Taller Women do Better in a Stressed Environment: Height and Reproductive Success in Rural Guatemalan Women
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ABSTRACT
Previous research on the relationship between height and reproductive success in women has produced mixed results. One possible explanation for these is mediation by ecological factors, such as environmental stress. Here we investigate female height and reproductive success under conditions of environmental stress (poverty) using a large-scale dataset from Guatemala (n = 2,571). Controlling for educational attainment, age and ethnicity, we examined relationships between height and childlessness, occurrence of a stillbirth, fertility and child survival. There was no significant relationship between height and never having given birth. Extremely short women had a significantly raised likelihood of experiencing stillbirth. There were curvilinear relationships between height and age at first birth, fertility, and survival rates for children. Overall, though, the penalties for short stature, particularly in terms of child survival, were far greater than those associated with extreme tallness, and so female height is positively associated with overall fitness in this population. Am. J. Hum. Biol. 00:000–000, 2008.

In men, tallness is related to socioeconomic status and good health (Bielecki and Szklarska, 1999; Kuh and Wadsworth, 1993; Macintyre and West, 1991; Magnusson et al., 2006; Mascie-Taylor and Lasker, 2005; Silventoinen et al., 1999; Szklarska et al., in press; Teasdale et al., 1991). Height also has a positive influence on male mating and reproductive success in some Western populations (Mueller and Mazur, 2001; Nettle, 2002a; Pawlowski et al., 2000; Sunde, 2006). For traditional societies, on the other hand, the relationship between male height and mating success appears to be positive, but there is no evidence that male height significantly influences fertility or child survival (Kirchengast, 2000; Kirchengast and Winkler, 1995; Sear, 2006).

For women, a frequent finding has been a curvilinear relationship between height and reproductive success (Brush et al., 1983; Mitton, 1975; Mueller, 1979; Nettle, 2002b; Veta, 1975 but see Allal et al., 2004; Sear et al., 2004 for a linear trend). Both tall and short women appear to be disadvantaged in terms of fitness. For modern societies, there might even be a weak selection pressure towards shortness for women, because of reduced mating success amongst tall women (Nettle, 2002b). However, maternal height has been thought to have positive effects on outcomes of pregnancy. Maternal height is for example negatively related to difficulties during childbirth, as well as low birth weight of neonates (Kelly et al., 1996; Magadi et al., 2003; Mahmoud et al., 1988; Prasad and Al-Taher, 2002). Taller women are also more likely to have twins (Basso et al., 2004; Reddy et al., 2005), indicating that they are able to invest more in their offspring. Archaeological and epidemiological evidence also suggests that, in general, height is negatively related to morbidity and mortality rates, not only in men but also in women (Gunnell et al., 2001; Kemkes-Grottenhaler, 2005; Silventoinen et al., 1989). For a sample of Gambian women, height was found to positively influence child survival rates, with taller women having higher overall reproductive success for this reason (Allal et al., 2004; Sear et al., 2004). This is despite taller women reproducing later. A study of Guatemalan women also found that shorter women have fewer surviving children (Martorell et al., 1981).

By contrast, one study of a sample of lower caste Indian women found negative effects of height on reproductive success, with taller women having lower fertility and lower numbers of surviving children (Devi et al., 1985). Some studies have also failed to find any relation at all between maternal height and reproductive success (Bailey and Garn, 1979; Kirchengast, 2000; Lasker and Thomas, 1976).

Thus, for women the findings of the relationship between height and reproductive success are mixed. It appears that the relationship between female height and reproductive success might be modified by environmental factors. In an environment with few resources, height might be a reflection of health status to a greater extent than is true for an affluent population (Sear et al., 2004; Silventoinen, 2003). In particular, where infant mortality is high, the positive relationship between maternal height and child survival may outweigh the later reproduction of tall women. Here, we examine the impact of women’s height on reproductive success for a stressed population in rural Guatemala. We investigate whether the relationship between height and reproductive success is linear or curvilinear while controlling for educational attainment, ethnicity, and age.

METHODOLOGY
For our analysis we used the Encuesta Guatemalteca de Salud Familiar of 1995 (EGSF). This is a cross-sectional study that collected data from 2,872 women between 18- and 35-years-old in rural Guatemala on a wide variety of economic, anthropometric, and sociodemographic variables. Data were collected in 1995 and participation rate in this survey was 89% (Peterson et al., 1997).
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The Guatemalan population is strongly socially divided into two ethnic groups of more or less equal size (Glei et al., 2003; Goldman and Glei, 2003). Only a fraction of the population, about 2% of the sample, does not identify themselves as being part of either group. The indigenous population consists of descendants of the Mayan and other preconquest populations, of which some only speak Mayan. The Ladina group is Spanish speaking and are of both preconquest population and European descent. The indigenous group is more socially excluded and poorer than the Ladina group. While the Ladina group can be found in all social strata of society, the indigenous group predominantly occupies the lowest social stratum.

Guatemala was among the poorest countries in Latin America and the world at the time of the survey and this still remains the case (Edwards, 2002; Gragnolati and Marini, 2006; Steele, 1994). The majority of the population did not have appropriate access to affordable public health, sanitation, potable water, and electricity at the time of the survey (Goldman and Glei, 2003; Peterson et al., 1997). The average household income was ~29 US$ a month at the time of the survey. Compared to other countries in Latin America, infant and maternal mortality in Guatemala is high (49 per 1,000 and 190 per 1,000, respectively; World Bank, 1999 in Goldman and Glei, 2003; for 2004: infant mortality is 45 per 1,000; Word Health Organization, 2006). Guatemala, especially the rural areas, is only just beginning the demographic and epidemiological transition (Goldman et al., 2001; Gragnolati and Marini 2006). The total fertility rate has dropped from 5.8 in 1990 to 3.82 in 2006 (CIA, 2006; UNPD, 2005). The demographics of this rural population are thus useful to study reproductive patterns of a population under stress from a Darwinian perspective. This sample has been widely used for the study of provision health care (Glei et al., 2003; Goldman and Glei, 2003) and beliefs about illness (Goldman et al., 2001; Heuveline and Goldman, 2000). Additional information on the sample can be found in the codebook or in these previously published articles.

We excluded participants for which data on the variables were missing, after which 2,571 participants were retained for the analysis. The descriptive statistics for the variables are summarized in Table 1. We present the raw data by use of height deciles (derived from $n = 2,571$).

For each of our analyses we controlled for the effects of age, ethnicity, and attained level of education. Attained level of education is coded as an interval variable, which is the sum of the grades completed. Age is coded as age of last birthday, and is thus an approximation. Besides fitting height (cm), we also included squared height ($cm^2$) and $ln(height)$ as additional variables to test for possible curvilinear effects in each analysis.

Binomial logistic regression was first used to analyze the likelihood of “never given birth” and the likelihood of having had a stillbirth ( Hosmer and Lemeshow, 1989;
Menard, 1995; Pampel, 2000). Binomial logistic regression as statistical technique is relatively free of assumptions and statistically robust. Unlike ordinary least square regression (OLS) parameters are estimated by maximum likelihood. As a parameter selection procedure we used backward stepwise. Model outcomes were only marginally different in terms of model fit and Nagelkerke $R^2$ (Nagelkerke, 1991) when forward stepwise was used instead. Here, we will report the likelihood ratio tests for variables ($p_{llr}$) in the model and the parameter estimates for the models (see Peng et al., 2002). Given that these are dichotomous data, binomial logistic regression is a preferred technique over general linear mixed models (GLMM’s) which requires the dependent to be interval.

We also built General Linear Mixed Models with age, age$^2$, height, squared height (cm$^2$), ln(height), ethnicity, and attained level of education as predictors for age at first birth, fertility (number of live births) of parous women, and survival ratio (number of living children/number of ever born children at time of survey). The models had absolute parameter and loglikelihood convergence and parameters were estimated by Restricted Maximum Likelihood (SPSS, 2005; see Verbeke and Molenberghs, 2000). We first examined baseline models with no random effects, then we constructed models with a random intercept and subsequently models with random intercepts and random slopes. We used an unstructured covariance matrix for the random effects (Litell et al., 2000). On the basis of Schwarz’s Bayesian information criterion (BIC) (smaller-is-better; we also examined AIC; see, Kuha, 2004), we selected the final model. This model could be a baseline model without random effects, have a random intercept or have a random intercept and random slope(s). Only significant parameters were retained for the final model (based on F-test). We will present the BIC of the final model, and parameter estimates.

We also performed stepwise Cox regression to examine the independent effect of height on the likelihood of the firstborn child’s death, while controlling for other variables. As a parameter selection we used backward stepwise (likelihood ratio), and the parameters included were ethnicity, age, age$^2$, height, height$^2$, ln(height), and attained level of education.

There is little indication that multicollinearity confounds any of the analyses. For our models we will focus on the effects of height, and not discuss the effects of control variables.

**RESULTS**

**Descriptive statistics**

From Figure 1 it appears that taller women are less likely to experience stillbirth. Taller women also have higher survival ratios. Figure 2 shows a curvilinear trend as well, with both extremely short and very tall women having lower fertility. Figure 3 shows a curvilinear trend.
The respondent has never given birth (versus given birth).

Grades by one grade makes it 1.18 times more likely that the woman has not had a stillbirth, whereas height did not affect the likelihood of childlessness, whereas age and age\(^2\) do. Odds ratios can be interpreted as follows: an increase of the number attained grades by one grade makes it 1.18 times more likely that the respondent has never given birth (versus given birth).

**Likelihood of childlessness (never gave birth)**

The model for never having given birth has a Nagelkerke \(R^2\) of 0.33 (model fit: –2LL = 2057.74; \(\chi^2 = 560.17; P < 0.0001\); Table 2). There is no effect of height, height\(^2\), or ln(height) on the likelihood of never having given birth (\(\chi^2\)-test: respectively: \(P < 0.3; P < 0.25; P < 0.3\)). Height does not affect the likelihood of childlessness, whereas age and age\(^2\) do. Odds ratios can be interpreted as follows: an increase of the number attained grades by one grade makes it 1.18 times more likely that the respondent has never given birth (versus given birth).

**Likelihood of a stillbirth**

The model for likelihood of having had a stillbirth has a Nagelkerke \(R^2\) of 0.056 (model fit: –2LL = 1010.29; \(\chi^2 = 47.66; P < 0.0001\)). Squared height proved a significant predictor of never having had a stillbirth (height\(^2\)-test: \(P < 0.3\); \(P < 0.25\); \(P < 0.3\)). Height does not affect the likelihood of childlessness, whereas age and age\(^2\) do. Odds ratios can be interpreted as follows: an increase of the number attained grades by one grade makes it 1.18 times more likely that the respondent has never given birth (versus given birth).

**Age at first birth**

The model with best fit was a baseline model, i.e. had no random intercept or random effects for variables (BIC = 9891.78). The model allows us to predict the age at first birth using the equation of the model: predicted age of first birth = 91.47 – 1.092(height) + 0.004(height\(^2\)) + 0.334(education) + 0.541(age) – 0.007(age\(^2\)). Women of average stature (147.06 cm), age (26.95 years), and educational attainment (1.97 years) are predicted to have their first child when they are 19.35 years. While extremely short (2 stds. below average height: 135.72 cm) women of the same level of education are predicted to have their first child at 20.02 years. On the other hand, extremely tall women (2 stds. above average height: 158.4 cm) of the same level of education are predicted to have their first child at 19.35 years.

**Fertility (number of live births)**

The model with the lowest BIC, only has baseline effects and no random intercept or random effects for variables (BIC: –1378.97). Inclusion of linear height of squared height did not significantly improve the prediction of the survival ratio (t-test; both \(P > 0.2\)). Extremely short women (135.69 cm) of average age (26.94 years) and educational level (1.97 years) are predicted to have a survival ratio of 0.9, whereas, women of average height (147.03 cm) and extremely tall women (158.37 cm) of similar age and educational attainment have higher survival ratios for their offspring (0.936 and 0.918 respectively). Extremely short women thus have worse survival ratios for their children than taller women.

**Survival ratio (number of living children/number of ever born children)**

The model with the lowest BIC, only has baseline effects and no random intercept or random effects for variables (BIC: –1378.97). Inclusion of linear height of squared height did not significantly improve the prediction of the survival ratio (t-test; both \(P > 0.2\)). Extremely short women (135.69 cm) of average age (26.94 years) and educational level (1.97 years) are predicted to have a survival ratio of 0.9, whereas, women of average height (147.03 cm) and extremely tall women (158.37 cm) of similar age and educational attainment have higher survival ratios for their offspring (0.936 and 0.918 respectively). Extremely short women thus have worse survival ratios for their children than taller women.

**Likelihood of death for first child**

Survival analysis by Cox regression shows an effect of linear height, ln(height), and age on survival of the first-born child (final model: –2LL = 2709.32; \(\chi^2 = 236.72; P < 0.0001\); Table 3). Given that we have a curvilinear effect and linear effect for height with different parameters, the effect of height can be more easily observed when comparing survival curves for different heights (Fig. 4). When comparing the survival curves for the median decile and for extreme heights (shortest decile and tallest decile), extremely short women show poorer child survival than for women who are extremely tall (Fig. 4). There

---

**Table 2. Odds ratios (exp(\(\beta\))) for logistic regression and unstandardized parameter estimates for GLMM’s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Never gave birth</th>
<th>Stillbirth (yes)</th>
<th>Age at first birth</th>
<th>Fertility</th>
<th>Survival ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logistic</td>
<td>Logistic</td>
<td>GLMM</td>
<td>GLMM</td>
<td>GLMM</td>
<td>GLMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(R^2 = 0.33)</td>
<td>(R^2 = 0.05)</td>
<td>BIC = 10137.29</td>
<td>BIC = 7371.67</td>
<td>BIC = 1378.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>91.47</td>
<td>–208.318</td>
<td>–0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>–1.092**</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height(^2)</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.004**</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln(height)</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>45.646**</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.225*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.541**</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age(^2)</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.258***</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.334***</td>
<td>–0.168***</td>
<td>0.005**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous → Ladina</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* \(P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001\).

---

**Table 3. Parameter estimates (\(\beta\)) and odds ratios (exp(\(\beta\))) for Cox regression on survival of firstborn**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survival of firstborn</th>
<th>Parameter estimate</th>
<th>Odds ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>0.884*</td>
<td>2.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height(^2)</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln(height)</td>
<td>–132.361**</td>
<td>3.28 e (-58.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age(^2)</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous → Ladina</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* \(P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001\).

Women of average height (147.03 cm), age (26.94 years), and educational level (1.97 years) are predicted to have 3.49 children. Extremely short women (135.69 cm) of the same age and educational attainment, however, are predicted to have 3.18 children. Extremely tall women (158.37 cm), of the same age and educational attainment are predicted to have 3.26 children.

---
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The finding that, in terms of fertility and survival rates, extremely short women are worse off than extremely tall women. The average effect of short and extremely tall women having lower reproductive success than women of average height. However, the penalties affecting very short women are generally greater than those affecting very tall women. We suggest a role for environmental mediators of the relationship between height and reproductive success, such as environmental stress. In an environment where stress is high, for instance due to scarcity of resources, growing tall is an accurate indication of health status, and will positively relate to female reproductive success, in particular through increased infant survival. In affluent populations, height is not so strongly related to health, infant survival is uniformly high, and female fitness is determined by other factors such as male mate preferences. This explains the difference in findings between this study and the Gambian one (Sear et al., 2004) on the one hand, and the studies from Western populations on the other (Nettle, 2002b).

In a stressed environment, such as under poverty, height thus appears to be a reliable indicator of maternal ability to reproduce successfully. In general, the relationship between height and reproductive success for this sample appears to be curvilinear, with both extremely tall and extremely short women having lower reproductive success than women of average height. However, the penalties affecting very short women are generally greater than those affecting very tall women. We suggest a role for environmental mediators of the relationship between height and reproductive success, such as environmental stress. In an environment where stress is high, for instance due to scarcity of resources, growing tall is an accurate indication of health status, and will positively relate to female reproductive success, in particular through increased infant survival. In affluent populations, height is not so strongly related to health, infant survival is uniformly high, and female fitness is determined by other factors such as male mate preferences. This explains the difference in findings between this study and the Gambian one (Sear et al., 2004) on the one hand, and the studies from Western populations on the other (Nettle, 2002b).

In a stressed environment, female height shows curvilinear effects on reproductive success, with extremely short and extremely tall women having lower reproductive success overall than women of average height. However, extremely short women are (far) worse off in fitness terms than extremely tall women, so the average effect of increasing height on fitness is positive.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT
The authors thank RAND and the ICSPR consortium who made the EGSF publicly available. The EGSF data were collected by Noreen Goldman (Princeton University) and Anne Pebley (RAND) in collaboration with the Nutritional Institute of Central America and Panama (INCAP).
Authors also thank the reviewers for comments which substantially improved previous drafts.

LITERATURE CITED


