomes, since it may affect both occupational choice as well as participation in other risky and unhealthy behaviors. We include measures of risk-tolerance in supplemental analyses and extended models to address this potential selection bias.

Instrumental Variables

[13] The categories can be ranked in order, without any functional form restrictions on the preference parameters or the utility function.

In the instrumental variables (IV) models based on external instruments, we use information on the county unemployment rate in 1968 (the earliest year county unemployment is reported) when the average respondent is 18 years of age, and whether the respondent's father worked in a blue-collar occupation. Similar instruments (early labor market conditions and parental occupation) were also utilized by Fletcher and Sindelar (2009). We confirm that these measures are significant predictors of whether the respondent's first occupation was blue-collar in the expected direction. Higher county unemployment rates in the initial wave raise the probability of blue-collar work; similarly, a respondent is also more likely to work in a blue-collar occupation if their father did so as well. Conditional on parental education and family resources, these variables do not have any direct effects on health behaviors as evidenced by the test of overidentification restrictions. Alternately, these instrumental variables are also insignificant with close-to-zero magnitudes when included in the extended specifications, again suggesting that they do not directly impact health behaviors. However, the instruments lack statistical power and the estimates should therefore be interpreted with caution. This underscores the difficulties of implementing a conventional IV-based strategy, particularly when analyzing the effects of early circumstances, since first occupation (at least 30 years prior to current adult outcomes) is difficult to predict with strong statistical power and in a way that is uncorrelated with subsequent inputs into health. Thus, alternate approaches with a series of checks add to the weight of the evidence bearing upon the research question.

Out of approximately 11,000 individuals who were either head of household or spouse in years 1999-2005, sample sizes after deleting missing information on the aforementioned variables are: 6971 (year 1999) and 6303 (year 2005). Summary statistics are provided in Table 1.

V. RESULTS

Baseline Estimates

Table 1 indicates that the largest fraction of workers first commence their labor market experience in the *Clerical* occupational category (approximately 22%), followed by *Professional* occupations (~17%). Approximately 36% of respondents were initially blue collar workers based on recall in 1999 or 2005, and approximately 38% were initially blue collar workers based on their first reported occupation in the earliest PSID wave. There are significant differences in health behaviors between individuals whose initial labor market entry was in blue-collar occupations relative to non-blue collar occupations. In general, initial blue-collar workers tend to engage in more unhealthy behaviors; they have a higher BMI and are more likely to be obese, have higher daily alcohol consumption, and are more likely to be current smokers. However, initial blue-collar workers are also more physically active. These differences are persistent in both 1999 and 2005.

While these differences in health behaviors are suggestive, individuals are not randomly selected into initial blue-collar occupations. There are also significant differences with respect to other observable characteristics between blue-collar and non-blue collar workers. For instance, initial blue-collar workers are more likely to be male, low-educated, slightly older, married, and have low-educated and poor parents. Thus, the association between first occupation and subsequent unhealthy behaviors also reflects confounding due to such non-random selection on observables and potential selection on unobservables. The multivariate analyses address these concerns.

Tables 2a and 2b present estimates of the impact of first occupation on BMI in 1999 and 2005, respectively. Estimates are generally robust across the alternate measures of first

occupation, whether based on recall in 1999/2005 or generated based on the respondent's first reported occupation in the earliest wave. In the limited specification (model 1), when broken down by occupational category, the *Craft*, *Operative*, *Transport*, *Labor*, *Farmer*, *Sales*, *Clerical*, *Service*, and *Private* occupations are significantly and positively associated with BMI (0.5 – 1.9 points higher), relative to initial *Professional* occupation. Aggregating occupations in specifications 3 and 6 suggests that initial blue-collar work is associated with a 0.4 to 0.7 point increase in BMI.[14] The extended specifications control for state indicators, which capture all time-invariant state-specific factors, maternal and paternal education, parental poverty status, and indicators of risk tolerance – measures which are typically unobserved in other datasets.[15] The magnitude of the impact of initial blue-collar occupation is fairly robust to these additional controls, suggesting a 0.1 – 0.6 point increase in BMI in 1999; the precision of these estimates is reduced in the extended models due to reduced sample size. This compares to a 1.4 point increase in BMI, among blue-collar workers, based on the unadjusted means reported in Table 1. About 50 to 60% of this unadjusted difference is driven by observable factors such as age, race, education, marital status, and gender. The robustness in the magnitude of the effect between the limited and extended models suggests that once the basic observables are taken into account, additional section on other factors may not be significant.

Models 5 and 8 control for prior BMI, as measured from the 1986 PSID wave. Prior BMI is a strong determinant of current BMI, consistent with the substantial persistence in BMI over time. The effect of initial blue-collar occupation on 1999 BMI decreases in magnitude and

[14] The effects of the other covariates are consistent with the literature on obesity; BMI is higher among individuals who are black (relative to all other races), low-educated, and never-married, and individuals whose parents are low-educated. The BMI-age profile is concave, generally increasing up to ages 50-55 and then declining due to a loss in muscle mass.

[15] The coefficients on the indicators of risk tolerance (least risk-averse being the reference category) suggest that more risk-averse individuals have lower BMI.

becomes insignificant. This is consistent with initial occupation having a lasting, but diminishing, effect on health behaviors over time.

The effects of first occupation on BMI in 2005, approximately 26 years on average after initial labor market entry, are generally consistent with the effects in 1999 noted above. Initial blue-collar occupation is associated with between a 0.3 to 1.0 point increase in BMI in 2005. Effect magnitudes are robust across the limited and extended specifications, and diminished when models control for prior BMI.

Tables 3a and 3b present models for obesity. Consistent with the estimates for BMI, initial blue-collar occupation is associated with a 3.4 to 6.7 percentage points increase in the probability of being obese in 1999. The unadjusted difference in means between blue-collar and non-blue collar workers was about 6 percentage points, again suggesting that as much as 50% of the observed difference is due to confounding. However, additional control for parental history, risk tolerance, and state fixed effects do not further diminish the impact of first-occupation. Results for 2005 show similar patterns with somewhat higher effect magnitudes; initial blue-collar work is associated with a 4.8 to 9.4 percentage points increase in obesity prevalence. Note, however, that obesity prevalence was in general higher in 2005 (24%) relative to 1999 (19%), as shown in Table 1. Thus, relative to these means, the effect magnitudes are consistent between both waves.

Tables 4a and 4b present models for daily alcohol consumption. There are generally no consistent or significant effects of initial occupation on drinking in 1999 or 2005. Other covariates affect alcohol consumption as expected and noted in the literature (Dave and Saffer 2008). Notably, a higher degree of risk aversion is associated with lower levels of drinking.

Table 5a and 5b present estimates of the impact of first-occupation on the propensity of being a current smoker. There is limited evidence in 1999 that initial blue-collar work is associated with a higher probability of being a current smoker (by between 1.5 to 3.6 percentage points), though the estimates based on recalled first-occupation are imprecise. Note that these estimates mask considerable heterogeneity across disaggregated occupational categories. For instance, initial work in *Labor* is associated with a 5.5 to 7.3 percentage points increase in smoking prevalence, relative to *Professional* workers. Based on the simple means, smoking prevalence among initial blue-collar workers is about 9 percentage points higher relative to non-blue-collar workers. Selection on observables therefore accounts for about 60-80% of the unadjusted difference, though as with BMI and obesity additional controls do not lead to substantial diminution of the effect magnitudes. For 2005, we do not find any significant or substantial associations between initial blue-collar work and current smoking status. This may reflect increased smoking cessation (decrease in current smoking prevalence) among all groups. Table 1 shows that current smoking prevalence declined from 24.9% in 1999 to 20.7% in 2005 among individuals whose initial occupation was blue-collar; this is a larger increase than that experienced by individuals whose initial occupation was not blue-collar. Thus, there is some convergence in smoking rates between these two groups over time, which may explain why no significant effects are found in 2005.

Tables 6a and 6b present models for physical activity. In 1999, initial blue-collar workers have a higher frequency of weekly physical activity by about 1-1.5 times, relative to those whose first-occupation was not blue-collar. This is about 50% of the unadjusted difference based on the reported means in Table 1. The effect is eroded in 2005; this is again consistent with the age trajectory in physical activity between initial blue-collar workers and non-blue

collar workers. While initial blue-collar workers are more physically active than the others, the difference tends to diminish over time.

To summarize, single-equation estimates suggest three points. First, there is some evidence that initial blue-collar work has some lasting effects on health behaviors; specifically, it is associated with higher BMI and obesity and with a higher prevalence of being a current smoker. It is also associated with a higher frequency of physical activity. Second, while there may be lasting effects of initial occupational choice, these effects tend to diminish over the life cycle as might be expected. Third, selection on observed factors account for about 50-80% of the unadjusted difference in health behaviors between the groups of workers; however, the effect magnitudes are not sensitive to additional controls for risk-tolerance, parental income and education, and state indicators. Thus, it is likely that additional selection on unobservables in the same direction may also not lead to substantial diminution of the effect magnitudes. The constrained bivariate probit models presented next gauge the sensitivity of the estimates to additional selection on unobservables.

Constrained Selection Models

Table 7a presents estimates of the impact of initial blue-collar occupation on obesity, based on constrained bivariate probit models. Model 1, which constrains the correlation between the error terms (ρ) in the obesity and first-occupation equations to 0, corresponds to single-equation probit estimates. Consistent with the earlier models, initial blue-collar work raises the probability of being obese in 1999 and 2005. Models 2-6 impose increasing amounts of positive selection on unobservables, based on increments to ρ of 0.1. Even small amounts of positive selection (for instance, ρ=0.1) are enough to wipe out any significant positive effects of initial blue-collar work on the probability of being obese. Models 7-11 impose increasing amounts of

negative selection on unobservables. These estimates answer the following question: What is the impact of initial blue-collar work on obesity if unobservable factors affecting initial blue-collar work and obesity are negatively correlated – that is, if there are unobservables which increase the likelihood of blue-collar work but reduce the likelihood of being obese? Even the smallest amounts of negative selection lead to large positive and significant effects of blue-collar entry on obesity.

Selection effects theoretically can be either negative or positive. For instance, individuals with a high rate of time preference (more present oriented) may be more likely to enter blue-collar occupations and also less likely to invest in their health leading to higher obesity; this would lead to positive selection bias. On the other hand, individuals with a taste for physical activity and manual labor may also be more likely to enter blue-collar occupations but would be less likely to be obese; this would lead to negative selection bias. Altonji et al. (2005) note that selection on observable factors can be helpful in assessing selection on unobservable factors. Model 12 presents estimates based on the assumption that selection on unobservables is equal to the selection on observables; this assumption is appropriate in general datasets where the factors that we observe are a random subset of all determinants of the outcome. For the PSID, which is a specialized longitudinal dataset with extensive information on labor market history and other individual and family characteristics, the equal selection rule is likely to overestimate the amount of selection on unobservable factors. This is consistent with our earlier estimates, which showed that adding richer covariates to the specification do not lead to substantial changes in effect magnitudes. Estimates from model 12 suggest that there is positive selection on observables ($\rho>0$ in all models), and if there is an equal additional amount of selection on unobservables, then initial blue-collar occupation has a negative impact on obesity. Thus, if the estimates from

the single-equation extended models represent upper bound estimates, then the estimates from the models based on the equal selection constraint represent lower bound estimates.

Table 7b presents similar estimates for current smoking status. As before, single-equation probit estimates ($\rho=0$) suggest that initial blue-collar occupation generally raises the probability of being a current smoker. Similar to the models for obesity, these estimates are sensitive to even small amounts of additional selection on unobservable factors. The estimates from the equal selection constraint (model 12) suggest that selection may be positive or negative depending on the time period.

To summarize, constrained selection models allow us to assess the sensitivity of the estimates to additional amounts of selection on unobservable factors. For both obesity and smoking, we find that even small amounts of additional selection on unobserved factors can wipe out the positive effects of initial blue-collar work on obesity and smoking. Note that these models suggest that *if* there is additional selection then the estimates are wiped out. However, it is not clear *whether* there is substantial additional selection on unobservables. The earlier models do no point to additional selection on unobservables. Thus, we also estimate instrumental variables models to further bear on this issue.

Instrumental Variables

Table 8 presents estimates from IV models, utilizing early labor market conditions (county unemployment rate in the first PSID wave) and paternal blue-collar occupation as instruments for own first blue-collar occupation. The tests of overidentification restrictions confirm that these instruments can be plausibly excluded from the structural model of health behaviors. In addition, the instruments do predict own first blue-collar occupation in the expected direction; however, they do so weakly and therefore these results should be interpreted

with caution. Low statistical power is reflected in the larger standard errors and wide confidence intervals. The point estimates suggest that initial first-occupation is associated with higher BMI, obesity, and smoking, while effects on physical activity depend on the time horizon.

In order to bypass the issues with weak external instruments, Table 9 presents estimates based on internal instruments as proposed in Lewbel (2007). These IVs have stronger predictive power and are also plausibly excludable based on the tests of overidentification restrictions. Indeed, Lewbel (2007) recommends this methodology precisely to overcome issues with questionable and low-powered external instruments. These results indicate that initial blue-collar occupation leads to increased BMI (1-2 points), higher probability of being obese (1.3 – 6.4 percentage points, based on recalled first-occupation), higher probability of being a current smoker (2.7 – 3.5 percentage points, based on recalled first-occupation), and a higher frequency of physical activity in 2005 (5-7 times per week). Some of these estimates are imprecise due to limited sample sizes in the extended models and, while the internal IVs are stronger, the statistical power of these IVs may still not be adequate. Nevertheless, it is validating that these estimates are generally consistent with the estimates from the extended specifications from Tables 2-6.

Heterogeneous Effects

The estimates thus far represent an average population effect, which may mask considerable heterogeneity in responses across demographic groups. Tables 10a and 10b present estimates based on models stratified across socio-demographic characteristics. These models suggest that initial blue-collar work has larger positive effects on alcohol consumption and smoking among males, relative to females. Similarly, initial blue-collar work raises BMI and the probability of being obese more for Whites relative to other races; however, the increase in

drinking and smoking is larger among non-Whites. Initial blue-collar work is also associated with larger increases in physical activity among females (relative to males) and among non-Whites (relative to whites); this is consistent with smaller increases in obesity among these groups. These patterns in effects on health behaviors across gender and race groups are also generally consistent with reported effects on health across these groups in Fletcher and Sindelar (2009). Some of these estimates are imprecise due to reduced cell sizes.

Exploratory Analysis of Potential Mediators

Potential mechanisms through which initial occupational choice may impact health behaviors include shifts in income, hours worked, and current occupation. Estimates in Table 11 assess the importance of these potential mediators by alternately adding these measures to the baseline model and gauging the effect magnitudes. Comparing baseline estimates to those that include household income and hours worked, we find that the effect magnitudes are virtually unchanged.[16] This suggests that the effects of first occupation on health behaviors are complex and may not solely operate through income effects or work intensity. When models control for current occupation codes (model 4), positive effects of initial blue-collar work on obesity, alcohol consumption, and frequency of physical activity become somewhat stronger. This is expected, and validating, since the correlation between initial blue-collar work and current blue-collar work is not perfect. When current occupation is not accounted, initial occupation confounds two groups of individuals, those who shift from blue-collar to non-blue collar over tine and those who do not. If the adverse effect of initial blue-collar work on healthy behaviors is attenuated when individuals are no longer currently working in blue-collar jobs (which is to be

[16] Household income is a computed variable, equal to the sum of: Taxable Income of Head and Wife, Transfer Income of Head and Wife, Taxable Income of Other Family Unit Members (OFUMs), Transfer Income of OFUMs, and Social Security Income.

expected), then controlling for current occupation should make the estimated effects larger in magnitude. This latter effect is evidence of a dose-response relation; the impact of initial blue-collar occupational choice on health behaviors appears to be somewhat more pronounced if the individual continues in that occupation over their life.

VI. DISCUSSION

This study is the first to assess the existence and strength of a potential causal relationship between initial occupational choice at labor entry and subsequent health behaviors and habits. While unadjusted differences and single-equation models do confirm that starting work in blue-collar occupations is subsequently associated with unhealthy behaviors (with the exception of physical activity) during later adulthood, one of the aims of this study was to examine how much of this association is consistent with a causal mechanism and how much of it is being driven by non-random selection.

We utilize several methods to address this confounding: (1) controlling for a rich set of individual characteristics and state fixed effects; (2) estimating constrained selection models; and (3) estimating instrumental variables models using external and internally-generated instruments. We also estimate effects for outcomes in 1999 and 2005 to establish robustness as well as assess the durability of these effects over time.

Estimates suggest that a substantial part of the observed difference (50-80%) is due to non-random selection on observable factors. Estimates also suggest that the effect magnitudes are sensitive (in terms of diminution) to additional positive selection on unobservable factors; if the additional selection is negative, then the estimated effect magnitudes become stronger. However, drawing upon the weight of the evidence from all of our various methodologies, a residual effect of first occupation on subsequent health behaviors remains, which is consistent

with a causal behavioral framework. Using years 1999 through 2005 from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, our results suggest that initial blue-collar work is associated with a higher body mass index and obesity later in life as well as higher probabilities of smoking later in life. Few effects are found for the effect of initial occupation on alcohol consumption, which is to be expected given that prior studies have generally found inconsistent effects between moderate alcohol consumption and labor market outcomes and health.

Specifically, results from the extended and IV specifications indicate that initial labor entry in blue collar work raises obesity by 4 percentage points (20% relative to the baseline mean) and smoking prevalence by about 3 percentage points (18%). The impact on obesity may explain the higher incidence of heart attacks found in Sindelar et al. (2007). We also find suggestive increase in the frequency of physical activity by between 1-5 times weekly (10 – 40%), which may be related to work-based physical activity. Studies have found some evidence of a substitution effect wherein individuals who have more physically-demanding jobs are less likely to be physically active outside of work (Saffer et al. forthcoming). Even if total physical activity is higher among manual workers, the specific composition of physical activity has implications for health; specifically, leisure-based physical activity is found to be health promoting whereas work-based physical activity, especially repetitive or factory tasks, tend to have little positive health effects (Saffer et al. forthcoming).

That initial work in blue collar occupations raises the likelihood of unhealthy behaviors later into adulthood does not necessarily suggest that these individuals are irrational or that they have not considered the full costs and benefits of their occupational choice, including shifts in material resources, occupational hazards, and other incentives. Indeed, the behavioral framework underlying the economic paradigm of investments in health capital presupposes some

rationality. However, if initial occupational choices are constrained based on other external factors (for instance, poor labor market conditions or limited choices based on educational attainment), then there may be room for altering these market constraints so as to improve health into adulthood, *ceteris paribus*.

Greater public support during periods of recession and high unemployment or during retrenchment of specific industries may give individuals greater flexibility in their occupational choice. In addition, expanding access to health care, especially among blue collar occupations, may also mediate the adverse effects of such occupational choice on healthy behaviors and health status. Thus, future work should focus on uncovering the channels through which initial labor market experiences are affecting subsequent health investments. On a broader context, the results from this study confirm previous findings that early labor market experiences may have lasting effects. While prior studies had focused on subsequent job mobility and income trajectories, our study underscores the durable effects of early work-related circumstances on later health behaviors.

REFERENCES

Altonji J.G., Elder T.E., Taber C. 2005. Selection on observable and unobservable variables: assessing the effectiveness of Catholic schools, *Journal of Political Economy*, 113 (1):151–184.

Bang, K.M. and Kim, J.H. 2001. Prevalence of Cigarette Smoking by Occupation and Industry in the United States, *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 40: 233–239.

Barsky R., Juster T., Kimball M. and Shapiro, M. 1997. Preference Parameters and Behavioral Heterogeneity: An Experimental Approach in the Health and Retirement Study, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(2): 537-579

Berger M.C., Leigh J.P. 1988. The effect of alcohol use on wages. *Applied Economics* 20(10): 1343-1351.

Borjas G.J. 2004. *Labor economics*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Boskin M.J. 1974. A Conditional Logit Model of Occupational Choice, Journal of Political Economy, 82(2): 389-398.

Bound, J., D. A. Jaeger, and R. M. Baker. 1995. Problems With Instrumental Variables Estimation When the Correlation between the Instruments and the Endogeneous Explanatory Variable is Weak. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 90(430):443–450.

Bray J.W. 2005. Alcohol use, human capital, and wages. *Journal of Labor Economics* 23(2): 279-312.

Burkhauser, R., and J. Cawley. 2008. Beyond BMI: The Value of More Accurate Measures of Fatness and Obesity in Social Science Research. *Journal of Health Economics* 27(2):519–529.

Case A. and Deaton A. 2005. Broken Down by Work and Sex: How our Health Declines. *Analyses in the Economics of Aging*, ed: David Wise, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Cesur, Resul. 2009. Essays on the Aggregate Burden of Alcohol Abuse. *Ph.D. Dissertation, Georgia State University*.

Chou, S., M. Grossman, and H. Saffer. 2004. An Economic Analysis of Adult Obesity: Results from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System. *Journal of Health Economics* 23(3): 565–587.

Cropper M. L. 1977. Health Investment in Health, and Occupational Choice, *Journal of Political Economy*, 85(6): 1273-1294.

Cutler, D., E. Glaeser, and J. Shapiro. 2003. Why Have Americans Become More Obese? *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 17(3):93–118.

Dave D. and Kaestner R. 2009. Health Insurance and Ex Ante Moral Hazard: Evidence from Medicare, *International Journal of Health Care Finance and Economics*, 9(4): 367-390.

Dave D. and Kaestner R. 2002. Alcohol Taxes and Labor Market Outcomes, Journal of Health Economics, 21(3): 357-371.

Dave D. and Saffer H. 2008. Alcohol Demand and Risk Preference, Journal of Economic Psychology, 29(6): 810-831.

Ettner S. 1996. New Evidence on the Relationship between Income and Health, *Journal of Health Economics*, 15(1):67-85.

Evans W.N. and Schwab R.M. 1995. Finishing high school and starting college: do catholic schools make a difference?, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110: 941–974.

Ewing, R., T. Schmid, R. Killingsworth, A. Zlot, and S. Raudenbush. 2003. Relationship between Urban Sprawl and Physical Activity, Obesity, and Morbidity. *American Journal of Health Promotion* 18(1):47–57.

Fletcher J.M. and Sindelar J.L. 2009. Estimating Causal Effects of Early Occupational Choice on Later Health: Evidence Using the PSID, *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 15256*.

Fletcher J.M., Sindelar J.L. and Yamaguchi S. 2009. Cumulative Effects of Job Characteristics on Health, *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 15121*.

French MT, Zarkin GA. 1995. Is moderate alcohol use related to wages? Evidence from four worksites. *Journal of Health Economics* 14(3): 319-344.

Goldman D.P., Bhattacharya J., McCaffrey D.F., Duan N., Leibowitz A.A., Joyce G.F. and Morton S.C. 2001. Effect of insurance on mortality in an HIV-positive population in care, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96: 883-894.

Grossman M. 1972. On the concept of health capital and the demand for health, *Journal of Political Economy*, 80:223-55.

Gueorguieva, R., Sindelar, J.L., Falba, T.A., Fletcher, J.M., Keenan, P., Wu, R., Gallo W.T. 2009. The impact of occupation on self-rated health: Cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence from the health and retirement survey. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 10.1093/geronb/gbn006.

Hadley J. 2003. Sicker and Poorer--The Consequences of Being Uninsured: A Review of the Research on the Relationship between Health Insurance, Medical Care Use, Health, Work, and Income, *Medical Care Research Review*, 60(2 Suppl):3S-75S.

Hamilton V, Hamilton B. 1997. Alcohol and earnings: Does drinking yield a wage premium? *Canadian Journal of Economics* 30(1): 135-151.

Howard MO, Kivlahan D, and Walker RD. 1997. Cloninger's Tridimensional Theory of Personality and Psychopathology: Applications to Substance Use Disorders, *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 58: 48-66.

Komlos, J., P. Smith, and B. Bogin. 2004. Obesity and the Rate of Time Preference: Is There A Connection? *Journal of Biosocial Science* 36(2):209–219.

Lakdawalla, D., and T. Philipson. 2009. The Growth of Obesity and Technological Change. *Economics and Human Biology*, Volume 7, Issue 3, Pages 283-293.

Lewbel, A. 2007. Using Heteroskedasticity to Identify and Estimate Mismeasured and Endogenous Regressor Models. *Boston College Working Paper*.

Light A. 2005. Job Mobility and Wage Growth: Evidence from the NLSY79, *Monthly Labor Review,* 128(2): 33-39.

Marmot M. 2001. Income Inequality, Social Environment, and Inequalities in Health, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 20(1): 156-59.

Marmot M. and Bobak N. 2000. Psychosocial and Biological Mechanisms behind the Recent Mortality Crisis in Central and Eastern Europe, *The mortality crisis in transitional economies*. G. A. Cornia and R. Paniccia. UNU/WIDER Studies in Development Economics. Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press**:** 127-48.

Marmot M.G. and Smith G.D. 1997. *Socio-Economic Differentials in Health: The Contribution of the Whitehall Studies*, *Journal of Health Psychology*, 2(3): 283-296.

McWilliams J.M., Meara E., Zaslavsky A.M., and Ayanian J.Z. 2007. Health of Previously Uninsured Adults after Acquiring Medicare Coverage. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 298(24): 2886-2894.

Menza M., Golbe L., Cody R. and Forman N. 1993. Dopamine-related Personality Traits, *Neurology*, 43: 505-598.

Michie S. and Williams S. 2003. Reducing Work-Related Psychological Ill Health and Sickness Absence: A Systematic Literature Review, *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 60:3-9.

Mokdad, A.H., E.S. Ford, B.A. Bowman, W.H. Dietz, F. Vinicor, V.S. Bales, and J.S. Marks. 2003. Prevalence of Obesity, Diabetes, and Obesity-Related Health Risk Factors, 2001. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 289(1):76–79.

Must, A., J. Spadano, E.H. Coakley, A.E. Field, G. Colditz, and W.H. Dietz. 1999. The Disease Burden Associated With Overweight and Obesity. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 282(16):1523–1529.

Newhouse J.P. 2004. Consumer-directed health plans and the RAND Health Insurance Experiment, *Health Affairs*, 23(6): 107-13.

Oreopoulos P., von Wachter T. 2006. Short- and Long-Term Career Effects of Graduating in a Recession: Hysteresis and Heterogeneity in the Market for College Graduates. *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 12159.*

Philipson, T. 2001. The World-Wide Growth in Obesity: An Economic Research Agenda. *Health Economics* 10(1):1–7.

Powers D.A., Xie Y. 2008. *Statistical Methods for Categorical Data Analysis*. UK: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.

Pratt M., Macera C.A., Blanton C. Levels of physical activity and inactivity in children and adults in the United States: current evidence and research issues. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 1999;31(S11):S526–S533.

Rashad, I., M. Grossman, S. Chou. 2006. The Super Size of America: An Economic Estimation of Body Mass Index and Obesity in Adults. *Eastern Economic Journal* 32(1):133– 148.

Saffer H., Dave D. 2005. Mental Illness and the Demand for Alcohol, Cocaine, and Cigarettes, *Economic Inquiry*, 43(2):229:246.

Saffer H., Dave D. 2005. The Effect of Alcohol Consumption on the Earnings of Older Workers, *Advances in Health Economics and Health Services Research*, eds: Bjorn Lindgren and Michael Grossman, 16: 61-90.

Sindelar J.L., Fletcher J., Falba T., Keenan P., Gallo W.T. 2007. Impact of First-Occupation on Health at Older Ages, *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 13715*.

Smith, J. 1999. Healthy Bodies and Thick Wallets: The Dual Relation Between Health and SES, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13(2):145-66.

Smith, P. K., B. Bogin, D. Bishai. 2005. Are Time Preference and Body Mass Index Associated? Evidence from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth. *Economics and Human Biology* 3(2):259–270.

Tekin E. 2004. Employment, wages, and alcohol consumption in Russia. *Southern Economic Journal* 71(2): 397-417.

Theorell T. 2000. Working conditions and health, *Social Epidemiology*. L. Berkman and I. Kawachi. New York, NY, Oxford University Press, Inc.

US Department of Health and Human Services. *Physical Activity and Health: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta, Ga: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 1996.

US Preventive Services Task Forces. 2003. Counseling for a Healthy Diet. *Report of the US Preventive Services Task Force*, US Department of Health and Human Services.

US Preventive Services Task Forces. 2004. Screening and Behavioral Counseling Interventions in Primary Care to Reduce Alcohol Misuse. *Report of the US Preventive Services Task Force*, US Department of Health and Human Services.

Viscusi W.K., Aldy J.E. 2003. The Value of a Statistical Life: A Critical Review of Market Estimates Throughout the World, *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 27(1): 5-76.

von Wachter T., Bender S. 2006. In the Right Place at the Wrong Time: The Role of Firms in Young Workers' Career, *American Economic Review*, 96(5): 1679-1705.

Wada, R., E. Tekin. 2010. Body Composition and Wages. *Economics and Human Biology*, Volume 8, Issue 2, Pages 242-254.

Zhang, L., I. Rashad. 2008. Time Preference and Obesity: The Health Consequences of Discounting the Future. *Journal of Biosocial Science* 40(1):97–113.

Table 1
Weighted Summary Statistics

Variable	Description	*1999*			*2005*		
			Bluecoll=0	Bluecoll=1		Bluecoll=0	Bluecoll=1
			Outcomes				
Body Mass Index	Weight in kilograms divided by height in squared meters	26.299 (5.060)	25.795 (5.183)	27.175*** (4.595)	27.134 (5.522)	26.597 (5.567)	28.086*** (5.195)
Obese	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if BMI is ≥ 30 kg/m^2	0.187 (0.390)	0.166 (0.372)	0.222*** (0.416)	0.242 (0.428)	0.214 (0.411)	0.293*** (0.455)
Alcohol	Daily number of alcoholic drinks consumed	0.514 (0.743)	0.478 (0.639)	0.595*** (0.900)	1.070 (1.740)	0.956 (1.536)	1.292*** (2.025)
Smoke	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if respondent smokes	0.189 (0.391)	0.157 (0.364)	0.249*** (0.433)	0.165 (0.371)	0.139 (0.346)	0.207*** (0.406)
Physical Activity	Weekly frequency of participation in light or heavy physical activity	9.823 (15.504)	9.154 (8.767)	11.177*** (24.163)	9.799 (15.402)	9.349 (16.981)	10.627** (12.164)
			First Occupation Variables				
Blue Collar	First Occupation Blue Collar (recall)	0.355 (0.479)	0.000 (0.000)	1.000*** (0.000)	0.346 (0.476)	0.000 (0.000)	1.000*** (0.000)
Blue Collar	First Occupation Blue Collar (generated)	0.377 (0.485)	0.232 (0.422)	0.632*** (0.482)	0.375 (0.484)	0.229 (0.420)	0.632*** (0.482)
Blue Collar	First Occupation Blue Collar (modified recall)	0.307 (0.461)	0.045 (0.207)	0.785*** (0.411)	0.299 (0.458)	0.043 (0.202)	0.781*** (0.414)
Craft	First Occupation: Craftsman and Kindred	0.106 (0.308)	0.000 (0.000)	0.300*** (0.458)	0.104 (0.305)	0.000 (0.000)	0.301*** (0.459)
Operative	First Occupation: Operatives, except Transport	0.121 (0.326)	0.000 (0.000)	0.340*** (0.474)	0.115 (0.320)	0.000 (0.000)	0.333*** (0.471)
Transport	First Occupation: Transport Equipment Oper	0.020 (0.139)	0.000 (0.000)	0.056*** (0.229)	0.020 (0.139)	0.000 (0.000)	0.057*** (0.232)
Labor	First Occupation: Laborers, except Farm	0.077 (0.267)	0.000 (0.000)	0.218*** (0.413)	0.077 (0.267)	0.000 (0.000)	0.223*** (0.416)
Farmer	First Occupation: Farm, Laborers, and Foremen	0.031 (0.173)	0.000 (0.000)	0.087*** (0.282)	0.030 (0.171)	0.000 (0.000)	0.087*** (0.282)
Manager	First Occupation: Managers, Administrators, except Farm	0.036 (0.187)	0.056 (0.230)	0.000*** (0.000)	0.037 (0.190)	0.057 (0.232)	0.000*** (0.000)
Sales	First Occupation: Sales Workers	0.068 (0.252)	0.106 (0.308)	0.000*** (0.000)	0.068 (0.252)	0.104 (0.305)	0.000*** (0.000)
Clerical	First Occupation: Clerical and Kindred Workers	0.219 (0.414)	0.340 (0.474)	0.000*** (0.000)	0.222 (0.416)	0.340 (0.474)	0.000*** (0.000)
Service	First Occupation: Service Workers, except Private Househld	0.140 (0.347)	0.217 (0.412)	0.000*** (0.000)	0.140 (0.347)	0.214 (0.410)	0.000*** (0.000)
Private	First Occupation: Private Household Workers	0.008 (0.087)	0.012 (0.108)	0.000*** (0.000)	0.006 (0.080)	0.010 (0.099)	0.000*** (0.000)
Professional (reference group)	First Occupation: Professional, Technical, and Kindred	0.173 (0.378)	0.268 (0.443)	0.000*** (0.000)	0.179 (0.384)	0.274 (0.446)	0.000*** (0.000)
Occ_Years	Years since first occupation (2005)	26.034 (9.322)	25.848 (9.105)	27.097*** (9.005)	26.010 (9.198)	25.850 (8.956)	27.174*** (8.904)
			Individual Characteristics				
BMI 86	Body Mass Index in 1986	24.539 (4.434)	23.898 (4.333)	25.614*** (4.375)	24.489 (4.428)	23.843 (4.289)	25.578*** (4.425)
Obese 86	Obese Status in 1986	0.099 (0.299)	0.089 (0.285)	0.112** (0.315)	0.097 (0.296)	0.087 (0.283)	0.107* (0.310)
Male	Male Respondent	0.464 (0.499)	0.298 (0.457)	0.789*** (0.408)	0.459 (0.498)	0.299 (0.458)	0.787*** (0.410)
White	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if respondent is non-Hispanic white	0.907 (0.290)	0.909 (0.288)	0.912 (0.284)	0.907 (0.290)	0.909 (0.287)	0.915 (0.279)
Black	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if respondent is non-Hispanic black	0.077 (0.267)	0.075 (0.263)	0.076 (0.266)	0.078 (0.268)	0.075 (0.263)	0.073 (0.261)
Hispanic	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if respondent is Hispanic	0.011 (0.103)	0.010 (0.101)	0.010 (0.098)	0.010 (0.101)	0.010 (0.097)	0.010 (0.098)
Other	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if respondent's race is other than above	0.005 (0.069)	0.006 (0.077)	0.002** (0.047)	0.005 (0.070)	0.006 (0.079)	0.002** (0.044)

Elementary	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if elementary school educ	0.034 (0.182)	0.015 (0.120)	0.063*** (0.242)	0.029 (0.167)	0.011 (0.105)	0.055*** (0.227)
Some High	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if some high school educ	0.105 (0.307)	0.068 (0.251)	0.162*** (0.369)	0.101 (0.302)	0.062 (0.242)	0.156*** (0.363)
High	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if high school education	0.370 (0.483)	0.336 (0.473)	0.426*** (0.495)	0.364 (0.481)	0.331 (0.471)	0.420*** (0.494)
Some College	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if some college education	0.224 (0.417)	0.232 (0.422)	0.218 (0.413)	0.228 (0.420)	0.235 (0.424)	0.230 (0.421)
College	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if college education	0.267 (0.442)	0.349 (0.477)	0.131*** (0.338)	0.277 (0.448)	0.361 (0.480)	0.139*** (0.346)
Age	Age of respondent (in years)	48.997 (14.493)	48.274 (14.207)	49.907*** (14.435)	54.266 (13.751)	53.669 (13.390)	55.291*** (13.920)
Single	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if respondent is single	0.055 (0.228)	0.064 (0.245)	0.039*** (0.193)	0.048 (0.213)	0.055 (0.227)	0.031*** (0.174)
Married	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if respondent is married	0.765 (0.424)	0.754 (0.431)	0.790*** (0.407)	0.752 (0.432)	0.747 (0.435)	0.776** (0.417)
Widowed	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if respondent is widowed	0.062 (0.241)	0.065 (0.246)	0.048*** (0.213)	0.077 (0.266)	0.079 (0.270)	0.063** (0.244)
Divorced	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if respondent is divorced or separated	0.119 (0.323)	0.117 (0.321)	0.123 (0.329)	0.124 (0.329)	0.119 (0.324)	0.130 (0.336)
Employed	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if respondent is employed	0.694 (0.461)	0.696 (0.460)	0.713 (0.452)	0.674 (0.469)	0.683 (0.465)	0.680 (0.467)
Household Income	Household Income (in thousands of dollars)	74196.290 (85220.890)	81946.790 (96964.200)	62402.600*** (59907.770)	89938.880 (145408.400)	97321.200 (126957.800)	78835.200*** (179404.400)
Mother's Educ.	Mother's Education (Category) (1=grades 0-5, .., 8=college)	3.989 (1.645)	4.219 (1.650)	3.619*** (1.544)	4.026 (1.637)	4.261 (1.639)	3.634*** (1.533)
Father's Educ	Father's Education (Category) (1=grades 0-5, .., 8=college)	3.966 (1.948)	4.272 (1.985)	3.437*** (1.747)	4.009 (1.953)	4.315 (1.982)	3.461*** (1.760)
Parents Poor	Dichotomous variable equal to 1 if respondent answered that growing up, parents were poor	0.266 (0.442)	0.232 (0.422)	0.323*** (0.468)	0.259 (0.438)	0.225 (0.418)	0.318*** (0.466)
Instrumental Variables							
County Unemp. (1968)	County Unemployment Rate in 1968	4.046 (2.350)	3.944 (2.146)	4.204*** (2.613)	4.049 (2.335)	3.949 (2.118)	4.207*** (2.630)
Father Blue Coll	Dichotomous indicator for whether father's main occupation was blue-collar	0.460 (0.498)	0.413 (0.493)	0.555*** (0.497)	0.462 (0.499)	0.418 (0.493)	0.551*** (0.497)

Notes: Standard deviations are reported in parentheses. Sample sizes are 6971 (year 1999) and 6303 (year 2005). Italicized occupational variables are classified as blue collar occupations. Asterisks denote that the difference in means by "blue collar" (based on recall) is statistically significant at the following levels: *** p-value≤ 0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1.

Table 2a
Impact of First Occupation on Body Mass Index, 1999

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	First Occupation Based on Recall					***Generated First Occupation***			***Modified Recall***
	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Extended + '86 BMI	Limited	Extended	Extended + '86 BMI	Extended
Blue Collar			0.3514*	0.3320	0.2184	0.7330**	0.1031	-0.2509	0.5871*
			(2.21)	(1.47)	(1.24)	(4.82)	(0.45)	(1.42)	(2.56)
Craft	1.0970**	1.1286**							
	(4.08)	(2.98)							
Operative	1.3761**	0.6962							
	(5.05)	(1.62)							
Transport	1.0650*	1.4230							
	(2.14)	(1.63)							
Labor	0.8677**	0.5713							
	(2.95)	(1.41)							
Farmer	1.1160**	1.0974							
	(2.82)	(1.85)							
Manager	0.4618	0.7798							
	(1.27)	(1.53)							
Sales	0.7111*	0.5044							
	(2.31)	(1.13)							
Clerical	0.5038*	0.4421							
	(2.08)	(1.17)							
Service	1.5094**	0.8029*							
	(5.62)	(2.03)							
Private	1.9115*	1.0171							
	(2.39)	(0.92)							
Male	1.2255**	0.8098**	1.2209**	0.8756**	-0.7834**	1.2171**	0.9801**	-0.6346**	0.8216**
	(7.86)	(3.40)	(8.31)	(3.81)	(4.01)	(9.40)	(4.68)	(3.53)	(3.74)
Black	2.0560**	2.0078**	2.1860**	2.0485**	1.0349**	2.1057**	2.0492**	0.9821**	2.0529**
	(11.75)	(6.65)	(12.72)	(6.84)	(4.31)	(12.48)	(6.98)	(4.17)	(6.88)
Hispanic	1.1845	0.9038	1.2065	0.9100	-0.0186	0.8530	0.9296	-0.0461	0.9291
	(1.74)	(0.79)	(1.77)	(0.80)	(0.02)	(1.33)	(0.82)	(0.04)	(0.82)
Other	-1.2469	-2.6125**	-1.3731	-2.7808**	-1.1715	-1.6280	-2.8751**	-1.4073*	-2.7762**
	(1.49)	(2.88)	(1.60)	(3.02)	(1.86)	(1.92)	(3.13)	(2.22)	(2.91)
Some High	-1.1232*	-1.1970	-1.1393*	-1.1529	-0.9552	-1.0264*	-1.1554	-0.9726	-1.0876
	(2.49)	(1.29)	(2.53)	(1.22)	(1.15)	(2.38)	(1.23)	(1.18)	(1.14)
High	-1.2713**	-1.0417	-1.4080**	-1.0098	-0.6497	-1.2614**	-1.0508	-0.7646	-0.9478
	(3.01)	(1.16)	(3.37)	(1.11)	(0.80)	(3.14)	(1.16)	(0.95)	(1.04)
Some College	-1.3027**	-0.4548	-1.5285**	-0.4347	-0.4869	-1.2338**	-0.4689	-0.6766	-0.3568
	(2.95)	(0.50)	(3.51)	(0.47)	(0.59)	(2.92)	(0.51)	(0.83)	(0.38)
College	-1.7614**	-0.7098	-2.2942**	-0.8868	-0.3108	-1.9182**	-0.9988	-0.5740	-0.8118
	(3.94)	(0.76)	(5.27)	(0.95)	(0.37)	(4.53)	(1.07)	(0.69)	(0.86)
Occ_Years	0.0265*	0.0062	0.0245*	0.0068	0.0347	0.0202	0.0023	0.0361	0.0129
	(2.40)	(0.24)	(2.20)	(0.26)	(1.46)	(1.51)	(0.09)	(1.55)	(0.50)
Age	0.2345**	0.2060**	0.2387**	0.2008*	-0.0651	0.2385**	0.2058**	-0.0641	0.1921*
	(6.41)	(2.61)	(6.48)	(2.54)	(0.69)	(6.30)	(2.63)	(0.68)	(2.45)
Age Squared	-0.0024**	-0.0020**	-0.0024**	-0.0020**	-0.0001	-0.0024**	-0.0020**	-0.0001	-0.0020**
	(7.41)	(2.80)	(7.50)	(2.73)	(0.10)	(7.27)	(2.81)	(0.14)	(2.69)
Married	-1.1859**	-1.1686**	-1.2164**	-1.1403**	-1.0877**	-1.0838**	-0.9713*	-1.0154*	-1.0527**
	(3.90)	(2.96)	(4.00)	(2.90)	(2.71)	(3.64)	(2.50)	(2.54)	(2.70)
Widowed	0.0813	-0.0237	0.1633	0.0935	-1.2111*	0.3237	0.3937	-0.9875	0.1840
	(0.18)	(0.03)	(0.36)	(0.11)	(2.13)	(0.73)	(0.49)	(1.75)	(0.22)
Divorced	-0.7302*	-1.3838**	-0.7032*	-1.3298**	-1.6264**	-0.6001	-1.2121**	-1.5014**	-1.2865**
	(2.09)	(3.12)	(2.02)	(3.01)	(3.73)	(1.75)	(2.79)	(3.46)	(2.94)
Employed	-0.5186**	0.2477	-0.5269**	0.2362	-0.3484	-0.5082**	0.1742	-0.3169	0.1882
	(2.65)	(0.71)	(2.68)	(0.68)	(1.24)	(2.65)	(0.51)	(1.13)	(0.55)
Mother Educ		-0.0560		-0.0562	-0.0440		-0.0474	-0.0546	-0.0430
		(0.69)		(0.69)	(0.70)		(0.59)	(0.87)	(0.53)
Father Educ		-0.3183**		-0.3313**	-0.0471		-0.3438**	-0.0524	-0.3297**
		(4.68)		(4.92)	(0.88)		(5.14)	(0.99)	(4.92)
Parents Poor		0.1567		0.1405	-0.1675		0.1365	-0.1117	0.1059

		(0.64)		(0.57)	(0.88)		(0.56)	(0.59)	(0.44)
Risk Averse 2		-0.5094		-0.5556	0.2046		-0.5655	0.2166	-0.5894
		(1.58)		(1.73)	(0.80)		(1.77)	(0.85)	(1.83)
Risk Averse 3		-0.4530		-0.4913	-0.2036		-0.5718	-0.2473	-0.5201
		(1.39)		(1.51)	(0.76)		(1.78)	(0.94)	(1.60)
Risk Averse 4		-0.5077		-0.5170*	-0.0374		-0.5648*	-0.0604	-0.5122
		(1.92)		(1.96)	(0.17)		(2.17)	(0.28)	(1.96)
BMI 86					0.8754**			0.8731**	
					(28.87)			(29.14)	
Constant	21.5310**	25.4000**	22.4511**	26.0759**	9.8278**	21.9274**	25.9824**	10.0515**	25.8283**
	(22.94)	(12.52)	(24.22)	(12.82)	(4.19)	(23.59)	(12.87)	(4.31)	(12.79)
Observations	6315	2711	6315	2711	2013	6583	2767	2050	2730
R-squared	0.09	0.11	0.08	0.11	0.59	0.08	0.11	0.59	0.11
Firstocc p-value	0.00000	0.31501	0.02718	0.14094	0.21554	0.00000	0.65067	0.15596	0.01054

Notes: Coefficients from OLS models are reported, with robust t-statistics in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value≤ 0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1. Column 9 uses a definition of blue collar that includes responses on first occupation from 2003 and 2005 surveys, which use the 2000 Census of Population; blue collar categories used are: cleaning/maintenance; farming/fishing/forestry; construction; extraction; install/maintenance/repair; production; and transportation. Risk Averse Category 4 represents individuals who are classified as the most risk-averse; the reference group includes individuals who are least risk-averse or most risk-tolerant.

Table 2b
Impact of First Occupation on Body Mass Index, 2005

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	First Occupation Based on Recall					***Generated First Occupation***			***Modified Recall***
	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Extended + '86 BMI	Limited	Extended	Extended + '86 BMI	Extended
Blue Collar			0.7518**	0.7201**	0.5927*	0.7436**	0.3084	-0.2974	1.0300**
			(4.02)	(2.70)	(2.44)	(4.21)	(1.17)	(1.36)	(3.80)
Craft	1.3503**	1.7603**							
	(4.31)	(4.07)							
Operative	1.8395**	1.3532**							
	(5.73)	(2.76)							
Transport	1.6847**	2.1138*							
	(2.84)	(2.02)							
Labor	1.4058**	1.2537**							
	(4.21)	(2.78)							
Farmer	1.1129*	1.4688*							
	(2.50)	(2.38)							
Manager	0.5226	1.0497							
	(1.20)	(1.60)							
Sales	1.0528**	0.7377							
	(2.97)	(1.54)							
Clerical	0.6910*	1.0512**							
	(2.52)	(2.62)							
Service	1.2698**	0.9291*							
	(4.13)	(2.15)							
Private	1.5847	1.0983							
	(1.36)	(0.65)							
Male	0.6385**	0.1503	0.5990**	0.1386	-1.5486**	0.7572**	0.3157	-1.2790**	0.0699
	(3.59)	(0.53)	(3.54)	(0.52)	(5.98)	(5.03)	(1.28)	(5.72)	(0.27)
Black	1.9646**	1.9268**	2.0652**	1.9645**	1.0552**	2.0458**	2.0120**	1.0417**	1.9199**
	(9.23)	(5.49)	(9.92)	(5.64)	(3.37)	(10.16)	(5.85)	(3.39)	(5.56)
Hispanic	0.9854	0.5707	1.0212	0.5988	0.3337	0.9210	0.6753	0.2840	0.6183
	(1.39)	(0.58)	(1.46)	(0.62)	(0.29)	(1.38)	(0.69)	(0.25)	(0.64)
Other	-1.2674	-2.5916**	-1.4392	-2.8774**	-1.0951	-1.5498	-2.9873**	-1.4236*	-2.9063**
	(1.07)	(3.00)	(1.20)	(3.33)	(1.81)	(1.37)	(3.49)	(2.32)	(3.16)
Some High	-0.8287	-1.1292	-0.8025	-1.1150	0.6571	-0.7233	-1.0956	0.6646	-1.0489
	(1.45)	(0.91)	(1.41)	(0.89)	(0.48)	(1.36)	(0.88)	(0.48)	(0.83)
High	-1.1874*	-1.0653	-1.2333*	-1.0149	0.7616	-1.1136*	-1.0343	0.5858	-0.8726
	(2.20)	(0.89)	(2.32)	(0.85)	(0.57)	(2.21)	(0.86)	(0.44)	(0.72)
Some College	-1.1804*	-0.0471	-1.2989*	-0.0194	1.1233	-1.0629*	-0.0191	0.8167	0.1550
	(2.11)	(0.04)	(2.35)	(0.02)	(0.83)	(2.02)	(0.02)	(0.61)	(0.13)
College	-1.8052**	-0.5906	-2.2181**	-0.8688	1.0472	-2.0177**	-1.0141	0.5955	-0.7119
	(3.17)	(0.48)	(4.00)	(0.71)	(0.77)	(3.81)	(0.83)	(0.44)	(0.58)
Occ_Years	0.0267*	0.0226	0.0257*	0.0234	0.0333	0.0281	0.0184	0.0378	0.0278
	(2.06)	(0.77)	(1.97)	(0.81)	(1.04)	(1.80)	(0.64)	(1.19)	(0.97)
Age	0.2157**	0.1258	0.2197**	0.1203	-0.1940	0.2269**	0.1274	-0.1924	0.1176
	(4.16)	(1.26)	(4.22)	(1.20)	(1.46)	(4.32)	(1.29)	(1.46)	(1.18)
Age Squared	-0.0023**	-0.0016	-0.0024**	-0.0015	0.0008	-0.0024**	-0.0015	0.0007	-0.0015
	(5.49)	(1.87)	(5.60)	(1.82)	(0.73)	(5.72)	(1.87)	(0.69)	(1.83)
Married	-1.2365**	-1.0868*	-1.2659**	-1.0302*	-0.6370	-0.9297*	-0.8003	-0.4810	-0.9368
	(3.15)	(2.11)	(3.23)	(2.00)	(1.26)	(2.44)	(1.57)	(0.96)	(1.83)
Widowed	-0.2816	-0.0672	-0.2477	0.0277	-0.7658	0.0631	0.2644	-0.6082	0.0294
	(0.55)	(0.08)	(0.49)	(0.03)	(0.99)	(0.13)	(0.30)	(0.79)	(0.03)
Divorced	-0.8901*	-1.2490*	-0.8512*	-1.1465*	-1.0243	-0.5370	-0.9541	-0.8199	-1.0460
	(2.06)	(2.22)	(1.98)	(2.05)	(1.91)	(1.30)	(1.73)	(1.54)	(1.89)
Employed	-0.3634	-0.0280	-0.3912	-0.0376	0.0096	-0.3483	-0.0020	0.0517	-0.0098
	(1.63)	(0.08)	(1.76)	(0.11)	(0.03)	(1.61)	(0.01)	(0.18)	(0.03)
Mother Educ		-0.0712		-0.0672	-0.0508		-0.0490	-0.0639	-0.0512
		(0.75)		(0.70)	(0.64)		(0.51)	(0.81)	(0.54)
Father Educ		-0.3207**		-0.3393**	-0.0632		-0.3722**	-0.0757	-0.3439**
		(4.14)		(4.39)	(1.00)		(4.77)	(1.20)	(4.46)
Parents Poor		0.0797		0.0478	-0.2086		0.0067	-0.1830	0.0011

		(0.27)		(0.16)	(0.87)		(0.02)	(0.77)	(0.00)
Risk Averse 2		-0.3724 (0.95)		-0.4206 (1.07)	0.3085 (0.94)		-0.4643 (1.18)	0.2986 (0.92)	-0.4735 (1.20)
Risk Averse 3		-0.5118 (1.36)		-0.5324 (1.42)	-0.0717 (0.22)		-0.6828 (1.82)	-0.1262 (0.39)	-0.6099 (1.62)
Risk Averse 4		-0.5206 (1.68)		-0.5222 (1.68)	0.0571 (0.20)		-0.5855 (1.90)	0.0135 (0.05)	-0.4981 (1.61)
BMI 86					0.8484** (20.43)			0.8502** (20.96)	
Constant	23.1582** (15.81)	28.3747** (9.97)	24.0258** (16.53)	29.3696** (10.35)	14.5504** (4.14)	23.0936** (16.05)	28.9447** (10.26)	14.6891** (4.20)	28.6530** (10.17)
Observations	5635	2531	5635	2531	1885	5963	2590	1921	2554
R-squared	0.08	0.10	0.07	0.10	0.51	0.07	0.10	0.50	0.10
Firstocc p-value	0.00001	0.02735	0.00006	0.00707	0.01473	0.00003	0.24380	0.17341	0.00015

Notes: Coefficients from OLS models are reported, with robust t-statistics in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value≤ 0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1. Column 9 uses a definition of blue collar that includes responses on first occupation from 2003 and 2005 surveys, which use the 2000 Census of Population; blue collar categories used are: cleaning/maintenance; farming/fishing/forestry; construction; extraction; install/maintenance/repair; production; and transportation. Risk Averse Category 4 represents individuals who are classified as the most risk-averse; the reference group includes individuals who are least risk-averse or most risk-tolerant.

Table 3a
Impact of First Occupation on Obesity, 1999

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	First Occupation Based on Recall					***Generated First Occupation***			***Modified Recall***
	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Extended + '86 Obese	Limited	Extended	Extended + '86 Obese	Extended
Blue Collar			0.0341**	0.0434*	0.0611*	0.0372**	-0.0005	-0.0326	0.0668**
			(2.64)	(2.13)	(2.49)	(3.14)	(0.03)	(1.38)	(3.35)
Craft	0.0735**	0.1096**							
	(2.69)	(2.64)							
Operative	0.1104**	0.0998*							
	(4.35)	(2.47)							
Transport	0.1117**	0.1567*							
	(2.58)	(2.01)							
Labor	0.0706*	0.0876							
	(2.45)	(1.96)							
Farmer	0.1013**	0.0394							
	(2.69)	(0.61)							
Manager	0.0118	0.0458							
	(0.32)	(0.83)							
Sales	0.0369	0.0474							
	(1.29)	(1.13)							
Clerical	0.0433	0.0429							
	(1.94)	(1.23)							
Service	0.0933**	0.0804*							
	(3.96)	(2.19)							
Private	0.1498**	0.1472							
	(2.60)	(1.53)							
Male	0.0195	0.0029	0.0147	0.0044	-0.0180	0.0204	0.0184	0.0063	-0.0021
	(1.51)	(0.14)	(1.21)	(0.22)	(0.74)	(1.88)	(1.00)	(0.29)	(0.11)
Black	0.1262**	0.1284**	0.1352**	0.1343**	0.1014**	0.1335**	0.1339**	0.1023**	0.1323**
	(9.53)	(5.26)	(10.27)	(5.52)	(3.36)	(10.31)	(5.58)	(3.43)	(5.43)
Hispanic	0.1751*	0.1324	0.1762*	0.1297	0.0266	0.1368*	0.1272	0.0093	0.1286
	(2.48)	(1.17)	(2.49)	(1.17)	(0.21)	(2.08)	(1.15)	(0.08)	(1.16)
Other	-0.0910		-0.0944			-0.1049			
	(0.98)		(1.02)			(1.17)			
Some High	-0.0612*	-0.0646	-0.0628*	-0.0600	-0.0219	-0.0629*	-0.0604	-0.0190	-0.0566
	(2.39)	(1.06)	(2.47)	(0.99)	(0.29)	(2.53)	(1.00)	(0.25)	(0.92)
High	-0.0738**	-0.0628	-0.0820**	-0.0606	-0.0362	-0.0815**	-0.0684	-0.0550	-0.0541
	(2.93)	(1.03)	(3.32)	(1.01)	(0.50)	(3.34)	(1.13)	(0.77)	(0.89)
Some College	-0.0530*	0.0021	-0.0664**	0.0030	0.0349	-0.0585*	-0.0073	0.0021	0.0117
	(2.01)	(0.03)	(2.59)	(0.05)	(0.46)	(2.27)	(0.12)	(0.03)	(0.18)
College	-0.0910**	-0.0279	-0.1188**	-0.0439	0.0427	-0.1135**	-0.0636	-0.0043	-0.0351
	(3.36)	(0.43)	(4.71)	(0.70)	(0.55)	(4.45)	(1.02)	(0.06)	(0.55)
Occ_Years	0.0021*	-0.0019	0.0020*	-0.0019	0.0005	0.0014	-0.0024	0.0001	-0.0015
	(2.38)	(0.88)	(2.25)	(0.88)	(0.17)	(1.35)	(1.15)	(0.05)	(0.72)
Age	0.0096**	0.0090	0.0099**	0.0089	-0.0083	0.0104**	0.0092	-0.0072	0.0080
	(3.07)	(1.37)	(3.16)	(1.36)	(0.81)	(3.28)	(1.42)	(0.71)	(1.22)
Age Squared	-0.0001**	-0.0001	-0.0001**	-0.0001	0.0001	-0.0001**	-0.0001	0.0001	-0.0001
	(3.85)	(1.03)	(3.93)	(1.05)	(0.77)	(3.98)	(1.09)	(0.67)	(0.95)
Married	-0.0889**	-0.0876**	-0.0907**	-0.0868**	-0.0917*	-0.0774**	-0.0720**	-0.0768*	-0.0768**
	(4.34)	(3.18)	(4.43)	(3.16)	(2.36)	(3.84)	(2.65)	(1.98)	(2.81)
Widowed	-0.0265	-0.0410	-0.0225	-0.0301	-0.1156*	-0.0078	0.0002	-0.0948	-0.0200
	(0.90)	(0.79)	(0.76)	(0.57)	(2.24)	(0.26)	(0.00)	(1.77)	(0.38)
Divorced	-0.0486*	-0.0799**	-0.0469*	-0.0766**	-0.1129**	-0.0392	-0.0690*	-0.1035**	-0.0714*
	(2.31)	(2.84)	(2.22)	(2.73)	(3.06)	(1.86)	(2.46)	(2.77)	(2.53)
Employed	-0.0361*	0.0171	-0.0360*	0.0149	0.0100	-0.0367**	0.0104	0.0128	0.0102
	(2.55)	(0.63)	(2.54)	(0.55)	(0.29)	(2.63)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)
Mother Educ		-0.0092		-0.0098	-0.0154		-0.0087	-0.0160	-0.0080
		(1.28)		(1.35)	(1.79)		(1.22)	(1.87)	(1.11)
Father Educ		-0.0161**		-0.0170**	-0.0118		-0.0188**	-0.0143*	-0.0178**
		(2.63)		(2.78)	(1.64)		(3.09)	(1.99)	(2.91)

Parents Poor		-0.0024 (0.12)		-0.0029 (0.15)	-0.0076 (0.32)		-0.0025 (0.13)	-0.0055 (0.23)	-0.0063 (0.32)
Risk Averse 2		-0.0656* (2.47)		-0.0684** (2.58)	-0.0442 (1.33)		-0.0708** (2.70)	-0.0455 (1.38)	-0.0728** (2.76)
Risk Averse 3		-0.0412 (1.54)		-0.0433 (1.63)	-0.0500 (1.53)		-0.0522* (1.99)	-0.0612 (1.90)	-0.0479 (1.81)
Risk Averse 4		-0.0738** (3.35)		-0.0748** (3.40)	-0.0675* (2.47)		-0.0804** (3.68)	-0.0756** (2.80)	-0.0771** (3.51)
Obese 86					0.6646** (16.98)			0.6635** (17.19)	
Observations	6315	2673	6315	2673	1980	6583	2728	2016	2691
Firstocc p-value	0.00090	0.30195	0.00833	0.03283	0.01286	0.00171	0.97861	0.16701	0.00081

Notes: Marginal effects from probit models are reported, with robust t-statistics in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value≤ 0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1. Column 9 uses a definition of blue collar that includes responses on first occupation from 2003 and 2005 surveys, which use the 2000 Census of Population; blue collar categories used are: cleaning/maintenance; farming/fishing/forestry; construction; extraction; install/maintenance/repair; production; and transportation. Risk Averse Category 4 represents individuals who are classified as the most risk-averse; the reference group includes individuals who are least risk-averse or most risk-tolerant.

Table 3b
Impact of First Occupation on Obesity, 2005

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	First Occupation Based on Recall					***Generated First Occupation***			***Modified Recall***
	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Extended + '86 Obese	Limited	Extended	Extended + '86 Obese	Extended
Blue Collar			0.0682**	0.0671**	0.0913**	0.0477**	0.0133	0.0017	0.0939**
			(4.57)	(2.91)	(3.15)	(3.52)	(0.62)	(0.06)	(4.13)
Craft	0.1111**	0.1673**							
	(3.55)	(3.62)							
Operative	0.1633**	0.1471**							
	(5.64)	(3.24)							
Transport	0.1686**	0.2244**							
	(3.28)	(2.63)							
Labor	0.1334**	0.1330**							
	(4.01)	(2.62)							
Farmer	0.1199**	0.1570*							
	(2.73)	(2.09)							
Manager	0.0094	0.0402							
	(0.23)	(0.65)							
Sales	0.0786*	0.0832							
	(2.41)	(1.72)							
Clerical	0.0719**	0.1136**							
	(2.89)	(2.87)							
Service	0.0949**	0.1019*							
	(3.55)	(2.47)							
Private	0.1309	0.0525							
	(1.89)	(0.51)							
Male	-0.0075	-0.0292	-0.0152	-0.0334	-0.0925**	0.0034	-0.0127	-0.0582*	-0.0384
	(0.52)	(1.23)	(1.11)	(1.49)	(3.27)	(0.28)	(0.62)	(2.30)	(1.79)
Black	0.1250**	0.1194**	0.1322**	0.1238**	0.1040**	0.1308**	0.1279**	0.1101**	0.1210**
	(8.05)	(4.35)	(8.59)	(4.53)	(3.05)	(8.81)	(4.75)	(3.26)	(4.44)
Hispanic	0.1163	0.0459	0.1186	0.0468	-0.0105	0.1056	0.0567	-0.0152	0.0455
	(1.61)	(0.38)	(1.65)	(0.38)	(0.08)	(1.57)	(0.46)	(0.11)	(0.37)
Other	-0.1478		-0.1525			-0.1642			
	(1.48)		(1.54)			(1.70)			
Some High	-0.0353	-0.0196	-0.0335	-0.0119	0.0256	-0.0321	-0.0179	0.0170	-0.0041
	(1.01)	(0.24)	(0.96)	(0.15)	(0.23)	(0.96)	(0.22)	(0.16)	(0.05)
High	-0.0606	-0.0377	-0.0628	-0.0269	0.0077	-0.0598	-0.0325	-0.0060	-0.0133
	(1.80)	(0.48)	(1.88)	(0.34)	(0.07)	(1.85)	(0.41)	(0.06)	(0.17)
Some College	-0.0459	0.0342	-0.0531	0.0434	0.0740	-0.0460	0.0294	0.0462	0.0606
	(1.31)	(0.42)	(1.54)	(0.53)	(0.68)	(1.36)	(0.36)	(0.43)	(0.73)
College	-0.0952**	-0.0161	-0.1225**	-0.0361	0.0680	-0.1184**	-0.0575	0.0290	-0.0187
	(2.66)	(0.20)	(3.58)	(0.45)	(0.62)	(3.50)	(0.71)	(0.27)	(0.23)
Occ_Years	0.0018	-0.0010	0.0018	-0.0008	-0.0003	0.0012	-0.0006	0.0006	-0.0005
	(1.66)	(0.40)	(1.62)	(0.33)	(0.10)	(0.96)	(0.25)	(0.16)	(0.19)
Age	0.0110*	0.0078	0.0113**	0.0071	-0.0012	0.0121**	0.0074	-0.0026	0.0068
	(2.56)	(0.90)	(2.63)	(0.82)	(0.08)	(2.83)	(0.87)	(0.18)	(0.80)
Age Squared	-0.0001**	-0.0001	-0.0001**	-0.0001	-0.0000	-0.0001**	-0.0001	-0.0000	-0.0001
	(3.80)	(1.18)	(3.89)	(1.12)	(0.31)	(3.95)	(1.17)	(0.25)	(1.12)
Married	-0.0472	-0.0141	-0.0498*	-0.0124	0.0070	-0.0314	0.0009	0.0255	-0.0051
	(1.89)	(0.42)	(2.00)	(0.37)	(0.14)	(1.29)	(0.03)	(0.53)	(0.15)
Widowed	0.0223	0.0298	0.0237	0.0362	0.0302	0.0370	0.0501	0.0431	0.0366
	(0.62)	(0.50)	(0.66)	(0.60)	(0.42)	(1.04)	(0.83)	(0.58)	(0.61)
Divorced	-0.0245	-0.0169	-0.0226	-0.0114	-0.0103	-0.0031	0.0029	0.0166	-0.0022
	(0.92)	(0.46)	(0.85)	(0.31)	(0.20)	(0.12)	(0.08)	(0.32)	(0.06)
Employed	-0.0373*	-0.0288	-0.0387*	-0.0276	-0.0386	-0.0304*	-0.0255	-0.0335	-0.0279
	(2.33)	(1.05)	(2.43)	(1.02)	(1.18)	(1.98)	(0.95)	(1.03)	(1.03)
Mother Educ		-0.0037		-0.0037	-0.0142		-0.0018	-0.0135	-0.0020
		(0.45)		(0.46)	(1.45)		(0.22)	(1.38)	(0.25)
Father Educ		-0.0184**		-0.0202**	-0.0142		-0.0230**	-0.0167*	-0.0212**
		(2.64)		(2.91)	(1.71)		(3.35)	(2.02)	(3.06)
Parents Poor		0.0129		0.0113	-0.0096		0.0093	-0.0082	0.0063

		(0.55)		(0.48)	(0.34)		(0.40)	(0.30)	(0.27)
Risk Averse 2		-0.0403 (1.25)		-0.0426 (1.33)	-0.0137 (0.34)		-0.0466 (1.48)	-0.0202 (0.51)	-0.0471 (1.47)
Risk Averse 3		-0.0595 (1.88)		-0.0588 (1.86)	-0.0662 (1.66)		-0.0685* (2.21)	-0.0770* (1.97)	-0.0646* (2.06)
Risk Averse 4		-0.0333 (1.29)		-0.0321 (1.25)	-0.0098 (0.30)		-0.0389 (1.53)	-0.0171 (0.54)	-0.0332 (1.30)
Obese 86					0.6017** (14.41)			0.5915** (14.44)	
Observations	5635	2491	5635	2491	1848	5963	2550	1884	2514
Firstocc p-value	0.00001	0.04190	0.00000	0.00366	0.00165	0.00043	0.53615	0.94948	0.00004

Notes: Marginal effects from probit models are reported, with robust t-statistics in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value≤ 0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1. Column 9 uses a definition of blue collar that includes responses on first occupation from 2003 and 2005 surveys, which use the 2000 Census of Population; blue collar categories used are: cleaning/maintenance; farming/fishing/forestry; construction; extraction; install/maintenance/repair; production; and transportation. Risk Averse Category 4 represents individuals who are classified as the most risk-averse; the reference group includes individuals who are least risk-averse or most risk-tolerant.

Table 4a
Impact of First Occupation on Alcohol Consumption (Drinks Per Day), 1999

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	First Occupation Based on Recall				***Generated First Occupation***		***Modified Recall***
	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Extended
Blue Collar			-0.0045	0.0757*	-0.0462*	0.0238	0.0710
			(0.18)	(2.03)	(2.03)	(0.70)	(1.89)
Craft	0.0387	0.0367					
	(0.89)	(0.61)					
Operative	-0.0003	0.0413					
	(0.01)	(0.68)					
Transport	0.0683	0.0368					
	(0.78)	(0.33)					
Labor	0.0887	0.1509					
	(1.71)	(1.83)					
Farmer	0.0008	0.0230					
	(0.01)	(0.18)					
Manager	0.0104	-0.0253					
	(0.20)	(0.37)					
Sales	0.0655	0.0021					
	(1.57)	(0.03)					
Clerical	0.0040	-0.0526					
	(0.14)	(1.23)					
Service	0.0710	-0.0029					
	(1.95)	(0.05)					
Private	-0.0003	0.1124					
	(0.00)	(0.61)					
Male	0.3106**	0.2792**	0.3281**	0.2909**	0.3330**	0.3117**	0.2978**
	(13.20)	(7.51)	(14.57)	(8.39)	(16.50)	(9.46)	(8.71)
Black	-0.0808**	-0.0102	-0.0769**	-0.0074	-0.0808**	-0.0023	-0.0085
	(3.15)	(0.23)	(3.01)	(0.17)	(3.25)	(0.05)	(0.20)
Hispanic	-0.0705	-0.0742	-0.0683	-0.0727	-0.0723	-0.0768	-0.0780
	(0.79)	(0.46)	(0.78)	(0.46)	(0.88)	(0.48)	(0.49)
Other	-0.0123	-0.0637	-0.0214	-0.0586	-0.0251	-0.0726	-0.0718
	(0.12)	(0.31)	(0.21)	(0.29)	(0.25)	(0.36)	(0.35)
Some High	0.1532**	0.0579	0.1598**	0.0508	0.1550**	0.0394	0.0484
	(2.94)	(0.37)	(3.12)	(0.33)	(3.17)	(0.26)	(0.32)
High	0.1505**	0.0298	0.1517**	0.0149	0.1245**	-0.0051	0.0153
	(3.33)	(0.20)	(3.47)	(0.10)	(2.91)	(0.04)	(0.11)
Some College	0.1497**	0.0172	0.1489**	0.0026	0.1217**	-0.0188	0.0020
	(3.08)	(0.12)	(3.14)	(0.02)	(2.59)	(0.13)	(0.01)
College	0.2093**	0.0114	0.1951**	0.0032	0.1531**	-0.0198	0.0017
	(4.12)	(0.08)	(4.08)	(0.02)	(3.19)	(0.14)	(0.01)
Occ_Years	-0.0004	0.0061	-0.0005	0.0058	-0.0010	0.0064	0.0060
	(0.30)	(1.47)	(0.34)	(1.37)	(0.53)	(1.56)	(1.43)
Age	0.0094	-0.0127	0.0095	-0.0122	0.0128*	-0.0110	-0.0118
	(1.84)	(1.05)	(1.87)	(1.01)	(2.35)	(0.93)	(0.99)
Age Squared	-0.0001*	0.0001	-0.0001*	0.0001	-0.0001**	0.0001	0.0001
	(2.13)	(0.92)	(2.21)	(0.89)	(2.81)	(0.75)	(0.85)
Married	-0.1465**	-0.1419**	-0.1497**	-0.1446**	-0.1630**	-0.1252*	-0.1380*
	(3.56)	(2.60)	(3.65)	(2.64)	(4.05)	(2.33)	(2.54)
Widowed	-0.0551	-0.1377	-0.0541	-0.1338	-0.0597	-0.1350	-0.1291
	(0.91)	(1.44)	(0.90)	(1.42)	(0.98)	(1.48)	(1.39)
Divorced	-0.0370	-0.0763	-0.0387	-0.0798	-0.0540	-0.0666	-0.0742
	(0.78)	(1.28)	(0.82)	(1.34)	(1.16)	(1.14)	(1.26)
Employed	0.0392	-0.0301	0.0367	-0.0320	0.0279	-0.0262	-0.0311
	(1.54)	(0.62)	(1.45)	(0.66)	(1.12)	(0.54)	(0.64)
Mother Educ		0.0025		0.0029		0.0012	0.0015
		(0.20)		(0.23)		(0.10)	(0.12)
Father Educ		0.0139		0.0146		0.0144	0.0153
		(1.16)		(1.23)		(1.26)	(1.30)
Parents Poor		-0.0238		-0.0207		-0.0197	-0.0214
		(0.65)		(0.57)		(0.55)	(0.60)

Risk Averse 2		-0.0544 (1.08)		-0.0544 (1.08)		-0.0568 (1.13)	-0.0605 (1.21)
Risk Averse 3		-0.0493 (0.96)		-0.0514 (0.99)		-0.0582 (1.13)	-0.0569 (1.10)
Risk Averse 4		-0.0837* (1.98)		-0.0852* (2.01)		-0.0960* (2.28)	-0.0898* (2.13)
Constant	0.0860 (0.64)	0.4969 (1.60)	0.1193 (0.91)	0.4876 (1.59)	0.1152 (0.88)	0.4586 (1.52)	0.4593 (1.52)
Observations	6580	2794	6580	2794	6855	2853	2814
R-squared	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.08
Firstocc p-value	0.28422	0.40416	0.85344	0.04248	0.04191	0.48589	0.05872

Notes: Coefficients from OLS models are reported, with robust t-statistics in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value≤ 0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1. Column 7 uses a definition of blue collar that includes responses on first occupation from 2003 and 2005 surveys, which use the 2000 Census of Population; blue collar categories used are: cleaning/maintenance; farming/fishing/forestry; construction; extraction; install/maintenance/repair; production; and transportation. Risk Averse Category 4 represents individuals who are classified as the most risk-averse; the reference group includes individuals who are least risk-averse or most risk-tolerant.

Table 4b
Impact of First Occupation on Alcohol Consumption (Drinks Per Day), 2005

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	First Occupation Based on Recall				***Generated First Occupation***		***Modified Recall***
	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Extended
Blue Collar			0.0273	0.0048	-0.0376	-0.0076	-0.0240
			(0.50)	(0.06)	(0.74)	(0.09)	(0.26)
Craft	0.0836	0.0208					
	(0.88)	(0.15)					
Operative	0.0205	-0.0720					
	(0.24)	(0.54)					
Transport	-0.1653	0.1557					
	(1.09)	(0.53)					
Labor	0.3918**	0.3462					
	(3.15)	(1.88)					
Farmer	-0.0077	-0.1098					
	(0.05)	(0.34)					
Manager	0.0510	-0.0589					
	(0.37)	(0.26)					
Sales	0.2118*	0.2067					
	(2.15)	(1.40)					
Clerical	0.0430	-0.0225					
	(0.65)	(0.20)					
Service	0.1010	0.1205					
	(1.30)	(0.95)					
Private	-0.2072	-0.5951**					
	(1.76)	(3.49)					
Male	0.6889**	0.7390**	0.7242**	0.7952**	0.7485**	0.8094**	0.8081**
	(13.51)	(8.50)	(14.41)	(9.31)	(16.40)	(10.14)	(9.45)
Black	-0.3990**	-0.3211**	-0.4022**	-0.3154**	-0.3840**	-0.2809**	-0.3227**
	(6.95)	(3.20)	(7.09)	(3.11)	(6.89)	(2.77)	(3.20)
Hispanic	0.1881	0.2263	0.1961	0.2175	0.4095	0.2086	0.2014
	(0.68)	(0.50)	(0.71)	(0.49)	(1.38)	(0.47)	(0.46)
Other	-0.1663	-0.6074	-0.1873	-0.6261	-0.2043	-0.6217	-0.6260
	(0.57)	(1.17)	(0.64)	(1.19)	(0.73)	(1.17)	(1.20)
Some High	0.1173	0.0947	0.1420	0.1863	0.1841	0.1715	0.1690
	(0.90)	(0.37)	(1.10)	(0.73)	(1.49)	(0.68)	(0.66)
High	0.1116	0.0252	0.1397	0.1117	0.1484	0.0999	0.1054
	(0.90)	(0.11)	(1.15)	(0.47)	(1.25)	(0.42)	(0.44)
Some College	-0.0022	-0.2593	0.0256	-0.1669	0.0013	-0.1897	-0.1842
	(0.02)	(1.08)	(0.20)	(0.71)	(0.01)	(0.80)	(0.78)
College	-0.0433	-0.2959	-0.0403	-0.2361	-0.0799	-0.2589	-0.2628
	(0.33)	(1.21)	(0.32)	(0.99)	(0.62)	(1.05)	(1.08)
Occ_Years	-0.0012	-0.0103	-0.0014	-0.0112	-0.0035	-0.0093	-0.0123
	(0.40)	(1.04)	(0.48)	(1.11)	(0.88)	(0.96)	(1.24)
Age	-0.0425**	-0.0142	-0.0429**	-0.0162	-0.0376*	-0.0180	-0.0144
	(2.95)	(0.40)	(2.97)	(0.46)	(2.53)	(0.52)	(0.42)
Age Squared	0.0001	-0.0001	0.0001	-0.0000	0.0001	-0.0000	-0.0000
	(1.25)	(0.19)	(1.23)	(0.11)	(0.94)	(0.08)	(0.15)
Married	-0.3806**	-0.3705*	-0.3912**	-0.3762*	-0.4392**	-0.3798*	-0.4003**
	(3.49)	(2.49)	(3.58)	(2.52)	(3.93)	(2.54)	(2.65)
Widowed	-0.0434	-0.0939	-0.0468	-0.0934	-0.0981	-0.1013	-0.1136
	(0.33)	(0.46)	(0.36)	(0.46)	(0.74)	(0.49)	(0.55)
Divorced	0.0496	0.0326	0.0450	0.0263	-0.0094	0.0145	0.0012
	(0.41)	(0.20)	(0.37)	(0.16)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.01)
Employed	0.0346	-0.1161	0.0387	-0.0960	0.0640	-0.0661	-0.0877
	(0.54)	(1.07)	(0.61)	(0.90)	(1.04)	(0.62)	(0.83)
Mother Educ		-0.0414		-0.0394		-0.0349	-0.0410
		(1.52)		(1.44)		(1.29)	(1.52)
Father Educ		0.0276		0.0285		0.0295	0.0296
		(1.11)		(1.15)		(1.22)	(1.21)
Parents Poor		-0.1732*		-0.1684*		-0.1757*	-0.1698*
		(2.14)		(2.10)		(2.23)	(2.13)

Risk Averse 2		-0.0648 (0.51)		-0.0684 (0.54)		-0.0786 (0.63)	-0.0694 (0.55)
Risk Averse 3		-0.2275 (1.82)		-0.2246 (1.79)		-0.2397 (1.95)	-0.2235 (1.80)
Risk Averse 4		-0.1913 (1.79)		-0.1906 (1.78)		-0.1889 (1.79)	-0.1795 (1.69)
Constant	2.8164** (6.30)	2.4499* (2.57)	2.8863** (6.51)	2.4291** (2.58)	2.8076** (6.37)	2.3986* (2.57)	2.4239** (2.61)
Observations	5872	2598	5872	2598	6212	2658	2621
R-squared	0.10	0.12	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.11	0.11
Firstocc p-value	0.00691	0.00250	0.61369	0.95520	0.45946	0.92893	0.79336

Notes: Coefficients from OLS models are reported, with robust t-statistics in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value≤ 0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1. Column 7 uses a definition of blue collar that includes responses on first occupation from 2003 and 2005 surveys, which use the 2000 Census of Population; blue collar categories used are: cleaning/maintenance; farming/fishing/forestry; construction; extraction; install/maintenance/repair; production; and transportation. Risk Averse Category 4 represents individuals who are classified as the most risk-averse; the reference group includes individuals who are least risk-averse or most risk-tolerant.

Table 5a
Impact of First Occupation on Smoking, 1999

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	First Occupation Based on Recall				***Generated First Occupation***		***Modified Recall***
	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Extended
Blue Collar			0.0150	0.0251	0.0317**	0.0357*	0.0052
			(1.28)	(1.33)	(2.88)	(2.00)	(0.29)
Craft	0.0383	0.0601					
	(1.57)	(1.59)					
Operative	0.0421	0.0572					
	(1.81)	(1.51)					
Transport	0.0524	0.1022					
	(1.38)	(1.53)					
Labor	0.0552*	0.0730					
	(2.11)	(1.75)					
Farmer	0.0185	0.0860					
	(0.55)	(1.35)					
Manager	-0.0245	-0.0403					
	(0.72)	(0.79)					
Sales	0.0338	0.0342					
	(1.23)	(0.80)					
Clerical	0.0338	0.0620					
	(1.53)	(1.79)					
Service	0.0379	0.0462					
	(1.69)	(1.30)					
Private	-0.0022	0.0459					
	(0.04)	(0.51)					
Male	0.0765**	0.0647**	0.0749**	0.0601**	0.0728**	0.0656**	0.0692**
	(6.40)	(3.18)	(6.69)	(3.15)	(7.36)	(3.77)	(3.83)
Black	-0.0152	-0.0354	-0.0134	-0.0336	-0.0192	-0.0265	-0.0341
	(1.24)	(1.60)	(1.10)	(1.52)	(1.61)	(1.21)	(1.54)
Hispanic	-0.0744	-0.0550	-0.0735	-0.0558	-0.0692	-0.0574	-0.0580
	(1.58)	(0.56)	(1.56)	(0.57)	(1.48)	(0.60)	(0.60)
Other	-0.1533*		-0.1538*		-0.1581*		
	(2.01)		(2.02)		(2.13)		
Some High	0.0408	0.0800	0.0461	0.0835	0.0313	0.0763	0.0792
	(1.42)	(1.23)	(1.60)	(1.28)	(1.14)	(1.19)	(1.23)
High	-0.0812**	-0.0916	-0.0771**	-0.0874	-0.0867**	-0.0845	-0.0921
	(3.15)	(1.66)	(3.01)	(1.58)	(3.49)	(1.53)	(1.67)
Some College	-0.1185**	-0.1218*	-0.1165**	-0.1199*	-0.1228**	-0.1189*	-0.1252*
	(4.79)	(2.32)	(4.74)	(2.28)	(5.12)	(2.27)	(2.41)
College	-0.1869**	-0.2077**	-0.1919**	-0.2168**	-0.1934**	-0.2103**	-0.2208**
	(7.71)	(4.11)	(8.20)	(4.37)	(8.36)	(4.23)	(4.49)
Occ_Years	-0.0003	-0.0010	-0.0003	-0.0010	-0.0009	-0.0005	-0.0010
	(0.32)	(0.50)	(0.32)	(0.48)	(0.92)	(0.28)	(0.53)
Age	0.0196**	0.0195**	0.0197**	0.0192**	0.0198**	0.0187**	0.0194**
	(5.56)	(2.89)	(5.60)	(2.85)	(5.71)	(2.80)	(2.90)
Age Squared	-0.0002**	-0.0002**	-0.0002**	-0.0002**	-0.0002**	-0.0002**	-0.0002**
	(7.01)	(3.57)	(7.07)	(3.52)	(7.19)	(3.46)	(3.57)
Married	-0.1045**	-0.0851**	-0.1063**	-0.0861**	-0.1150**	-0.0889**	-0.0861**
	(5.29)	(3.12)	(5.38)	(3.17)	(5.94)	(3.33)	(3.19)
Widowed	-0.0216	-0.0164	-0.0232	-0.0171	-0.0382	-0.0378	-0.0186
	(0.71)	(0.30)	(0.77)	(0.31)	(1.30)	(0.72)	(0.34)
Divorced	0.0231	0.0414	0.0226	0.0418	0.0149	0.0382	0.0462
	(1.09)	(1.40)	(1.08)	(1.42)	(0.73)	(1.32)	(1.57)
Employed	-0.0378**	-0.0666*	-0.0381**	-0.0655*	-0.0354**	-0.0614*	-0.0640*
	(2.82)	(2.33)	(2.84)	(2.29)	(2.66)	(2.16)	(2.24)
Mother Educ		-0.0048		-0.0049		-0.0037	-0.0056
		(0.70)		(0.72)		(0.55)	(0.83)
Father Educ		0.0010		-0.0001		0.0007	-0.0008
		(0.17)		(0.02)		(0.12)	(0.14)

Parents Poor		-0.0168 (0.87)		-0.0173 (0.90)		-0.0139 (0.73)	-0.0160 (0.84)
Risk Averse 2		0.0229 (0.83)		0.0229 (0.83)		0.0217 (0.79)	0.0247 (0.89)
Risk Averse 3		0.0161 (0.57)		0.0182 (0.65)		0.0135 (0.49)	0.0163 (0.59)
Risk Averse 4		0.0416 (1.92)		0.0428* (1.97)		0.0372 (1.73)	0.0409 (1.89)
Observations	6573	2762	6573	2762	6847	2824	2785
Firstocc p-value	0.52375	0.61747	0.19934	0.18416	0.00400	0.04531	0.77501

Notes: Marginal effects from probit models are reported, with robust t-statistics in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value≤ 0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1. Column 7 uses a definition of blue collar that includes responses on first occupation from 2003 and 2005 surveys, which use the 2000 Census of Population; blue collar categories used are: cleaning/maintenance; farming/fishing/forestry; construction; extraction; install/maintenance/repair; production; and transportation. Risk Averse Category 4 represents individuals who are classified as the most risk-averse; the reference group includes individuals who are least risk-averse or most risk-tolerant.

Table 5b
Impact of First Occupation on Smoking, 2005

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	First Occupation Based on Recall				***Generated First Occupation***		***Modified Recall***
	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Extended
Blue Collar			0.0062	-0.0024	0.0193	0.0084	-0.0262
			(0.53)	(0.13)	(1.77)	(0.48)	(1.51)
Craft	0.0068	0.0021					
	(0.29)	(0.06)					
Operative	0.0083	-0.0161					
	(0.37)	(0.47)					
Transport	0.0233	0.1020					
	(0.62)	(1.55)					
Labor	0.0298	0.0220					
	(1.17)	(0.58)					
Farmer	0.0080	0.0927					
	(0.24)	(1.48)					
Manager	0.0032	-0.0124					
	(0.10)	(0.25)					
Sales	-0.0015	-0.0090					
	(0.06)	(0.24)					
Clerical	0.0019	0.0154					
	(0.09)	(0.48)					
Service	0.0175	0.0191					
	(0.81)	(0.58)					
Private	-0.0362	0.0229					
	(0.75)	(0.29)					
Male	0.0620**	0.0475*	0.0650**	0.0529**	0.0693**	0.0521**	0.0607**
	(5.26)	(2.46)	(5.82)	(2.90)	(7.00)	(3.09)	(3.48)
Black	-0.0155	-0.0442*	-0.0148	-0.0432*	-0.0184	-0.0442*	-0.0466*
	(1.27)	(2.06)	(1.23)	(2.02)	(1.56)	(2.12)	(2.19)
Hispanic	-0.0746	-0.0835	-0.0734	-0.0799	-0.0857*	-0.0825	-0.0805
	(1.74)	(1.09)	(1.70)	(0.98)	(2.03)	(1.01)	(0.99)
Some High	0.0189	0.0238	0.0213	0.0319	0.0231	0.0301	0.0270
	(0.65)	(0.37)	(0.74)	(0.49)	(0.83)	(0.47)	(0.42)
High	-0.0797**	-0.0977	-0.0789**	-0.0922	-0.0737**	-0.0922	-0.0986
	(3.01)	(1.70)	(3.02)	(1.61)	(2.88)	(1.61)	(1.72)
Some College	-0.1123**	-0.1228*	-0.1122**	-0.1183*	-0.1099**	-0.1192*	-0.1272*
	(4.45)	(2.30)	(4.51)	(2.21)	(4.47)	(2.22)	(2.40)
College	-0.1686**	-0.1862**	-0.1704**	-0.1877**	-0.1684**	-0.1860**	-0.1985**
	(6.80)	(3.57)	(7.10)	(3.64)	(7.10)	(3.60)	(3.89)
Occ_Years	-0.0004	-0.0002	-0.0004	-0.0002	-0.0007	0.0002	-0.0004
	(0.49)	(0.10)	(0.47)	(0.09)	(0.75)	(0.10)	(0.21)
Age	0.0182**	0.0167*	0.0181**	0.0160*	0.0181**	0.0149*	0.0166*
	(4.66)	(2.31)	(4.64)	(2.23)	(4.76)	(2.09)	(2.32)
Age Squared	-0.0002**	-0.0002**	-0.0002**	-0.0002**	-0.0002**	-0.0002**	-0.0002**
	(6.18)	(3.22)	(6.18)	(3.13)	(6.34)	(3.03)	(3.21)
Married	-0.1053**	-0.0904**	-0.1072**	-0.0909**	-0.1211**	-0.0891**	-0.0925**
	(5.15)	(3.15)	(5.24)	(3.18)	(6.08)	(3.14)	(3.24)
Widowed	0.0063	-0.0129	0.0052	-0.0133	-0.0115	-0.0120	-0.0123
	(0.22)	(0.28)	(0.18)	(0.29)	(0.41)	(0.26)	(0.26)
Divorced	0.0049	0.0277	0.0042	0.0282	-0.0039	0.0283	0.0268
	(0.24)	(0.94)	(0.20)	(0.96)	(0.20)	(0.97)	(0.92)
Employed	-0.0278*	-0.0523*	-0.0274*	-0.0511*	-0.0301*	-0.0448*	-0.0487*
	(2.15)	(2.29)	(2.12)	(2.24)	(2.39)	(1.99)	(2.15)
Mother Educ		-0.0183**		-0.0178**		-0.0175**	-0.0186**
		(2.76)		(2.69)		(2.68)	(2.80)
Father Educ		0.0057		0.0049		0.0060	0.0047
		(0.99)		(0.86)		(1.06)	(0.83)
Parents Poor		-0.0050		-0.0061		-0.0027	-0.0049
		(0.26)		(0.32)		(0.14)	(0.26)
Risk Averse 2		0.0288		0.0270		0.0243	0.0250
		(1.09)		(1.02)		(0.93)	(0.95)

Risk Averse 3		0.0126 (0.48)		0.0117 (0.45)		0.0090 (0.35)	0.0101 (0.39)
Risk Averse 4		0.0189 (0.93)		0.0207 (1.01)		0.0183 (0.91)	0.0198 (0.98)
Observations	5841	2567	5841	2567	6180	2627	2590
Firstocc p-value	0.95340	0.67305	0.59429	0.89280	0.07692	0.62849	0.13173

Notes: Marginal effects from probit models are reported, with robust t-statistics in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value≤ 0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1. Column 7 uses a definition of blue collar that includes responses on first occupation from 2003 and 2005 surveys, which use the 2000 Census of Population; blue collar categories used are: cleaning/maintenance; farming/fishing/forestry; construction; extraction; install/maintenance/repair; production; and transportation. Risk Averse Category 4 represents individuals who are classified as the most risk-averse; the reference group includes individuals who are least risk-averse or most risk-tolerant.

Table 6a
Impact of First Occupation on Physical Activity (frequency of light/vigorous), 1999

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	First Occupation Based on Recall				***Generated First Occupation***		***Modified Recall***
	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Extended
Blue Collar			1.2917*	0.8384	1.4910*	1.1768*	1.0556
			(2.17)	(1.48)	(2.30)	(2.29)	(1.80)
Craft	2.4834	0.2361					
	(1.32)	(0.29)					
Operative	0.3401	0.2129					
	(0.42)	(0.20)					
Transport	0.8045	2.5454					
	(0.70)	(1.20)					
Labor	1.4411	1.4544					
	(1.83)	(1.30)					
Farmer	2.9176*	3.5134					
	(2.13)	(1.93)					
Manager	1.1764	0.5871					
	(1.31)	(0.51)					
Sales	-0.1623	-0.2539					
	(0.22)	(0.27)					
Clerical	-0.3694	-0.4761					
	(0.72)	(0.65)					
Service	0.3053	0.0208					
	(0.55)	(0.03)					
Private	2.7320	3.0636					
	(1.05)	(0.87)					
Male	0.5349	-0.0155	0.8696	0.1603	0.9705	0.1676	0.0670
	(1.09)	(0.03)	(1.46)	(0.29)	(1.66)	(0.32)	(0.13)
Black	-0.5006	0.3504	-0.5288	0.4144	-0.4496	0.5726	0.6573
	(1.03)	(0.50)	(1.00)	(0.57)	(0.78)	(0.78)	(0.87)
Hispanic	-0.6962	-1.6022	-0.8711	-1.3432	-0.7093	-1.3993	-1.2688
	(0.66)	(1.18)	(0.74)	(0.92)	(0.58)	(0.94)	(0.88)
Other	-2.2045**	0.4750	-2.3461**	0.5463	-1.9621*	0.6584	0.5252
	(2.61)	(0.32)	(2.75)	(0.36)	(2.11)	(0.45)	(0.34)
Some High	0.3384	-1.0817	0.0549	-1.3233	0.5669	-1.5496	-1.1867
	(0.18)	(0.38)	(0.03)	(0.47)	(0.31)	(0.56)	(0.43)
High	0.2105	-2.1947	-0.1051	-2.5771	0.5842	-2.4142	-2.4102
	(0.11)	(0.81)	(0.05)	(0.99)	(0.30)	(0.92)	(0.93)
Some College	-1.5023	-3.5603	-1.7760	-3.9078	-0.8549	-3.3128	-3.4283
	(0.82)	(1.30)	(0.91)	(1.48)	(0.46)	(1.25)	(1.30)
College	-1.5493	-3.5877	-1.8273	-3.8969	-0.9929	-3.4258	-3.5460
	(0.84)	(1.29)	(0.93)	(1.47)	(0.54)	(1.29)	(1.34)
Occ_Years	-0.0580	-0.0866	-0.0583	-0.0863	-0.1014	-0.0936	-0.0850
	(0.94)	(1.04)	(0.89)	(1.04)	(1.24)	(1.16)	(1.04)
Age	0.2044	0.2168	0.2007	0.2044	0.2405	0.2263	0.2206
	(0.96)	(0.93)	(0.93)	(0.88)	(1.06)	(1.00)	(0.97)
Age Squared	-0.0014	-0.0016	-0.0013	-0.0015	-0.0013	-0.0016	-0.0017
	(0.79)	(0.77)	(0.76)	(0.71)	(0.77)	(0.79)	(0.80)
Married	-1.7438*	-1.2417	-1.6795*	-1.2210	-1.2515	-1.0720	-1.0829
	(2.53)	(1.54)	(2.46)	(1.52)	(1.90)	(1.32)	(1.33)
Widowed	-3.1753*	-1.2097	-2.9498	-1.0067	-2.9253*	-1.2892	-0.8762
	(2.06)	(0.60)	(1.94)	(0.49)	(1.97)	(0.64)	(0.42)
Divorced	-1.2200	-0.7503	-1.1458	-0.7589	-0.8949	-0.6690	-0.7364
	(1.49)	(0.80)	(1.43)	(0.81)	(1.19)	(0.73)	(0.80)
Employed	-2.5994*	-1.7767*	-2.6040*	-1.7944*	-2.2774	-1.7340*	-1.7635*
	(2.03)	(2.22)	(2.01)	(2.21)	(1.86)	(2.18)	(2.18)
Mother Educ		0.1909		0.1998		0.1791	0.1552
		(0.83)		(0.88)		(0.80)	(0.69)
Father Educ		-0.0459		-0.0441		-0.0542	-0.0418
		(0.28)		(0.27)		(0.34)	(0.26)
Parents Poor		0.0317		0.0214		-0.0308	-0.1173
		(0.05)		(0.03)		(0.05)	(0.18)

Riskdummy2		-1.7384* (2.54)		-1.7434* (2.57)		-1.7277** (2.60)	-1.7895** (2.67)
Riskdummy3		-0.6711 (1.00)		-0.7323 (1.10)		-0.8567 (1.31)	-0.8000 (1.20)
Riskdummy4		-0.1189 (0.20)		-0.0843 (0.14)		-0.0512 (0.09)	-0.0535 (0.09)
Constant	8.7729	9.4987	9.0475	9.9578	6.8060	9.0206	9.2728
	(1.94)	(1.68)	(1.90)	(1.79)	(1.37)	(1.62)	(1.67)
Observations	3543	1722	3543	1722	3705	1761	1738
R-squared	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.05
Firstocc p-value	0.05674	0.42823	0.03020	0.13889	0.02175	0.02187	0.07149

Notes: Coefficients from OLS models are reported, with robust t-statistics in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value≤ 0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1. Column 7 uses a definition of blue collar that includes responses on first occupation from 2003 and 2005 surveys, which use the 2000 Census of Population; blue collar categories used are: cleaning/maintenance; farming/fishing/forestry; construction; extraction; install/maintenance/repair; production; and transportation. Risk Averse Category 4 represents individuals who are classified as the most risk-averse; the reference group includes individuals who are least risk-averse or most risk-tolerant.

Table 6b
Impact of First Occupation on Physical Activity (frequency of light/vigorous), 2005

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	First Occupation Based on Recall				***Generated First Occupation***		***Modified Recall***
	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Limited	Extended	Extended
Blue Collar			-0.1763	0.8241	-0.0945	0.2732	0.5822
			(0.17)	(0.55)	(0.12)	(0.29)	(0.72)
Craft	-1.5988	-1.7635					
	(1.35)	(0.99)					
Operative	-1.7221	-0.6476					
	(1.69)	(0.44)					
Transport	-2.9583*	-3.9303					
	(2.14)	(1.21)					
Labor	1.5054	4.0395					
	(0.91)	(1.48)					
Farmer	2.9019	4.5617					
	(1.34)	(1.58)					
Manager	-0.8926	-0.1305					
	(1.00)	(0.11)					
Sales	1.3768	4.1563					
	(0.42)	(0.78)					
Clerical	-1.1202	-1.3791					
	(1.48)	(1.32)					
Service	-1.0078	-2.0316					
	(1.20)	(1.61)					
Private	0.4916	-0.3619					
	(0.25)	(0.13)					
Male	1.7845	1.6432	2.1015*	2.0418	1.9096**	2.2257*	2.2056
	(1.80)	(1.03)	(2.04)	(1.25)	(2.72)	(2.00)	(1.85)
Black	1.2904	4.9821	1.1650	5.0157	1.0269	4.7855	4.8595
	(0.79)	(1.08)	(0.72)	(1.05)	(0.69)	(1.03)	(1.03)
Hispanic	-1.5870	-2.7300	-1.3344	-2.1715	-1.1631	-2.2820	-2.3505
	(1.57)	(1.15)	(1.33)	(0.97)	(1.25)	(0.99)	(1.02)
Other	-1.9440*	-1.3767	-1.9584*	-1.8497	-1.9980**	-1.9952	-1.9377
	(2.15)	(0.50)	(2.39)	(0.62)	(2.61)	(0.72)	(0.70)
Some High	2.7443	-0.2167	2.2127	0.3209	1.8867	0.1931	0.1940
	(1.80)	(0.09)	(1.49)	(0.14)	(1.23)	(0.08)	(0.08)
High	2.0602	0.8221	1.4919	1.1891	1.0581	1.1222	1.0766
	(1.63)	(0.35)	(1.17)	(0.50)	(0.82)	(0.48)	(0.45)
Some College	2.2569	0.4206	1.7541	0.7840	1.2483	0.6134	0.6716
	(1.26)	(0.18)	(0.95)	(0.31)	(0.66)	(0.24)	(0.26)
College	0.9755	-2.0557	0.8097	-1.1213	0.5174	-1.3236	-1.3147
	(0.79)	(0.69)	(0.65)	(0.41)	(0.40)	(0.51)	(0.51)
Occ_Years	0.0719	0.0086	0.0812	0.0289	0.0967*	-0.0074	-0.0123
	(1.54)	(0.11)	(1.67)	(0.39)	(2.08)	(0.09)	(0.15)
Age	-0.3872	-1.2499	-0.4095	-1.2967	-0.4914	-1.1808	-1.1704
	(1.31)	(1.26)	(1.35)	(1.25)	(1.55)	(1.14)	(1.15)
Age Squared	0.0039	0.0140	0.0040	0.0143	0.0046	0.0135	0.0134
	(1.32)	(1.25)	(1.34)	(1.24)	(1.48)	(1.16)	(1.17)
Married	0.7440	1.7746	0.6379	1.5607	0.6419	1.6629	1.5325
	(0.84)	(1.10)	(0.75)	(1.05)	(0.86)	(1.17)	(1.08)
Widowed	-1.0020	-4.3037	-1.0367	-4.5251	-0.9502	-4.4429	-4.4810
	(0.68)	(1.14)	(0.70)	(1.17)	(0.61)	(1.15)	(1.13)
Divorced	0.8730	0.1252	0.7078	-0.3022	0.6556	-0.1637	-0.2478
	(0.92)	(0.14)	(0.75)	(0.35)	(0.77)	(0.19)	(0.28)
Employed	-1.8045	-2.6625	-1.8327	-2.7912	-1.7027	-2.7766	-2.7760
	(1.84)	(1.28)	(1.80)	(1.27)	(1.80)	(1.29)	(1.24)
Mother Educ		-0.6121		-0.5267		-0.4982	-0.4927
		(1.51)		(1.34)		(1.26)	(1.24)
Father Educ		1.0089		1.0388		1.0484	1.0624
		(1.03)		(1.01)		(1.02)	(1.03)
Parents Poor		-1.2951		-1.3461		-1.0909	-1.1376
		(1.01)		(1.05)		(0.84)	(0.88)

Riskdummy2		-0.9244 (0.94)		-0.7181 (0.72)		-0.6119 (0.63)	-0.6742 (0.68)
Riskdummy3		-0.3776 (0.39)		-0.4922 (0.56)		-0.4664 (0.52)	-0.4643 (0.52)
Riskdummy4		1.2233 (1.06)		1.2726 (1.06)		1.3631 (1.17)	1.3869 (1.18)
Constant	15.3545** (2.83)	32.6283 (1.81)	15.8567** (2.79)	32.1561 (1.71)	18.4081** (3.04)	29.5804 (1.61)	29.1670 (1.61)
Observations	3040	1513	3040	1513	3184	1548	1528
R-squared	0.02	0.09	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.08	0.08
Firstocc p-value	0.05747	0.28242	0.86724	0.58499	0.90089	0.77142	0.47300

Notes: Coefficients from OLS models are reported, with robust t-statistics in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value≤ 0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1. Column 7 uses a definition of blue collar that includes responses on first occupation from 2003 and 2005 surveys, which use the 2000 Census of Population; blue collar categories used are: cleaning/maintenance; farming/fishing/forestry; construction; extraction; install/maintenance/repair; production; and transportation. Risk Averse Category 4 represents individuals who are classified as the most risk-averse; the reference group includes individuals who are least risk-averse or most risk-tolerant.

Table 7a
Constrained Bivariate Probit Estimates
Effect of Blue Collar First Occupation on Obesity

Sample		*1999*		*2005*	
Model	Constraint	First Occupation Recalled	First Occupation Generated	First Occupation Recalled	First Occupation Generated
1	Probit (ρ=0)	0.0339* (2.17)	0.0147 (0.97)	0.0590** (3.27)	0.0384* (2.21)
2	ρ=0.1	-0.012837 (0.84)	-0.0304* (2.02)	0.5970 (0.22)	-0.0149 (0.86)
3	ρ=0.2	-0.0585** (3.89)	-0.0756** (5.08)	-0.0501** (2.87)	-0.0681** (3.99)
4	ρ=0.3	-0.1036** (7.06)	-0.1213** (8.24)	-0.1033** (6.09)	-0.1213** (7.23)
5	ρ=0.4	-0.1486 (10.41)	-0.1680** (11.59)	-0.1557** (9.48)	-0.1748** (10.66)
6	ρ=0.5	-0.1940 (14.03)	-0.2162** (15.20)	-0.2076** (13.16)	-0.2285** (14.35)
7	ρ=-0.1	0.0821*** (5.17)	0.0603*** (3.95)	0.1150*** (6.31)	0.0919*** (5.28)
8	ρ=-0.2	0.1321*** (8.22)	0.1067*** (6.98)	0.1720*** (9.40)	0.1457*** (8.39)
9	ρ=-0.3	0.1842*** (11.37)	0.1545*** (10.10)	0.2297*** (12.61)	0.1999*** (11.62)
10	ρ=-0.4	0.2385*** (14.71)	0.2039*** (13.37)	0.2881*** (16.00)	0.2546*** (15.01)
11	ρ=-0.5	0.2953*** (18.31)	0.2555*** (16.87)	0.3468*** (19.67)	0.3096*** (18.66)
12	Sel on obs= Sel on unobs	-0.0403*** (3.16) [ρ=0.15]	-0.3101*** (26.46) [ρ=0.72]	-0.0071 (0.48) [ρ=0.10]	-0.0671*** (4.62) [ρ=0.26]
Observations		4596	4454	4137	4052

Notes: Marginal effects are reported. Robust t statistics are reported in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value<0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1.

Table 7b
Constrained Bivariate Probit Estimates
Effect of Blue Collar First Occupation on Smoking

Sample		*1999*		*2005*	
Model	Constraint	First Occupation Recalled	First Occupation Generated	First Occupation Recalled	First Occupation Generated
1	Probit (ρ=0)	0.0119 (1.04)	0.0293* (2.52)	0.0088 (0.77)	0.0226* (1.98)
2	ρ=0.1	-0.0324** (2.90)	-0.0152 (1.32)	-0.0304** (2.80)	-0.0174 (1.58)
3	ρ=0.2	-0.0754** (6.91)	-0.0597** (5.22)	-0.0680** (6.44)	-0.0567** (5.21)
4	ρ=0.3	-0.1175** (11.08)	-0.1046** (9.27)	-0.1050** (10.21)	-0.0966** (8.97)
5	ρ=0.4	-0.1591** (15.49)	-0.1503** (13.56)	-0.1419** (14.19)	-0.1378** (12.94)
6	ρ=0.5	-0.2008** (20.24)	-0.1973** (18.20)	-0.1794** (18.48)	-0.1807** (17.24)
7	ρ=-0.1	0.0581*** (4.97)	0.0744*** (6.34)	0.0495*** (4.33)	0.0621*** (5.54)
8	ρ=-0.2	0.1065*** (8.95)	0.1203*** (10.23)	0.0930*** (7.94)	0.1034*** (9.16)
9	ρ=-0.3	0.1573*** (13.06)	0.1675*** (14.23)	0.1396*** (11.66)	0.1465*** (12.89)
10	ρ=-0.4	0.2106*** (17.37)	0.2161*** (18.43)	0.1896*** (15.57)	0.1919*** (16.82)
11	ρ=-0.5	0.2666*** (22.01)	0.2664*** (22.92)	0.2432*** (19.77)	0.2399*** (21.04)
12	Sel on obs= Sel on unobs	-0.1655*** (14.73) [ρ=0.52]	[ρ>1]	0.3847*** (36.40) [ρ=-0.62]	[ρ>1]
Observations		6602	6448	5897	5848

Notes: Marginal effects are reported. Robust t statistics are reported in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value<0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1.

Table 8
Instrumental Variables Estimates based on External Instruments

	1999		*2005*	
	First Occupation Recalled	First Occupation Generated	First Occupation Recalled	First Occupation Generated
BMI				
Blue Collar	4.690 (4.329)	3.624 (4.834)	3.507 (4.000)	7.730 (7.403)
Observations	2507	2554	2399	2452
Overidentification p-value	0.1155	0.0572	0.1024	0.1195
F statistic	3.86	2.63	5.07	1.75
OBESE				
Blue Collar	0.308 (0.348)	0.211 (0.391)	0.386 (0.345)	0.722 (0.646)
Observations	2507	2554	2399	2452
Overidentification p-value	0.2789	0.1442	0.3439	0.3848
F statistic	3.86	2.63	5.07	1.75
ALCOHOL				
Blue Collar	-1.471** (0.712)	-2.053* (1.135)	-2.422* (1.368)	-3.547 (2.646)
Observations	2586	2636	2463	2517
Overidentification p-value	0.1579	0.4118	0.6211	0.6354
F statistic	3.95	2.37	4.93	1.78
SMOKING				
Blue Collar	0.058 (0.334)	-0.036 (0.416)	0.360 (0.321)	0.631 (0.552)
Observations	2585	2635	2461	2515
Overidentification p-value	0.2991	0.1882	0.7588	0.9025
F statistic	3.94	2.36	4.99	1.80
PHYSICAL ACTIVITY				
Blue Collar	-9.216 (6.031)	-11.993 (9.805)	13.275 (46.597)	20.116 (54.880)
Observations	1596	1628	1449	1480
Overidentification p-value	0.9763	0.6909	0.2321	0.2564
F statistic	5.90	2.84	0.29	0.22

Notes: Extended models are employed. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value<0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1. Excluded instruments pertain to county unemployment (1968) and father's blue collar occupation.

Table 9
Instrumental Variables Estimates based on Internal Instruments

	1999		*2005*	
	First Occupation Recalled	First Occupation Generated	First Occupation Recalled	First Occupation Generated
BMI				
Blue Collar	0.156 (0.679)	1.481** (0.749)	1.247* (0.753)	1.851** (0.876)
Observations	2720	2777	2536	2596
Overidentification p-value	0.6858	0.9457	0.9843	0.9400
F statistic	16.33	12.13	16.78	11.10
OBESE				
Blue Collar	0.013 (0.057)	0.087 (0.063)	0.064 (0.061)	0.113 (0.071)
Observations	2720	2777	2536	2596
Overidentification p-value	0.7824	0.5592	0.8717	0.8180
F statistic	16.33	12.13	16.78	11.10
ALCOHOL				
Blue Collar	0.219** (0.109)	0.128 (0.108)	0.207 (0.249)	-0.495* (0.268)
Observations	2803	2863	2603	2664
Overidentification p-value	0.5351	0.2723	0.0773	0.2518
F statistic	14.61	13.45	15.46	11.84
SMOKING				
Blue Collar	0.035 (0.057)	-0.034 (0.057)	0.027 (0.054)	-0.042 (0.058)
Observations	2801	2861	2600	2661
Overidentification p-value	0.6697	0.4607	0.3944	0.1538
F statistic	14.97	13.65	15.38	11.80
PHYSICAL ACTIVITY				
Blue Collar	0.589 (1.326)	0.542 (0.867)	5.149* (3.010)	6.768** (3.217)
Observations	1728	1767	1517	1553
Overidentification p-value	0.5047	0.7278	0.0289	0.9244
F statistic	16.12	49.75	16.88	13.02

Notes: Extended models are employed. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value<0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1.

Table 10a
Stratified Samples
Controlling for Current Occupation, 1999

		BMI	Obese	Alcohol	Smoking	Physical Activity
1	Full Sample	0.283	0.042**	0.079*	0.014	0.406
		(0.235)	(0.021)	(0.040)	(0.020)	(0.639)
2	Male	0.368	0.033	0.107*	0.020	0.731
		(0.263)	(0.027)	(0.060)	(0.026)	(0.764)
3	Females	0.143	0.040	0.016	0.013	-0.315
		(0.482)	(0.037)	(0.052)	(0.033)	(1.208)
4	White	0.303	0.049**	0.059	0.016	0.484
		(0.261)	(0.024)	(0.049)	(0.024)	(0.626)
5	Non-White	-0.050	0.001	0.154**	0.028	0.417
		(0.515)	(0.047)	(0.075)	(0.039)	(1.757)

Table 10b
Stratified Samples
Controlling for Current Occupation, 2005

		BMI	Obese	Alcohol	Smoking	Physical Activity
1	Full Sample	0.717**	0.079***	0.024	0.010	2.151*
		(0.326)	(0.028)	(0.101)	(0.021)	(1.299)
2	Male	0.717**	0.075**	0.161	0.019	0.996
		(0.326)	(0.033)	(0.152)	(0.027)	(0.802)
3	Females	0.803	0.067	-0.340***	-0.039	4.575
		(0.711)	(0.051)	(0.114)	(0.032)	(4.174)
4	White	0.885***	0.124***	-0.004	0.010	0.787
		(0.336)	(0.032)	(0.135)	(0.025)	(0.788)
5	Non-White	0.209	-0.039	0.175	0.045	6.417
		(0.818)	(0.058)	(0.149)	(0.045)	(4.005)

Notes: Each cell represents a separate regression model and shows coefficients on blue collar (based on recall). Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. Extended models are employed. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value≤ 0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1. Sample sizes range from 2043 to 6599.

Table 11
Potential Mediators
2005

Model	Outcome	**BMI**	**Obese**	**Alcohol**	**Smoking**	**Physical Activity**
		First Occupation Recalled	First Occupation Recalled	First Occupation Recalled	First Occupation Recalled	First Occupation Recalled
1	Baseline	0.674***	0.063***	0.049	0.005	-0.070
		(0.188)	(0.015)	(0.054)	(0.012)	(1.054)
2	Baseline with Household Income	0.674***	0.063***	0.048	0.004	-0.068
		(0.188)	(0.015)	(0.054)	(0.012)	(1.056)
3	Baseline with Work Hours	0.674***	0.063***	0.049	0.005	-0.070
		(0.188)	(0.015)	(0.054)	(0.012)	(1.054)
4	Baseline with Current Occupation	0.686***	0.071***	0.098	0.004	1.309
		(0.234)	(0.019)	(0.073)	(0.016)	(0.818)

Notes: Each cell represents a separate regression model. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. All models control for the variables in the limited models in Tables 2-6 in addition to state fixed effects. Asterisks denote statistical significance as follows: *** p-value≤ 0.01; ** 0.01<p-value≤ 0.05; * 0.05<p-value≤ 0.1. Sample sizes range from 2043 to 6599.