# Childhood Misfortune and Handgrip Strength Among Black, White, and Hispanic Americans

Natalie R Smith,[1] Kenneth F Ferraro,[2,3] Blakelee R Kemp,[2,3] Patricia M Morton,[4,5,6] Sarah A Mustillo,[7] and Jacqueline L Angel[8]

[1]Department of Biostatistics, University of North Carolina Gillings School of Global Public Health, Chapel Hill
[2]Center on Aging and the Life Course, West Lafayette, Indiana
[3]Department of Sociology, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana
[4]Children's Environmental Health Initiative, Houston, Texas
[5]Department of Statistics, Houston, Texas
[6]Department of Sociology, Rice University, Houston, Texas
[7]Department of Sociology, University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana
[8]Population Research Center, University of Texas at Austin

Correspondence should be addressed to Kenneth Ferraro, PhD, Center on Aging and the Life Course, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907-2055. E-mail: ude.eudrup@orarref
Received 2016 Jan 30; Accepted 2016 Oct 28.

**Supplementary Materials follow the References.**

## Abstract

### Objective

Although early-life insults may affect health, few studies use objective physical measures of adult health. This study investigated whether experiencing misfortune during childhood is associated with handgrip strength (HGS) in later life.

## Method

Data on childhood misfortune and adult characteristics from the Health and Retirement Study were used to predict baseline and longitudinal change in HGS among White, Black, and Hispanic American men and women.

## Results

Regression analyses revealed that multiple indicators of childhood misfortune were related to HGS at baseline, but the relationships were distinct for men and women. Over the study, having one childhood impairment predicted steeper declines in HGS for men, but childhood misfortune was unrelated to HGS change among women. Hispanic Americans had lower baseline HGS than their non-Hispanic counterparts and manifested steeper declines in HGS.

## Discussion

The relationship between childhood exposures and adult HGS varied by the type of misfortune, but there was no evidence that the relationship varied by race/ethnicity. The significant and enduring Hispanic disadvantage in HGS warrants greater attention in gerontology.

**Keywords:** Childhood disadvantage, Disability, Life course epidemiology

Research on the early origins of adult health has emerged as a notable theme in gerontology. There has always been interest in the health and functional problems of older people, but greater attention in recent years has been given to the development of those problems. Pioneering studies during the past two decades revealed a higher prevalence of adult health problems due to diseases during childhood (Blackwell, Hayward, & Crimmins, 2001) or harsh living conditions while growing up (O'Rand & Hamil-Luker, 2005). This line of research has provided evidence for the utility of a life-course approach to health and fostered fresh examination of resilience in the face of early-life insults (Seery, Holman, & Silver, 2010).

Two limitations of the literature on early origins merit attention. First, most research on the early origins of adult health is based on self-reported measures of adult health. Considerable research shows that these measures are generally valid and reliable (Ferraro & Farmer, 1999), but questions asking whether a "doctor ever told" the respondent they have a condition are contingent on the use of medical services. Self-reported measures will remain a central component of research on health, but objective measures of later-life functional health are a necessary complement to self-reported measures. To our knowledge, relatively few studies of the early origins of adult health have used objective measures of physical performance as their outcome (e.g., Haas, Krueger, & Rohlfsen, 2012).

Second, few studies give attention to racial/ethnic differences in the study of adult health's early origins. Part of this may be due to the richness of longitudinal data in locations that had relatively modest racial diversity decades ago (e.g., British National Survey of Health and Development). Other studies may underrepresent population diversity or lack sufficient cases to test for racial/ethnic differences. It is clear that there is substantial racial and ethnic variation in stress exposure during early life (Turner & Avison, 2003). What is less clear is whether those differences in early stress exposure translate into compromised physical functioning in later life. There are many reasons why handgrip strength (HGS) may vary by race/ethnicity, but we focus on whether the influence of childhood misfortune operates differently for Black, White, and Hispanic Americans. To examine this question systematically, it is also important to consider adult status and resources, which can alter the potential consequences of early negative exposures. This study, therefore, examines the relationship between childhood misfortune and an objective performance measure within a diverse sample of older adults. We focus on HGS because studies show it can be used as a marker of late-life conditions such as frailty (Syddall et al., 2003) and sarcopenia (Sayer, Syddall, Gilbody, Dennison, & Cooper, 2004). Few researchers have investigated racial/ethnic variability in HGS; however, given the persistent racial/ethnic gaps in functional health outcomes associated with HGS such as disability (Warner & Brown, 2011), we examine potential racial/ethnic disparity in HGS. Moreover, if childhood misfortune is related to HGS, it may be a harbinger of other health problems and a way to detect emergent racial/ethnic disparities. We ask whether the relationship between childhood misfortune and HGS varies across non-Hispanic White Americans, non-Hispanic Black Americans, and Hispanic Americans. Owing to major differences in HGS between men and women, we also examine sex differences.

## Significance and Theoretical Approach

Considerable research demonstrates that early-life misfortune raises the risk of health problems during later life, including heart attack (O'Rand & Hamil-Luker, 2005), cancer (Morton, Schafer, & Ferraro, 2012), and disability (Bowen & Gonzalez, 2010). Most studies examining morbidity and/or disability rely on self-reported adult measures, but some have examined performance measures—including HGS—and shown negative associations between childhood misfortune and adult functional ability. The type of childhood misfortune examined by most studies is socioeconomic status (SES; Birnie et al., 2011; Starr & Deary, 2011), but Haas and colleagues (2012) investigated the influence of both childhood SES and health on HGS. Their article is also important because the cross-sectional analyses revealed that Hispanic Americans have lower HGS than either White or Black Americans—one of the few studies to explore racial/ethnic variability in HGS. We seek to build on these studies by incorporating longitudinal analyses and examining a more comprehensive inventory of childhood misfortune. Performing both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses will allow us to establish baseline models of HGS and then subsequently examine how HGS changes over time; steeper declines in HGS may indicate early-onset issues and reveal emerging racial/ethnic disparities.

## Multiple Domains of Misfortune

Although the literature on the early origins of adult health has been greatly aided by studies examining a single negative exposure in childhood, negative experiences may be related. Failure

to consider multiple types of misfortune may lead to overestimating the effect of a single exposure. For instance, some studies examine whether poor health during childhood influences health in later life, whereas others focus on the effects of financial strain on adult health. Although such studies are helpful, the poor health of a child (or other household member) may lead to or exacerbate financial strain (e.g., expenses of health care or caregiving). Alternatively, financial strain can lead to or exacerbate a child's health problem (e.g., nutritional deficiency). Drawing from cumulative inequality theory, disadvantage in one life domain may spill over to others (Ferraro & Shippee, 2009). Moreover, besides interfering with important child development processes, negative experiences may also be consequential because most children have limited ability to control undesirable situations. Some researchers argue for investigating the cumulative toll of negative experiences, reflecting a dose–response relationship (Brown et al., 2009). Others prefer to distinguish across domains (O'Rand & Hamil-Luker, 2005), but the overarching point is to consider multiple domains of early misfortune.

## Social Stratification of Misfortune

The idea of multiple domains of childhood misfortune implies a consideration of accumulated difficulty. All of us will face hard times—consistent with Longfellow's "into each life some rain must fall" (*The Rainy Day*)—but such rain does not fall randomly. Some people face frequent hard times or a cascade of setbacks and catastrophic problems, whereas others live for long spells without major misfortune, even if beset by daily hassles. The fact that a child may have to face both a serious health condition and household financial strain is daunting enough, but the sequelae are predictably worse if accompanied by violence or substance abuse in the home or neighborhood.

The variability in exposure to misfortune is not due solely to personal choices but shaped by processes of social stratification. According to Max Weber (1978), social stratification unfolds at the nexus of life choices and life chances. He defined the latter as related to one's class situation: "the typical chance for a supply of goods, external living conditions, and personal life experiences" (Weber, 1922/2001, p. 114). Especially for children, life chances are tightly linked to the social structure of their development, and early differences in status and quality of life lead to greater inequality within cohorts (Ferraro & Shippee, 2009).

Weber (1922/2001) also observed that these stratification processes are often more extreme when linked to racial and ethnic segregation. Race and ethnicity are major axes of stratification, differentiating life chances, either for privilege or hindrance, and thereby differentiating stress exposure (Turner & Avison, 2003). In the United States, childhood experiences are quite different by race/ethnicity. For instance, Black, Hispanic, and Native American children are more likely than White or Asian American children to live in poor households (Lichter, Qian, & Crowley, 2006; Macartney, 2011), which, in turn, means that they are more likely to attend schools with a higher dropout rate and be exposed to more risk in their neighborhoods (e.g., violence, air pollution; Williams & Collins, 2001). Poor childhood health, another type of misfortune, also varies by race/ethnicity (Flores, Olson, & Tomany-Korman, 2005). Thus, there is ample evidence to expect that Black, White, and Hispanic children have distinct early-life experiences that may lead to long-term effects on physical health. Moreover, the childhood of

today's older Black and Hispanic Americans was generally harsher than that of more recent cohorts who grew up after the Civil Rights Movement.

Stratification processes likely mean that adult resources such as education, wealth, marital status, and a culture of health promotion are quite different by race/ethnicity, which, in turn, may influence one's ability to cope with childhood misfortune and its sequelae. Social stratification is related to access to health care and norms of daily physical activity—and racial/ethnic subcultures add another layer of meaning for whether and how to access those resources. Distinct childhood exposures coupled with differential access to adult resources to address misfortune may result in relationships between childhood disadvantage and functional health that are specific to race/ethnicity.

This study, therefore, poses two main research questions.

1. Is childhood misfortune associated with lower HGS in later life? Based on prior research on the early antecedents of adult health, we expect that childhood misfortune will be associated with poorer health in later life, specifically (a) lower initial levels of adult HGS and (b) more rapid declines in HGS (Starr & Deary, 2011).
2. Are there racial/ethnic differences in the relationship between childhood misfortune and HGS? Based on prior research documenting more misfortune among racial/ethnic groups as well as differential adult status and resources, we anticipate that (a) Hispanic and Black Americans will have lower HGS than White Americans and (b) the effect of childhood misfortune on HGS will be stronger for Hispanic and Black Americans than for White Americans (Haas et al., 2012). These anticipated relationships (a and b) require testing for main effects and interaction effects, respectively.

# Method

Analyses used panel data from the 2004–2012 waves of the Health and Retirement Study (HRS, 2014). Multistage stratified panel data on individuals aged 50 and older are collected, with oversamples of Black adults, Hispanic adults, and Floridians. **Supplementary Material** contains a detailed description of the HRS.

## Handgrip Strength

After a pilot sample in 2004, the HRS began collecting physical performance measures in 2006. Sample design specifies HGS measurement for a random half of the sample every 4 years. Therefore, one half of the sample was measured in 2006 and again in 2010; the other half was measured in 2008 and 2012. The 2006 and 2008 measurements were designated Time 1 (T1); the 2010 and 2012 measurements were Time 2 (T2). Longitudinal analyses are important to the study of the early origins of adult health to examine if potential effects are exhausted at the baseline HRS measurement or continue as people grow older (i.e., change over the study).

HGS measurements are recorded in kilograms for participants without medical issues (e.g., swelling) in both hands during the 6 months prior to the survey (Crimmins et al., 2008). A

Smedley spring-type dynamometer was fit to the respondent to take two measurements on each hand; HGS for each survey occasion was the average of four measurements.

## Childhood Misfortune Variables

We identified 27 dichotomous indicators of childhood misfortune; each represents a condition experienced before age 18 (1, experienced misfortune). Based on theory, confirmatory factor analyses, and prior literature (Felitti et al., 1998; Morton, Mustillo, & Ferraro, 2014), indicators were organized into five domains: infectious disease, chronic disease, impairment, SES, and risky parental behavior. The final domains were constructed as a count of indicators for each domain. **Supplementary Material** provides specific information on the indicators used in each domain. To examine the threshold effect of having at least two misfortunes compared with one, each count was top coded at 2, resulting in three categories of misfortune per domain: 0, 1, and 2+. Distributions of raw counts for each domain showed that in general few responses were changed by this top-coding scheme. We performed sensitivity analyses comparing this coding scheme with a binary variable for each domain (1, if any misfortune experienced). The same trends were seen using dichotomous domains, but were driven by the influence of having two or more misfortunes, revealing the utility of three categories. This decision also emphasizes the concept of accumulated misfortune, a central tenet of cumulative inequality theory.

## Covariates

Given that race and ethnicity are focal variables, all models include three dichotomous and mutually exclusive categories: non-Hispanic White Americans (reference group; hereafter White Americans), non-Hispanic Black Americans (hereafter Black Americans), and Hispanic Americans (including 26 respondents reporting Black and Hispanic). Preliminary analyses examined binary variables to differentiate Hispanics of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban descent, but there was no evidence that the conclusions varied across the groups.

Intermediate variables on the pathway relating childhood misfortune and HGS were taken from the baseline (2004) wave of the HRS and included wealth, educational attainment, marital status, depressive symptoms, physical activity, smoking status, body mass index, and chronic conditions. See **Supplementary Material** for detailed methodology on the measurement of these covariates.

Whereas HGS is dependent on age, we included age at the time of HGS measurement and an indicator variable for each time period to adjust for the staggered measurement within each (2006 or 2008; 2010 or 2012). Because the relationship between age and HGS may not be linear, we also included a squared term for age.

We identified potential confounding and intermediate variables on the relationship between childhood misfortune and HGS. To control for possible confounding variables, models were sex stratified and adjusted for immigration status (1, if born outside United States).

## Analytic Design

After excluding participants who were deceased, age ineligible, or had validity issues (i.e., proxy response) in 2004, the sample size was 13,921. Regression analyses use individuals with complete HGS measurements at the time period analyzed, and descriptive statistics are presented for individuals included in regression models.

Descriptive statistics for HGS and childhood misfortune are stratified by race/ethnicity and sex (six groups) in Table 1; parallel information for all variables is presented in **Supplementary Tables S1 and S2**. Within gender, we performed analysis of variance or $\chi^2$ tests for race/ethnic differences in variables (Table 1; **Supplementary Tables S1 and S2**) and estimated regression models using ordinary least squares (OLS) analyses in Stata 14. Analyses used the HRS physical measure weights corresponding to the time period when the respondent was measured to adjust for differential selection and nonresponse to physical measures.

**Table 1.** Descriptive Statistics From the Health and Retirement Study, 2004–2012

| Variable | White men | Black men | Hispanic men | White women | Black women | Hispanic women |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HGS, Time 1 (kg) | *37.71* [a] *(9.19)*[b] | *37.25 (9.67)* | *34.92 (8.63)* | *22.13 (5.82)* | *24.09 (6.27)* | *20.78 (5.55)* |
| HGS, Time 2 (kg) | *35.41 (9.13)* | *35.81 (8.54)* | *32.55 (8.35)* | *21.20 (5.69)* | *23.30 (5.85)* | *19.41 (5.67)* |
| Childhood misfortune[c] | | | | | | |
| Infectious disease (= 1) | *0.13* | *0.16* | *0.23* | *0.12* | *0.18* | *0.25* |
| Infectious disease (= 2+) | *0.80* | *0.70* | *0.49* | *0.83* | *0.73* | *0.58* |
| Chronic disease (= 1) | 0.21 | 0.17 | 0.24 | *0.22* | *0.16* | *0.17* |
| Chronic disease (= 2+) | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.11 |
| Impairment (= 1) | *0.19* | *0.16* | *0.11* | *0.15* | *0.13* | *0.09* |
| Impairment (= 2+) | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| SES (= 1) | *0.21* | *0.18* | *0.13* | *0.20* | *0.21* | *0.15* |
| SES (= 2+) | *0.55* | *0.68* | *0.76* | *0.59* | *0.65* | *0.76* |
| Parental behavior (= 1) | *0.59* | *0.51* | *0.57* | *0.55* | *0.47* | *0.51* |
| Parental behavior (= 2+) | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.11 | *0.16* | *0.08* | *0.09* |
| Number of cases (Time 1) | 3,713 | 438 | 308 | 5,046 | 855 | 502 |

*Note:* ANOVA = analysis of variance; HGS = handgrip strength; SES = socioeconomic status. Italics indicate significant ANOVA or $\chi^2$ tests between Black, White, and Hispanic Americans for each sex.

[a]Mean. [b]Standard deviations are reported in parentheses. [c]Proportion with 0 childhood misfortune not shown (total adds to 1 for each misfortune).

We estimated three regression models per gender and time period. T1 (baseline) and T2 (residualized change) models were estimated using the two full sets of measurement. In the change model, HGS, T2 was regressed on HGS, T1 to study change over time (longitudinally).

Model 1 contains indicators of race/ethnicity, immigration status, linear and quadratic age terms (centered on average age), and an indicator of year of measurement within time period. Model 2 adds childhood misfortune indicators. Model 3 adds adult factors to examine their potential intermediate effects. Finally, product terms of childhood misfortune by race/ethnicity were tested in Model 3 to address our second research question. Twenty models, each with four product terms, were estimated to test for interactions at T1 and T2 for both men and women. Testing 20 models, each with four product terms, requires adjusting the significance values to avoid

rejection by random chance. Due to the high number of related hypothesis tests being conducted, an adjusted significance cutoff (0.00256) was obtained using a step-down procedure to control for the family-wise error rate (Benjamini & Liu, 1999).

**Supplementary Material** also presents methods and results for additional analyses. These analyses tested corresponding male and female coefficients, estimated models using each domain of misfortune to independently predict HGS, and examined selection bias.

# Results

Significant differences in HGS by race/ethnicity for both men and women are noted in Table 1 by italicized means. For men and women, Hispanic Americans had the lowest HGS among the three groups at T1 and T2. Black women had the highest HGS over both time periods. White men had the highest HGS at T1, but Black men had slightly higher HGS at T2.

Among both men and women, White Americans were most likely to report childhood infectious disease, impairment, and risky parental behavior. For both men and women, Hispanic Americans were most likely of the three groups to report SES misfortune. Descriptive statistics for all variables used in analyses are presented separately for men and women in **Supplementary Tables S1 and S2**, respectively.

Table 2 presents unstandardized OLS regression coefficients for focal variables and $R^2$ values. Within each gender, we present three models per time period (T1 and T2): Model 1 establishes a baseline relationship between demographic characteristics and the outcome; Model 2 adds childhood misfortune; and Model 3 adds adult covariates. The same models but with all variables and standard errors are shown in online Supplementary Tables S3 and S4 for men and women, respectively.

**Table 2.** OLS Regression of Handgrip Strength in Men and Women

| Independent variables | Men, Time 1 (n = 4,459) | | | Men, Time 2 (n = 3,322) | | | Women, Time 1 (n = 6,403) | | | Women, Time 2 (n = 4,572) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M1[a] | M2 | M3[b] | M1 | M2 | M3 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M1 | M2 | M3 |
| Black | $-1.79^{‡}$ | $-1.53^{*}$ | $-0.42$ | $0.25$ | $0.39$ | $0.79$ | $0.62$ | $0.57$ | $1.25^{†}$ | $0.38$ | $0.40$ | $0.50^{*}$ |
| Hispanic | $-3.98^{†}$ | $-3.61^{†}$ | $-3.28^{†}$ | $-2.40^{†}$ | $-2.27^{†}$ | $-1.92^{†}$ | $-2.66^{†}$ | $-2.70^{†}$ | $-1.89^{†}$ | $-0.67^{*}$ | $-0.70^{*}$ | $-0.70^{*}$ |
| Immigrant | $-1.81^{‡}$ | $-1.55^{*}$ | $-1.88^{‡}$ | $0.53$ | $0.68$ | $0.51$ | $-0.15$ | $-0.16$ | $-0.15$ | $-0.18$ | $-0.15$ | $-0.18$ |
| Age | $-0.52^{†}$ | $-0.51^{†}$ | $-0.46^{†}$ | $-0.22^{†}$ | $-0.21^{†}$ | $-0.22^{†}$ | $-0.31^{†}$ | $-0.31^{†}$ | $-0.28^{†}$ | $-0.14^{†}$ | $-0.14^{†}$ | $-0.14^{†}$ |
| Age$^2$ | $-0.01^{‡}$ | $-0.01^{‡}$ | $-0.00^{*}$ | $-0.00$ | $-0.00^{*}$ | $-0.00$ | $-0.00^{*}$ | $-0.00^{*}$ | $-0.00$ | $-0.00$ | $-0.00$ | $-0.00^{*}$ |
| HGS, Time 1 | | | | $0.69^{†}$ | $0.69^{†}$ | $0.67^{†}$ | | | | $0.68^{†}$ | $0.67^{†}$ | $0.67^{†}$ |
| Infectious disease (= 1) | | $0.86$ | $0.62$ | | $-0.18$ | $-0.40$ | | $0.17$ | $-0.09$ | | $-0.27$ | $-0.30$ |
| Infectious disease (= 2+) | | $1.49^{*}$ | $1.06$ | | $0.47$ | $0.25$ | | $0.22$ | $-0.04$ | | $-0.12$ | $-0.14$ |
| Chronic disease (= 1) | | $-0.53$ | $-0.48$ | | $-0.13$ | $-0.08$ | | $-0.23$ | $-0.12$ | | $-0.17$ | $-0.14$ |
| Chronic disease (= 2+) | | $-1.62^{*}$ | $-1.24$ | | $0.33$ | $0.34$ | | $-0.57^{‡}$ | $-0.27$ | | $-0.40$ | $-0.35$ |
| Impairment (= 1) | | $-0.41$ | $-0.09$ | | $-0.71^{*}$ | $-0.60^{*}$ | | $-0.26$ | $-0.19$ | | $0.04$ | $0.05$ |
| Impairment (= 2+) | | $-1.27$ | $-0.40$ | | $-0.21$ | $0.21$ | | $-0.65$ | $-0.25$ | | $-0.77$ | $-0.68$ |
| SES (= 1) | | $-0.39$ | $-0.19$ | | $-0.50$ | $-0.30$ | | $0.08$ | $0.41$ | | $-0.08$ | $-0.02$ |
| SES (= 2+) | | $-0.83^{*}$ | $-0.38$ | | $-0.62^{*}$ | $-0.28$ | | $0.09$ | $0.63^{‡}$ | | $-0.06$ | $0.03$ |
| Parental behavior (= 1) | | $0.07$ | $0.27$ | | $-0.08$ | $0.00$ | | $-0.05$ | $-0.07$ | | $0.11$ | $0.11$ |
| Parental behavior (= 2+) | | $0.50$ | $0.91^{*}$ | | $0.15$ | $0.36$ | | $-0.18$ | $-0.01$ | | $0.13$ | $0.14$ |
| Constant | $38.85^{†}$ | $38.34^{†}$ | $32.06^{†}$ | $9.17^{†}$ | $9.51^{†}$ | $8.95^{†}$ | $22.86^{†}$ | $22.82^{†}$ | $19.43^{†}$ | $6.08^{†}$ | $6.33^{†}$ | $6.64^{†}$ |
| $R^2$ | .28 | .29 | .34 | .64 | .64 | .65 | .28 | .28 | .31 | .64 | .64 | .65 |

*Note:* BMI = body mass index; HGS = handgrip strength; OLS = ordinary least squares; SES = socioeconomic status. Unstandardized regression coefficients are presented. Italicized coefficients indicate significantly different coefficients for men and women. Reference group for each of the five domains is no misfortune.

[a]M1 = Model 1; M2 = Model 2; M3 = Model 3. [b]M3 adjusts for education, wealth, BMI, former smoking status, current smoking status, physical activity, depressive symptoms, marital status, and chronic conditions.

$^{*}p < .05$; $^{‡}p < .01$; $^{†}p < .001$.

# Men

## Baseline models

Black and Hispanic men had significantly lower HGS than White men (Model 1 of Table 2 and Supplementary Table S3). Consistent with our hypotheses, Model 2 shows that HGS at T1 is associated with several indicators of childhood misfortune (2+ infectious diseases, 2+ chronic diseases, and 2+ SES disadvantages). However, differential exposure to childhood misfortune across race/ethnicity contributed little to race/ethnic disparities in HGS at T1. Specifically, adjusting for childhood misfortune in Model 2 explained just more than 14% of the Black-White difference and 9% of the Hispanic-White difference in HGS. In Model 3, we found that after adjusting for adult factors the Black-White difference was no longer significant ($p > .05$); 73% of the Black-White difference in Model 2 was due to adult resources and behaviors. By contrast, adjusting for adult resources and behaviors explained just 9% of the Hispanic-White difference in HGS. In Model 3, men who reported 2+ risky parental behaviors manifested higher HGS values.

## Change models

Hispanic men exhibited steeper declines in HGS than White men, but change in HGS did not differ between Black and White men (Model 1). Again consistent with our hypotheses, Model 2 shows that steeper declines in HGS are associated with multiple domains of childhood misfortune (1 impairment and 2+ SES disadvantages). Differential exposure to childhood misfortune across ethnicity, however, contributed little to the Hispanic disparity in HGS change over time. Adjusting for childhood misfortune in Model 2 explained just 5% of the Hispanic-White difference. In Model 3, we found that adjusting for adult resources and behaviors explained more than 15% of the Hispanic-White difference in changing HGS.

Wealth, physical activity, and the absence of depressive symptoms emerged as significant adult factors in both the baseline and change analyses in men.

# Women

## Baseline models

Hispanic women had significantly lower HGS than White women (Model 1 of Tables 2 and Supplementary Table S4). Distinct from men, Model 2 shows that only one type of childhood misfortune (2+ chronic diseases) predicted HGS at T1. Adjusting for childhood misfortune in Model 2 increased the Hispanic-White difference in HGS by 1.5%. In Model 3, adjusting for adult factors revealed that Black women had higher HGS than White women at T1 and that the adult resources and behaviors explained about 30% of the Hispanic-White difference in HGS. Model 3 also showed that women with 2+ indicators of low SES reported higher HGS values.

**Change models**

Hispanic women manifested steeper declines relative to White women (Model 1). In contrast to our expectations, none of the indicators of childhood misfortune were associated with change in HGS (Models 2 and 3). In Model 3, we found that adjusting for adult resources and behaviors did not explain the Hispanic-White difference in changing HGS. Indeed, $R^2$ values changed very little across the three models; initial HGS was strongly related to HGS change by T2. Parallel to Model 3 for T1, we note that HGS change among Black women was more favorable than for White women. Examination of residuals revealed that a higher percentage of Black women experienced an increase in HGS from T1 to T2, relative to White women (i.e., not just smaller declines).

Physical activity and fewer chronic conditions emerged as significant adult factors in both the baseline and change analyses in women.

## Tests of Interactions

To address our second research question, we specified a series of product terms to examine race/ethnic differences in vulnerability to childhood misfortune. This involved testing interactions between race/ethnic groups and each domain of childhood misfortune. Results from the 20 models are summarized in Table 3. The complete results showing slopes and standard errors are presented Supplementary Tables S5–S8.

**Table 3.** Comparison of $R^2$ Values for Models Testing Four Interaction Terms for Each Domain[a]

| Model | CM domain | Base $R^2$ | Interaction $R^2$ | $p$ Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | Infectious disease | .3379 | .3392 | .3637 |
| | Chronic disease | .3379 | .3385 | .6061 |
| Time 1 | Impairment | .3379 | .3385 | .4308 |
| | SES | .3379 | .3386 | .3579 |
| | Parental behavior | .3379 | .3390 | .1641 |
| Male | Infectious disease | .6518 | .6522 | .1642 |
| | Chronic disease | .6518 | .6523 | .3275 |
| Time 2 | Impairment | .6518 | .6519 | .2593 |
| | SES | .6518 | .6521 | .4846 |
| | Parental behavior | .6518 | .6520 | .6617 |
| Female | Infectious disease | .3148 | .3155 | .1940 |
| | Chronic disease | .3148 | .3156 | .2384 |
| Time 1 | Impairment | .3148 | .3153 | .6356 |
| | SES | .3148 | .3154 | .6205 |
| | Parental behavior | .3148 | .3156 | .0573 |
| Female | Infectious disease | .6453 | .6455 | .7395 |
| | Chronic disease | .6453 | .6457 | .1701 |
| Time 2 | Impairment | .6453 | .6456 | .0204 |
| | SES | .6453 | .6454 | .9617 |
| | Parental behavior | .6453 | .6456 | .6461 |

*Note:* CM = childhood misfortune; SES = socioeconomic status.

[a]Four product terms were tested for each model (Black × CM1, Black × CM2+, Hispanic × CM1, Hispanic × CM2+). Base $R^2$ is the corrected $R^2$ from the fully adjusted M3. Each group of four product term interactions was entered into the adjusted model and tested for joint significance by assessing whether the set of interactions significantly increased the $R^2$ compared with the base model $R^2$. Due to the high number of related hypothesis tests being conducted, an adjusted significance cutoff (0.00256) was obtained using a step-down procedure to control for the family-wise error rate (Benjamini & Liu, 1999; multproc command in Stata 14 using method=liu1). None of the product term interaction groups were significant.

As shown in Table 3, there is no evidence that the effect of any domain of childhood misfortune differentially affects the HGS of Black, Hispanic, and White Americans.

# Discussion

The study addressed two main research questions. The first probed whether childhood misfortune is associated with lower HGS in later life. Findings revealed that certain domains of misfortune are associated with HGS in adulthood, but relationships are distinct for men and women—and not always in the expected direction. Consistent with other studies, we anticipated that early misfortune would take a toll on the aging process and result in lower HGS (Birnie et al., 2011; Sayer et al., 2004). This was true for baseline HGS in men and women: Two or more chronic diseases in childhood predicted lower HGS, but the relationships were attenuated after adjustment for adult resources. A surprising conclusion was that some domains predicted better baseline HGS, and the findings were distinct for men and women.

In men, 2+ infectious diseases during childhood actually were predictive of better adult HGS before adjustment, suggestive of an acquired immunity thesis (Preston, Hill, & Drevenstedt, 1998). Few studies report that infectious diseases during childhood are associated with adult health (Blackwell et al., 2001); however, this study provides evidence that multiple infectious diseases during men's childhood are associated with better HGS. Having at least two of these infectious diseases (measles, mumps, and chickenpox) could be seen as an accumulated immune advantage at the time (vaccines for these diseases were not available until the late 20th century). After adjustment, multiple risky parental behaviors also predicted better HGS among men at baseline, suggesting a compensatory mechanism (Seery et al., 2010).

In contrast to men, SES misfortune (e.g., financial strain when growing up) predicted better HGS among Black, White, and Hispanic women after adjustment for adult factors. When comparing these results with prior studies, two points are noteworthy. First, it could be that the distinct relationships reported herein for men and women may not be discernible in studies combining the sexes. Second, the present study used a more comprehensive measure of childhood SES and uncovered the importance of accumulated misfortune on women's HGS. One might speculate that financially disadvantaged families were more likely to call on daughters to help with household tasks involving manual dexterity, but there are no data in the HRS to examine this thesis.

The analyses revealed the influence of early disadvantage on baseline HGS, but any additional declines over the study period appear to be largely contingent on adult resources and lifestyle. After accounting for adult factors, experiencing one impairment was the only type of childhood misfortune that predicted HGS declines in men. This finding was surprising; however, the same association was seen in the supplementary simple regressions.

Thus, rather than concluding that childhood misfortune leaves an amplifying imprint on lifelong health and function, this study provides evidence of early influence but also that such influence may operate through adult factors. Therefore, interventions and factors of adult health, SES, or psychosocial status may be able to constrain negative consequences associated with early insults. There is plasticity involved in the influence of the types of early misfortune considered; some types of presumed disadvantage (low SES) may lead to compensatory mechanisms to ward off unfavorable health outcomes (Elder & Liker, 1982). It is tempting to think of accumulated disadvantage as universally detrimental, but that is an oversimplification. This study revealed

multiple exceptions to the presumption that early misfortune leads to more health problems and as such, investigators should anticipate a wider range of outcomes.

Future research on the early origins of adult health should also give more attention to formally analyzing adult factors as mediators. The present study identified that some adult factors were associated with better HGS in both the T1 and T2 analyses. Physical activity was the only adult factor that was associated with better HGS for both men and women at baseline and over time. Although people may regularly engage in physical effort to "stay active"—whether via walking, golf, or dancing—HGS may be a health dividend realized through a wide range of activities.

The second research question addressed whether the relationship between childhood misfortune and HGS varied across racial/ethnic groups. We began by estimating main effects for the influence of race/ethnicity on HGS, then turned to testing interaction effects. After estimating 20 models with multiple product terms to test for interactions, there was no evidence that the relationship between childhood misfortune and HGS varied by race/ethnicity. We anticipated that Black and Hispanic Americans would suffer more misfortune during childhood, which was the case for SES disadvantage, but it did not translate into distinctive effects on HGS due to early misfortune. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the main-effect differences by race/ethnicity is notable.

Consistent with prior research, this study revealed disparities in HGS among White, Black, and Hispanic Americans, even after adjusting for adult factors. As expected, Hispanic Americans manifested lower baseline HGS than their White American counterparts, but the present study also observed steeper declines in HGS for Hispanic Americans over the observational period. Although consistent with prior research, these observed disparities are surprising given that the average age of Hispanic Americans in this sample is younger than either White or Black Americans. When interpreting these results, it is critical to note that the mean educational attainment for Hispanic Americans was at least 2 years less than White or Black Americans. We interpret this educational disparity as likely resulting in fewer resources such as health insurance coverage, access to quality medical care, and other amenities that enhance healthful aging. The results also show that immigrant men also have lower HGS, again likely related to SES resources prior to immigration.

The data also showed racial differences between Black and White Americans. Lower baseline HGS was observed in Black men, but relative to White women, Black women had better initial levels of HGS and slower declines in HGS over time. The baseline finding for women was somewhat surprising given the extensive literature documenting higher levels of disability in the Black population (Haas et al., 2012; Hirsch et al., 2006; Warner & Brown, 2011). When examining potential explanations for the slower declines in HGS, supplementary analyses revealed that a higher percentage of Black women actually experienced an increase in HGS from T1 to T2, relative to White women.

Three limitations of the current study are notable. First, retrospective reports of childhood may contain bias. The HRS avoided types of questions known to be highly unreliable (e.g., asking for the date or age of an experience), and we excluded respondents with poor memory. Nevertheless, recall bias is possible. A review of validity studies showed that retrospective reports in adulthood

of adverse childhood events generally have a higher rate of false negatives than false positives (Hardt & Rutter, 2004). False negatives would likely lead to an underestimation of the relationship between early misfortune and HGS; thus, caution is warranted when interpreting the results. Gender bias in reporting of childhood misfortune is also possible.

Second, whereas this study uses respondents at least 51 years of age, the findings should be interpreted in light of selective survival. Although we took steps to reduce selective sample survival bias (adjustments for sample weights and mortality), there could be population survivorship bias that we were unable to adjust for in our analyses. Given our findings, this may apply particularly to Black Americans and the oldest members of our sample (Markides & Machalek, 1984). Adults who experienced the most childhood misfortune, along with higher risk of premature mortality, may not survive to be eligible for the HRS (Brown et al., 2009).

Third, although we examined potential differences among Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Rican respondents, the relatively small numbers of the latter two categories did not allow for detailed sex-stratified analyses.

Despite the limitations, the current study contributes to the literature regarding childhood misfortune and adult health. Using a longitudinal approach enabled investigation of the influence of childhood misfortune and race/ethnicity on both baseline and change in HGS. These findings reveal the long-term influence of early insults on adult functioning and the plasticity involved. There was little evidence that childhood misfortune resulted in late-onset declines in HGS; rather, its influence is likely to be earlier in the life course.

Racial and ethnic differences, by contrast, influenced not only initial HGS but also change in HGS. Hispanic American men and women were notably disadvantaged, despite accounting for childhood misfortune and adult factors. Hispanic Americans manifested lower baseline HGS and steeper declines in HGS over time. Compared with their White counterparts, Black women manifested higher baseline HGS and Black men showed lower baseline HGS. Additionally, Black women have slower age-related declines than White women. This finding was surprising given that previous studies generally show Black Americans, namely women, to be disadvantaged on other measurements of muscle strength such as knee extension (Goodpaster et al., 2006). Thus, future research is needed to probe racial and ethnic differences in upper- and lower-body strength, especially among women.

Understanding the properties of a simple, objective, and cost-effective performance measure such as HGS is important to aid its utility in epidemiologic and clinical settings. HGS is a useful marker of frailty (Hirsch et al., 2006; Syddall et al., 2003) and also predicts mortality (Gale et al., 2007), speed of aging (Sanderson & Scherbov, 2014), and cognitive decline (Alfaro-Acha et al., 2007). With better understanding of pathways influencing HGS as well as its racial/ethnic disparities, clinicians can use HGS to document function before and after interventions or identify patients at risk. Given our findings that modest forms of childhood misfortune are associated with better baseline HGS, research is needed to investigate pathways, especially compensatory mechanisms.

# Funding

# Supplementary Material

**Supplementary Materials follow the References.**

# Acknowledgments

# References

1. Alfaro-Acha A. Al Snih S. Raji M. A. Kuo Y. F. Markides K. S., & Ottenbacher K. J (2007). Handgrip strength and cognitive decline in older Mexican Americans. The Journals of Gerontology, Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences, 61, 859–865. doi:10.1093/gerona/61.8.859 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
2. Benjamini Y., & Liu W (1999). A step-down multiple hypotheses testing procedure that controls the false discovery rate under independence. Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference, 82, 163–170. doi:10.1016/s0378-3758(99)00040-3 [Google Scholar]
3. Birnie K. Cooper R. Martin R. M. Kuh D. Sayer A. A. Alvarado B. E., & Corley J (2011). Childhood socioeconomic position and objectively measured physical capability levels in adulthood: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PloS One, 6, e15564. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0015564 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
4. Blackwell D. L. Hayward M. D., & Crimmins E. M (2001). Does childhood health affect chronic morbidity in later life?Social Science and Medicine, 52, 1269–1284. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00230-6 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
5. Bowen M. E., & Gonzalez H. M (2010). Childhood socioeconomic position and disability in later life: Results of the Health and Retirement Study. American Journal of Public Health, 100(Suppl. 1), 197–203. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2009.160986 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

6.  Brown D. W. Anda R. F. Tiemeier H. Felitti V. J. Edwards V. J. Croft J. B., & Giles W. H (2009). Adverse childhood experiences and the risk of premature mortality. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 37, 389–396. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2009.06.021 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
7.  Crimmins E. Guyer H. Langa K. Ofstedal M. B. Wallace R., & Weir D (2008). Documentation of physical measures, anthropometrics and blood pressure in the Health and Retirement Study (HRS Documentation Report). Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan. [Google Scholar]
8.  Elder G. H. Jr., & Liker J. K (1982). Hard times in women's lives: Historical influences across forty years. American Journal of Sociology, 88, 241–269. doi:10.1086/227670 [Google Scholar]
9.  Felitti V. J., Anda R. F., Nordenberg D., Williamson D. F., Spitz A. M., Edwards V., & Marks J. S (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults. The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study. American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 14, 245–258. doi:10.1016/S0749-3797(98)00017-8 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
10. Ferraro K. F., & Farmer M. M (1999). Utility of health data from social surveys: Is there a gold standard for measuring morbidity?American Sociological Review, 64, 303–315. doi:10.2307/2657534 [Google Scholar]
11. Ferraro K. F., & Shippee T. P (2009). Aging and cumulative inequality: How does inequality get under the skin?The Gerontologist, 49, 333–343. doi:10.1093/geront/gnp034 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
12. Flores G. Olson L., & Tomany-Korman S. C (2005). Racial and ethnic disparities in early childhood health and health care. Pediatrics, 115, e183–e193. doi:10.1542/peds.2004-1474 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
13. Gale C. R. Martyn C. N. Cooper C., & Sayer A. A (2007). Grip strength, body composition, and mortality. International Journal of Epidemiology, 26, 228–235. doi:10.1093/ije/dyl224 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
14. Goodpaster B. H. Park S. W. Harris T. B. Kritchevsky S. B. Nevitt M. Schwartz A. V., & Newman A. B (2006). The loss of skeletal muscle strength, mass, and quality in older adults: The Health, Aging and Body Composition study. The Journals of Gerontology, Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences, 61, 1059–1064. doi:10.1093/gerona/61.10.1059 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
15. Haas S. A. Krueger P. M., & Rohlfsen L (2012). Race/ethnic and nativity disparities in later life physical performance: The role of health and socioeconomic status over the life course. The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 67, 238–248. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbr155 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
16. Hardt J., & Rutter M (2004). Validity of adult retrospective reports of adverse childhood experiences: Review of the evidence. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 45, 260–273. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00218.x [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
17. Health and Retirement Study (HRS) (2014). Public use dataset (Produced and distributed by the University of Michigan with funding from the National Institute on Aging, U01AG009740). Ann Arbor, MI: Author. [Google Scholar]
18. Hirsch C. Anderson M. L. Newman A. Kop W. Jackson S. Gottdiener J., & Fried L. P (2006). The association of race with frailty: The Cardiovascular Health Study. Annals of

Epidemiology, 16, 545–553. doi:10.1016/j.annepidem.2005.10.003 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

19. Lichter D. T. Qian Z., & Crowley M. L (2006). Race and poverty: Divergent fortunes of America's children?Focus, 24, 8–16. [Google Scholar]

20. Macartney S. (2011). Child poverty in the United States 2009 and 2010: Selected race groups and Hispanic origin (ACSBR/10-05). U.S. Bureau of the Census; Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/acsbr10-05.pdf [Google Scholar]

21. Markides K. S., & Machalek R (1984). Selective survival, aging, and society. Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics, 3, 207–222. doi:10.1016/0167-4943(84)90022-0 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

22. Morton P. M. Mustillo S. A., & Ferraro K. F (2014). Does childhood misfortune raise the risk of acute myocardial infarction in adulthood?Social Science & Medicine, 104, 133–141. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.11.026 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

23. Morton P. M. Schafer M. H., & Ferraro K. F (2012). Does childhood misfortune increase cancer risk in adulthood?Journal of Aging and Health, 24, 948–984. doi:10.1177/0898264312449184 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

24. O'Rand A. M., & Hamil-Luker J (2005). Processes of cumulative adversity: Childhood disadvantage and increased risk of heart attack across the life course. The Journal of Gerontology, Series B: Social Sciences, 60(Special Issue 2), 117–124. doi:10.1093/geronb/60.Special_Issue_2.S117 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

25. Preston S. H. Hill M. E., & Drevenstedt G. L (1998). Childhood conditions that predict survival to advanced ages among African-Americans. Social Science and Medicine, 47, 1231–1246. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(98)00180-4 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

26. Sanderson W. C., & Scherbov S (2014). Measuring the speed of aging across population subgroups. PLoS One, 9, e96289. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0096289 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

27. Sayer A. A. Syddall H. E. Gilbody H. J. Dennison E. M., & Cooper C (2004). Does sarcopenia originate in early life? Findings from the Hertfordshire cohort study. The Journal of Gerontology, Series A: Medical Sciences, 59, 930–934. doi:10.1093/gerona/59.9.M930 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

28. Seery M. D. Holman E. A., & Silver R. C (2010). Whatever does not kill us: Cumulative lifetime adversity, vulnerability, and resilience. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99, 1025–1041. doi:10.1037/a0021344 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

29. Starr J. M., & Deary I. J (2011). Socio-economic position predicts grip strength and its decline between 79 and 87 years: The Lothian Birth Cohort 1921. Age and Ageing, 40, 749–752. doi:10.1093/ageing/afr070 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

30. Syddall H. Cooper C. Martin F. Briggs R., & Sayer A. A (2003). Is grip strength a useful single marker of frailty?Age & Ageing, 32, 650–656. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

31. Turner R. J., & Avison W. R (2003). Status variations in stress exposure: Implications for the interpretation of research on race, socioeconomic status, and gender. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 44, 488–505. doi:10.2307/1519795 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

32. Warner D. F., & Brown T. H (2011). Understanding how race/ethnicity and gender define age-trajectories of disability: An intersectionality approach. Social Science & Medicine,

72, 1236–1248. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.02.034 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

33. Weber M. (1978). Economy and society (Vol. 2). Translated and edited by Roth G. & Wittich C. Berkeley: University of California Press. [Google Scholar]

34. Weber M. (1922/2001). Class, status, party. In Grusky D. B. (Ed.), Social stratification: Class, race, and gender in sociological perspective (pp. 113–122). Boulder, CO: Westview. [Google Scholar]

35. Williams D. R., & Collins C (2001). Racial residential segregation: A fundamental cause of racial disparities in health. Public Health Reports, 116, 404–416. doi:10.1016/S0033-3549(04)50068-7 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

---

Childhood Misfortune and Handgrip Strength Among Black, White, and Hispanic Americans

**Research Design, Methods, and Supplementary Analyses**

*Health and Retirement Study (HRS)*

Panel data from the 2004-2012 waves of the (HRS) were used (Health and Retirement Study, 2014). The HRS is sponsored by the National Institute on Aging and conducted by the University of Michigan. Multistage stratified panel data on individuals over 50 years of age are collected, with oversamples of Black adults, Hispanic adults, and Floridians. By 2004, the HRS was comprised of five cohorts (e.g., War Babies Cohort, Early Baby Boomers Cohort). Core interviews take place every two years via in-person interviews, telephone calls, self-administered mail-back questionnaires, and Internet surveys. The core survey includes data on health, health services, economic status, and family structure. The HRS also collects data on physical measures, genetics, and psychosocial factors. Beginning in 1994, response rates for all waves have been at least 85%.

*Childhood Misfortune Variables*

The five domains of misfortune were composed of twenty-seven dichotomous indicators. Infectious disease included measles, mumps, and chicken pox (3 indicators). Chronic disease was comprised of 11 indicators: asthma, diabetes, respiratory disorder, allergies, heart trouble, ear problems, seizures, migraines, stomach problems, high blood pressure, and self-rated health. Childhood impairment included childhood disability, head injury, speech impairment, vision impairment, and learning problems (5 indicators). SES was also built with 5 indicators of paternal education, maternal education, whether or not the child's family ever moved due to finances before 16, paternal occupation, and perception of family SES before 16. Finally, risky parental behavior included whether parent/guardian smoked, parent substance abuse, and parent physical abuse (3 indicators).

*Adult Covariates*

Adult SES was represented by wealth (cube root transformation of sum of wealth less total debt) and educational attainment (years of schooling). Adult psychosocial factors included marital status (1, married)

1

and depressive symptoms (Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale). Physical activity (1, exercise at least once a week), smoking status (never, former, current smoker), body mass index (BMI; kg/m2), and a sum of seven comorbid chronic conditions were included to adjust for adult health and lifestyle. We also examined intermediate variables of occupation (manual, service, or professional work) and alcohol use (drinks per week), but they were removed for parsimony after being non-significant in early analyses. Correlations between covariates were modest, the largest being between variables of education and wealth (r=0.36) and marital status and wealth (r=0.30).

*Supplementary Analyses*

Additional analyses were completed. First, corresponding male and female coefficients were tested using adjusted Wald tests for each model and time period using Holm's adjustment for multiple comparisons. These tests determine whether the associations of independent variables and HGS are significantly different between men and women (H0: $\beta_{women} = \beta_{men}$). Significant gender differences are indicated by italicized coefficients in Tables S3 and S4. Coefficients differed by gender for Black Americans at T1 (Models 1 and 2) and for Hispanic Americans at T2 (Models 1 and 2). Over both time periods, the linear effect of age differed by gender. These effects were all negative and had greater magnitude in men than women.

We also estimated models using each domain of misfortune to independently predict HGS with age, age2, race/ethnicity, and immigration status. The findings confirmed the results presented herein.

Finally, given attrition over the study period, selection bias models were estimated using unique predictors of selective survival (Heckman, 1979). We estimated a probit model predicting survival until the 2012 interview using variables from 2004 and 2006 that are not in our substantive models (change in self-rated health, change in activities of daily living, onset of a memory related disease in the previous two years, change in the number of health conditions, hospital stay in the last two years, receiving home health care in the last two years, subjective probability of living to an age of 80 to 100, medical expenses, and difficulties with activities of daily living and instrumental activities of daily living). Variables known to predict survival were also included (age, race and ethnicity, BMI, smoking, wealth, and depression). We then used the results from

2

the probit model to create a variable to express mortality risk (lambda) based on the inverse Mills ratio. When added to T2, Model 3 in Table 2, the mortality lambda was nonsignificant, indicating parameter estimates were not biased by nonrandom mortality.

Childhood Misfortune and Handgrip Strength Among Black, White, and Hispanic Americans

**Table S1**. Descriptive Statistics for Men from the Health and Retirement Study (2004-2012)

| Variable | Range | Non-Hispanic White (n=3,713) | | Non-Hispanic Black (n=438) | | Hispanic (n=308) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| *Dependent Variables* | | | | | | | |
| Time 1 HGS (kg) | 0.50 – 74.75 | *37.71[a]* | 9.19 | *37.25* | 9.67 | *34.92* | 8.63 |
| Time 2 HGS (kg)[b] | 6.5 – 70.25 | *35.41* | 9.13 | *35.81* | 8.54 | *32.55* | 8.35 |
| | | | | | | | |
| *Demographics* | | | | | | | |
| Age (Time 1) | 52 – 97 | *69.14* | 9.46 | *66.76* | 8.75 | *65.85* | 8.52 |
| Age (Time 2)[c] | 56 – 99 | *72.18* | 8.95 | *69.79* | 8.24 | *69.71* | 8.19 |
| Immigrant | 0,1 | *0.05* | [d] | *0.07* | | *0.54* | |
| | | | | | | | |
| *Childhood Misfortune* | | | | | | | |
| Infectious Disease (= 0)[e] | 0,1 | *0.07* | | *0.14* | | *0.28* | |
| Infectious Disease (=1) | 0,1 | *0.13* | | *0.16* | | *0.23* | |
| Infectious Disease (=2+) | 0,1 | *0.80* | | *0.70* | | *0.49* | |
| Chronic Disease (=0)[e] | 0,1 | 0.70 | | 0.74 | | 0.69 | |
| Chronic Disease (=1) | 0,1 | 0.21 | | 0.17 | | 0.24 | |
| Chronic Disease (=2+) | 0,1 | 0.09 | | 0.09 | | 0.07 | |
| Impairment (=0)[e] | 0,1 | *0.77* | | *0.81* | | *0.87* | |
| Impairment (=1) | 0,1 | *0.19* | | *0.16* | | *0.11* | |
| Impairment (=2+) | 0,1 | 0.04 | | 0.03 | | 0.02 | |
| SES (=0)[e] | 0,1 | *0.24* | | *0.14* | | *0.11* | |
| SES (=1) | 0,1 | *0.21* | | *0.18* | | *0.13* | |
| SES (=2+) | 0,1 | *0.55* | | *0.68* | | *0.76* | |
| Parental Behavior (=0)[e] | 0,1 | *0.27* | | *0.38* | | *0.32* | |
| Parental Behavior (=1) | 0,1 | *0.59* | | *0.51* | | *0.57* | |
| Parental Behavior (=2+) | 0,1 | 0.14 | | 0.11 | | 0.11 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| *Adult Characteristics* | | | | | | | |
| Socioeconomic Status | | | | | | | |
| Education (years) | 0 – 17 | *13.54* | 2.70 | *12.15* | 3.00 | *10.12* | 4.31 |
| Wealth | -12.60 – 31.58 | *6.87* | 3.48 | *4.00* | 3.23 | *4.21* | 3.06 |
| Psychosocial Factors | | | | | | | |
| Depressive Symptoms | 0 – 8 | *0.93* | 1.55 | *1.42* | 1.85 | *1.39* | 1.85 |
| Married | 0,1 | *0.84* | | *0.68* | | *0.82* | |
| Health Factors | | | | | | | |
| BMI | 16.4 – 57.4 | *27.80* | 4.63 | *28.45* | 5.12 | *28.50* | 4.70 |
| Never Smoker [e] | 0,1 | 0.33 | | 0.31 | | 0.30 | |
| Former Smoker | 0,1 | *0.54* | | *0.46* | | *0.53* | |
| Current Smoker | 0,1 | *0.13* | | *0.23* | | *0.17* | |
| Physical Activity | 0,1 | *0.37* | | *0.26* | | *0.32* | |
| Chronic Conditions | 0 – 7 | *1.66* | 1.29 | *1.68* | 1.26 | *1.30* | 1.13 |

Notes: SD=standard deviation.

[a] Italicized coefficients indicate significant differences in means or proportions at the 0.05 level.

[b] N of cases = 2,801; 311; and 210 at Time 2 measurements due to attrition

[c] Centered around mean age of the sample (68.67 and 71.57 years at Time 1 and Time 2, respectively).

[d] SD of dichotomous variables omitted.

[e] Reference group.

4

**Table S2**. Descriptive Statistics for Women from the Health and Retirement Study (2004-2012)

| Variable | Range | Non-Hispanic White (n=5,046) | | Non-Hispanic Black (n=855) | | Hispanic (n=502) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| *Dependent Variables* | | | | | | | |
| Time 1 HGS (kg) | 0.38 – 45.38 | *22.13[a]* | 5.82 | *24.09* | 6.27 | *20.78* | 5.55 |
| Time 2 HGS (kg)[b] | 0.5 – 44.13 | *21.20* | 5.69 | *23.30* | 5.85 | *19.41* | 5.67 |
| | | | | | | | |
| *Demographics* | | | | | | | |
| Age (Time 1) | 52 – 100 | *69.31* | 9.69 | *66.91* | 9.02 | *66.55* | 9.00 |
| Age (Time 2)[c] | 56 – 100 | *72.13* | 8.87 | *69.90* | 8.20 | *69.90* | 8.57 |
| Immigrant | 0,1 | *0.05* | [d] | *0.05* | | *0.53* | |
| | | | | | | | |
| *Childhood Misfortune* | | | | | | | |
| Infectious Disease (= 0)[e] | 0,1 | *0.05* | | *0.09* | | *0.17* | |
| Infectious Disease (=1) | 0,1 | *0.12* | | *0.18* | | *0.25* | |
| Infectious Disease (=2+) | 0,1 | *0.83* | | *0.73* | | *0.58* | |
| Chronic Disease (=0)[e] | 0,1 | *0.65* | | *0.72* | | *0.72* | |
| Chronic Disease (=1) | 0,1 | *0.22* | | *0.16* | | *0.17* | |
| Chronic Disease  (=2+) | 0,1 | 0.13 | | 0.12 | | 0.11 | |
| Impairment (=0)[e] | 0,1 | *0.83* | | *0.85* | | *0.90* | |
| Impairment (=1) | 0,1 | *0.15* | | *0.13* | | *0.09* | |
| Impairment (=2+) | 0,1 | 0.02 | | 0.02 | | 0.01 | |
| SES (=0)[e] | 0,1 | *0.21* | | *0.14* | | *0.09* | |
| SES (=1) | 0,1 | *0.20* | | *0.21* | | *0.15* | |
| SES (=2+) | 0,1 | 0.59 | | 0.65 | | 0.76 | |
| Parental Behavior (=0)[e] | 0,1 | *0.29* | | *0.45* | | *0.40* | |
| Parental Behavior (=1) | 0,1 | *0.55* | | *0.47* | | *0.51* | |
| Parental Behavior (=2+) | 0,1 | *0.16* | | *0.08* | | *0.09* | |
| | | | | | | | |
| *Adult Characteristics* | | | | | | | |
| Socioeconomic Status | | | | | | | |
| Education (years) | 0 – 17 | *13.04* | 2.37 | *12.28* | 2.70 | *9.05* | 4.38 |
| Wealth | -8.20 – 31.57 | *6.40* | 3.41 | *3.27* | 2.68 | *3.69* | 2.89 |
| Psychosocial Factors | | | | | | | |
| Depressive Symptoms | 0-8 | *1.32* | 1.85 | *1.79* | 2.12 | *2.31* | 2.52 |
| Married | 0,1 | *0.64* | | *0.40* | | *0.60* | |
| Health Factors | | | | | | | |
| BMI | 9.6 – 61.3 | *27.05* | 5.74 | *30.47* | 6.66 | *28.90* | 5.93 |
| Never Smoker [e] | 0,1 | *0.51* | | *0.51* | | *0.60* | |
| Former Smoker | 0,1 | *0.36* | | *0.33* | | *0.29* | |
| Current Smoker | 0,1 | *0.13* | | *0.16* | | *0.11* | |
| Physical Activity | 0,1 | *0.29* | | *0.18* | | *0.20* | |
| Chronic Conditions | 0 – 7 | *1.62* | 1.19 | *1.92* | 1.21 | *1.53* | 1.18 |

Notes: SD=standard deviation.

[a] Italicized coefficients indicate significant differences in means or proportions at the 0.05 level.

[b] N of cases = 3,634; 595; and 343 at Time 2 measurements due to attrition

[c] Centered around mean age of the sample (68.77 and 71.67 years at Time 1 and Time 2, respectively).

[d] SD of dichotomous variables omitted.

[e] Reference group.

Childhood Misfortune and Handgrip Strength Among Black, White, and Hispanic Americans

**Table S3.** OLS Regression Analysis of Hand-Grip Strength in Men

| | Time 1 (n=4,459) | | | | | | Time 2 (n=3,322) | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 3 | | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 3 | |
| Independent Variables | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE |
| Black | -1.788** [a,b] | 0.532[c] | -1.526* | 0.548 | -0.418 | 0.494 | 0.252 | 0.377 | 0.394 | 0.381 | 0.786 | 0.410 |
| Hispanic | -3.981*** | 0.812 | -3.614*** | 0.788 | -3.281*** | 0.722 | -2.401*** | 0.476 | -2.274*** | 0.445 | -1.921*** | 0.470 |
| Immigrant | -1.810** | 0.650 | -1.548* | 0.642 | -1.880** | 0.622 | 0.528 | 0.400 | 0.680 | 0.400 | 0.506 | 0.396 |
| Age | -0.524*** | 0.015 | -0.508*** | 0.017 | -0.457*** | 0.021 | -0.216*** | 0.017 | -0.207*** | 0.018 | -0.219*** | 0.020 |
| Age$^2$ | -0.005** | 0.002 | -0.005** | 0.002 | -0.003* | 0.002 | -0.003 | 0.001 | -0.003* | 0.001 | -0.003 | 0.001 |
| Time 1 HGS | | | | | | | 0.687*** | 0.020 | 0.685*** | 0.020 | 0.667*** | 0.019 |
| Infectious Disease (=1)[d] | | | 0.859 | 0.771 | 0.623 | 0.741 | | | -0.178 | 0.393 | -0.401 | 0.397 |
| Infectious Disease (=2+) | | | 1.493* | 0.648 | 1.056 | 0.616 | | | 0.473 | 0.377 | 0.245 | 0.392 |
| Chronic Disease (=1)[d] | | | -0.532 | 0.452 | -0.476 | 0.420 | | | -0.133 | 0.227 | -0.076 | 0.225 |
| Chronic Disease (=2+) | | | -1.618* | 0.682 | -1.237 | 0.648 | | | 0.331 | 0.439 | 0.335 | 0.432 |
| Impairment (=1)[d] | | | -0.408 | 0.375 | -0.094 | 0.367 | | | -0.709* | 0.288 | -0.600* | 0.277 |
| Impairment (=2+) | | | -1.266 | 1.034 | -0.395 | 0.891 | | | -0.210 | 1.047 | 0.213 | 1.064 |
| SES (=1)[d] | | | -0.394 | 0.441 | -0.190 | 0.436 | | | -0.499 | 0.437 | -0.304 | 0.424 |
| SES (=2+) | | | -0.829* | 0.369 | -0.382 | 0.325 | | | -0.624* | 0.311 | -0.279 | 0.327 |
| Parental Behavior (=1)[d] | | | 0.074 | 0.357 | 0.266 | 0.324 | | | -0.083 | 0.268 | 0.003 | 0.265 |
| Parental Behavior (=2+) | | | 0.501 | 0.424 | 0.908* | 0.396 | | | 0.147 | 0.364 | 0.357 | 0.372 |
| Education | | | | | -0.059 | 0.065 | | | | | 0.067 | 0.052 |
| Wealth | | | | | 0.206*** | 0.043 | | | | | 0.094* | 0.038 |
| BMI | | | | | 0.209*** | 0.035 | | | | | 0.002 | 0.032 |
| Former Smoker[e] | | | | | 0.341 | 0.279 | | | | | 0.427 | 0.267 |
| Current Smoker[e] | | | | | -0.445 | 0.381 | | | | | -0.474 | 0.368 |
| Physical Activity | | | | | 1.317*** | 0.342 | | | | | 0.572* | 0.227 |
| Depressive Symptoms | | | | | -0.358** | 0.121 | | | | | -0.174* | 0.085 |
| Married | | | | | 1.162** | 0.440 | | | | | -0.508 | 0.355 |
| Chronic Conditions | | | | | -1.072*** | 0.136 | | | | | -0.235 | 0.128 |
| Constant | 38.847*** | 0.228 | 38.336 | 0.818 | 32.063*** | 1.697 | 9.165*** | 0.833 | 9.508*** | 0.867 | 8.952*** | 1.367 |
| R$^2$ | 0.2831 | | 0.2899 | | 0.3379 | | 0.6421 | | 0.6445 | | 0.6518 | |

Notes [a] Unstandardized coefficient. [b] Italicized coefficient denotes significant gender differences (p<0.05) compared to Table 3. [c] Standard error. [d] Reference group for each domain is no misfortune. [e] Reference group is never smoker. * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

**Table S4.** OLS Regression Analysis of Hand-Grip Strength in Women

| | Time 1 (n=6,403) | | | | | | Time 2 (n=4,572) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 3 | | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 3 | |
| Independent Variables | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE |
| Black | *0.616*[a,b] | 0.309[c] | *0.574* | 0.315 | 1.248*** | 0.277 | 0.383 | 0.212 | 0.402 | 0.211 | 0.502* | 0.230 |
| Hispanic | -2.655*** | 0.357 | -2.701*** | 0.361 | -1.889*** | 0.340 | *-0.669** | 0.313 | *-0.695** | 0.312 | -0.697* | 0.304 |
| Immigrant | -0.147 | 0.340 | -0.155 | 0.339 | -0.151 | 0.332 | -0.177 | 0.213 | -0.154 | 0.212 | -0.184 | 0.210 |
| Age | *-0.307*** | 0.008 | *-0.312*** | 0.009 | *-0.279*** | 0.009 | *-0.139*** | 0.008 | *-0.140*** | 0.008 | *-0.140*** | 0.009 |
| Age$^2$ | -0.002* | 0.001 | -0.002* | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001* | 0.001 |
| Time 1 HGS | | | | | | | 0.676*** | 0.015 | 0.674*** | 0.015 | 0.665*** | 0.015 |
| Infectious Disease (=1)[d] | | | 0.171 | 0.403 | -0.092 | 0.398 | | | -0.270 | 0.304 | -0.299 | 0.300 |
| Infectious Disease (=2+) | | | 0.221 | 0.321 | -0.042 | 0.329 | | | -0.119 | 0.266 | -0.137 | 0.260 |
| Chronic Disease (=1)[d] | | | -0.234 | 0.231 | -0.123 | 0.218 | | | -0.174 | 0.177 | -0.144 | 0.179 |
| Chronic Disease (=2+) | | | -0.566** | 0.212 | -0.269 | 0.226 | | | -0.404 | 0.241 | -0.348 | 0.237 |
| Impairment (=1)[d] | | | -0.259 | 0.212 | -0.193 | 0.214 | | | 0.043 | 0.180 | 0.048 | 0.173 |
| Impairment (=2+) | | | -0.649 | 0.742 | -0.253 | 0.745 | | | -0.774 | 0.474 | -0.676 | 0.485 |
| SES (=1)[d] | | | 0.075 | 0.219 | 0.414 | 0.229 | | | -0.081 | 0.234 | -0.020 | 0.227 |
| SES (=2+) | | | 0.091 | 0.194 | 0.634** | 0.206 | | | -0.060 | 0.209 | 0.030 | 0.201 |
| Parental Behavior (=1)[d] | | | -0.054 | 0.171 | -0.066 | 0.166 | | | 0.105 | 0.125 | 0.107 | 0.130 |
| Parental Behavior (=2+) | | | -0.180 | 0.230 | -0.016 | 0.245 | | | 0.126 | 0.181 | 0.143 | 0.180 |
| Education | | | | | 0.094** | 0.029 | | | | | -0.013 | 0.028 |
| Wealth | | | | | 0.111*** | 0.028 | | | | | 0.019 | 0.027 |
| BMI | | | | | *0.072*** | 0.016 | | | | | 0.006 | 0.012 |
| Former Smoker[e] | | | | | 0.076 | 0.177 | | | | | 0.115 | 0.129 |
| Current Smoker[e] | | | | | 0.285 | 0.250 | | | | | -0.332 | 0.231 |
| Physical Activity | | | | | 1.035*** | 0.182 | | | | | 0.307* | 0.134 |
| Depressive Symptoms | | | | | -0.198*** | 0.049 | | | | | -0.003 | 0.030 |
| Married | | | | | -0.009 | 0.161 | | | | | -0.207 | 0.119 |
| Chronic Conditions | | | | | *-0.534*** | 0.079 | | | | | -0.155* | 0.071 |
| Constant | 22.856*** | 0.144 | 22.819*** | 0.401 | 19.425*** | 0.658 | 6.076*** | 0.385 | 6.326*** | 0.537 | 6.641*** | 0.820 |
| R$^2$ | 0.2785 | | 0.2805 | | 0.3148 | | 0.6418 | | 0.6430 | | 0.6453 | |

Notes [a] Unstandardized coefficient. [b] Italicized coefficient denotes significant gender differences (p<0.05) compared to Table 3.  [c] Standard error.  [d] Reference group for each domain is no misfortune.  [e] Reference group is never smoker.  * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

**Table S5**: OLS Regression Analysis of Baseline HGS in Men Including Interaction Terms (n=4,459)

| Misfortune Interacted: | Infectious Disease | | Chronic Disease | | Impairment | | SES | | Parental Behavior | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Independent Variables | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE |
| Black | 0.059[a] | 1.759[b] | -0.239 | 0.696 | -0.265 | 0.585 | -2.344 | 1.179 | -1.678 | 0.855 |
| Hispanic | -3.186 | 1.366 | -3.425 | 0.948 | -3.349 | 0.810 | -2.633 | 1.211 | -3.585 | 0.987 |
| Immigrant | -1.850 | 0.600 | -1.867 | 0.623 | -1.874 | 0.654 | -1.863 | 0.615 | -1.857 | 0.618 |
| Age | -0.457 | 0.021 | -0.457 | 0.021 | -0.457 | 0.021 | -0.457 | 0.021 | -0.457 | 0.021 |
| $Age^2$ | -0.003 | 0.002 | -0.003 | 0.002 | -0.003 | 0.001 | -0.003 | 0.002 | -0.003 | 0.002 |
| *Childhood Misfortune[c]* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Infectious Disease (=1) | 1.036 | 0.838 | 0.637 | 0.746 | 0.602 | 0.743 | 0.588 | 0.735 | 0.582 | 0.734 |
| Infectious Disease (=2+) | 1.100 | 0.723 | 1.053 | 0.613 | 1.030 | 0.625 | 1.022 | 0.618 | 1.029 | 0.618 |
| Chronic Disease (=1) | -0.481 | 0.423 | -0.510 | 0.453 | -0.470 | 0.422 | -0.473 | 0.419 | -0.474 | 0.419 |
| Chronic Disease (=2+) | -1.188 | 0.646 | -1.109 | 0.712 | -1.244 | 0.652 | -1.234 | 0.650 | -1.238 | 0.649 |
| Impairment (=1) | -0.093 | 0.367 | -0.097 | 0.366 | -0.027 | 0.392 | -0.104 | 0.364 | -0.065 | 0.366 |
| Impairment (=2+) | -0.412 | 0.903 | -0.373 | 0.897 | -0.537 | 0.969 | -0.411 | 0.894 | -0.390 | 0.890 |
| SES (=1) | -0.190 | 0.436 | -0.188 | 0.436 | -0.198 | 0.434 | -0.294 | 0.449 | -0.206 | 0.434 |
| SES (=2+) | -0.384 | 0.330 | -0.375 | 0.324 | -0.384 | 0.325 | -0.480 | 0.350 | -0.391 | 0.326 |
| Parental Behavior (=1) | 0.271 | 0.323 | 0.272 | 0.323 | 0.259 | 0.325 | 0.257 | .0329 | 0.118 | 0.362 |
| Parental Behavior (=2+) | 0.929 | 0.396 | 0.903 | 0.399 | 0.900 | 0.392 | 0.907 | 0.399 | 0.587 | 0.436 |
| *Adult Covariates* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Education | -0.062 | 0.066 | -0.057 | 0.065 | -0.060 | 0.066 | -0.059 | 0.066 | -0.063 | 0.065 |
| Wealth | 0.208 | 0.043 | 0.207 | 0.043 | 0.208 | 0.044 | 0.204 | 0.043 | 0.205 | 0.043 |
| BMI | 0.207 | 0.035 | 0.211 | 0.035 | 0.209 | 0.035 | 0.208 | 0.035 | 0.209 | 0.035 |
| Former Smoker[d] | 0.319 | 0.279 | 0.330 | 0.278 | 0.344 | 0.279 | 0.331 | 0.278 | 0.329 | 0.280 |
| Current Smoker[d] | -0.461 | 0.380 | -0.441 | 0.384 | -0.450 | 0.375 | -0.439 | 0.388 | -0.477 | 0.387 |
| Physical Activity | 1.314 | 0.342 | 1.324 | 0.340 | 1.307 | 0.340 | 1.316 | 0.342 | 1.308 | 0.341 |
| Depressive Symptoms | -0.354 | 0.120 | -0.359 | 0.122 | -0.361 | 0.121 | -0.365 | 0.121 | -0.364 | 0.120 |
| Married | 1.173 | 0.439 | 1.156 | 0.441 | 1.152 | 0.443 | 1.135 | 0.439 | 1.180 | 0.444 |
| Chronic Conditions | -1.072 | 0.135 | -1.071 | 0.136 | -1.070 | 0.135 | -1.074 | 0.136 | -1.078 | 0.138 |
| *Interaction Terms[e]* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black*CM[f] (=1) | -3.543 | 2.348 | 0.328 | 1.957 | -1.639 | 1.459 | 2.535 | 1.436 | 1.458 | 1.171 |
| Hispanic*CM (=1) | -0.780 | 1.601 | 0.287 | 1.508 | 0.810 | 2.353 | -0.828 | 1.588 | 0.271 | 1.191 |
| Black*CM (=2+) | 0.121 | 1.828 | -2.857 | 2.247 | 2.750 | 2.208 | 2.318 | 1.229 | 3.909 | 1.490 |
| Hispanic*CM (=2+) | 0.057 | 1.567 | 1.606 | 1.978 | -1.625 | 2.644 | -0.728 | 1.375 | 0.861 | 2.052 |
| Constant | 32.025 | 1.743 | 31.972 | 1.713 | 32.100 | 1.695 | 32.237 | 1.697 | 32.286 | 1.678 |
| $R^2$ | 0.3392 | | 0.3385 | | 0.3385 | | 0.3386 | | 0.3390 | |

*Notes*: [a] Unstandardized coefficient. [b] Standard error. [c] Reference group is no misfortune. [d] Reference group is never smoker.
[e] The joint significance of the four product term interactions was assessed in each of the 5 models. Due to the high number of related hypothesis tests being conducted (20 total: 5 per gender and time period), the critical value for significance was adjusted to control for the family-wise error rate using a step-down procedure (Benjamini and Liu, 1999). None of the product-term groups contributed significantly to the model (adjusted significance cutoff: 0.00256). [f] CM – childhood misfortune.

**Table S6**: OLS Regression Analysis of Longitudinal HGS in Men Including Interaction Terms (n=3,322)

| Misfortune Interacted: | Infectious Disease | | Chronic Disease | | Impairment | | SES | | Parental Behavior | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Independent Variables | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE |
| Black | 0.485[a] | 0.784[b] | 0.566 | 0.380 | 0.915 | 0.446 | 0.083 | 1.146 | 0.926 | 0.624 |
| Hispanic | -0.416 | 0.849 | -1.583 | 0.559 | -1.771 | 0.530 | -1.582 | 1.166 | -1.778 | 0.813 |
| Immigrant | 0.507 | 0.403 | 0.477 | 0.379 | 0.478 | 0.393 | 0.518 | 0.400 | 0.478 | 0.391 |
| Age | -0.218 | 0.020 | -0.219 | 0.020 | -0.219 | 0.020 | -0.219 | 0.020 | -0.219 | 0.020 |
| $Age^2$ | -0.003 | 0.001 | -0.003 | 0.001 | -0.003 | 0.001 | -0.003 | 0.001 | -0.003 | 0.001 |
| Time 1 HGS | 0.667 | 0.019 | 0.668 | 0.019 | 0.667 | 0.019 | 0.667 | 0.019 | 0.668 | 0.019 |
| *Childhood Misfortune[c]* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Infectious Disease (=1) | -0.225 | 0.505 | -0.411 | 0.396 | -0.393 | 0.401 | -0.414 | 0.393 | -0.420 | 0.401 |
| Infectious Disease (=2+) | 0.502 | 0.480 | 0.230 | 0.389 | 0.245 | 0.393 | 0.231 | 0.387 | 0.226 | 0.391 |
| Chronic Disease (=1) | -0.085 | 0.225 | -0.065 | 0.249 | -0.071 | 0.226 | -0.072 | 0.226 | -0.069 | 0.226 |
| Chronic Disease (=2+) | 0.315 | 0.428 | 0.337 | 0.469 | 0.343 | 0.438 | 0.348 | 0.431 | 0.345 | 0.433 |
| Impairment (=1) | -0.607 | 0.278 | -0.597 | 0.274 | -0.560 | 0.291 | -0.593 | 0.279 | -0.608 | 0.277 |
| Impairment (=2+) | 0.225 | 1.067 | 0.214 | 1.065 | 0.324 | 1.114 | 0.197 | 1.063 | 0.208 | 1.067 |
| SES (=1) | -0.313 | 0.425 | -0.302 | 0.423 | -0.308 | 0.415 | -0.386 | 0.438 | -0.294 | 0.423 |
| SES (=2+) | -0.283 | 0.327 | -0.275 | 0.328 | -0.280 | 0.327 | -0.253 | 0.356 | -0.272 | 0.327 |
| Parental Behavior (=1) | 0.008 | 0.267 | -0.006 | 0.265 | 0.003 | 0.265 | -0.001 | 0.265 | 0.007 | 0.283 |
| Parental Behavior (=2+) | 0.359 | 0.374 | 0.361 | 0.375 | 0.353 | 0.374 | 0.353 | 0.374 | 0.449 | 0.404 |
| *Adult Covariates* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Education | 0.069 | 0.052 | 0.067 | 0.052 | 0.067 | 0.052 | 0.068 | 0.052 | 0.071 | 0.053 |
| Wealth | 0.094 | 0.038 | 0.094 | 0.038 | 0.095 | 0.038 | 0.094 | 0.038 | 0.095 | 0.038 |
| BMI | 0.003 | 0.032 | 0.001 | 0.032 | 0.003 | 0.032 | 0.002 | 0.032 | 0.001 | 0.032 |
| Former Smoker[d] | 0.434 | 0.265 | 0.438 | 0.266 | 0.426 | 0.267 | 0.426 | 0.266 | 0.418 | 0.271 |
| Current Smoker[d] | -0.470 | 0.362 | -0.479 | 0.369 | -0.479 | 0.367 | -0.479 | 0.368 | -0.483 | 0.372 |
| Physical Activity | 0.573 | 0.227 | 0.568 | 0.228 | 0.571 | 0.227 | 0.580 | 0.226 | 0.570 | 0.228 |
| Depressive Symptoms | -0.177 | 0.082 | -0.173 | 0.084 | -0.174 | 0.085 | -0.170 | 0.084 | -0.171 | 0.085 |
| Married | -0.509 | 0.356 | -0.510 | 0.351 | -0.514 | 0.353 | -0.497 | 0.354 | -0.521 | 0.353 |
| Chronic Conditions | -0.235 | 0.129 | -0.237 | 0.128 | -0.233 | 0.129 | -0.232 | 0.128 | -0.231 | 0.129 |
| *Interaction Terms[e]* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black*CM[f] (=1) | 0.819 | 1.771 | 0.159 | 0.775 | -0.432 | 1.056 | 1.907 | 1.478 | -0.158 | 1.049 |
| Hispanic*CM (=1) | -1.110 | 1.269 | -0.472 | 1.196 | -0.732 | 1.194 | 0.196 | 1.519 | 0.308 | 1.128 |
| Black*CM (=2+) | 0.275 | 0.848 | 1.850 | 2.523 | -1.328 | 2.380 | 0.429 | 1.422 | -0.428 | 0.897 |
| Hispanic*CM (=2+) | -2.272 | 1.102 | -3.629 | 1.799 | -3.592 | 1.609 | -0.534 | 1.325 | -1.745 | 1.729 |
| Constant | 8.690 | 1.405 | 8.982 | 1.374 | 8.934 | 1.375 | 8.957 | 1.364 | 8.899 | 1.377 |
| $R^2$ | 0.6522 | | 0.6523 | | 0.6519 | | 0.6521 | | 0.6520 | |

*Notes*: [a] Unstandardized coefficient. [b] Standard error. [c] Reference group is no misfortune. [d] Reference group is never smoker.
[e] The joint significance of the four product term interactions was assessed in each of the 5 models. Due to the high number of related hypothesis tests being conducted (20 total: 5 per gender and time period), the critical value for significance was adjusted to control for the family-wise error rate using a step-down procedure (Benjamini and Liu, 1999). None of the product-term groups contributed significantly to the model (adjusted significance cutoff: 0.00256). [f] CM – Childhood misfortune.

**Table S7**: OLS Regression Analysis of Baseline HGS in Women Including Interaction Terms (n=6,403)

| Misfortune Interacted: | Infectious Disease | | Chronic Disease | | Impairment | | SES | | Parental Behavior | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Independent Variables | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE |
| Black | 1.635[a] | 0.712[b] | 1.354 | 0.322 | 1.260 | 0.294 | 0.583 | 0.824 | 1.305 | 0.468 |
| Hispanic | -0.383 | 0.790 | -2.175 | 0.318 | -1.956 | 0.334 | -2.109 | 0.836 | -2.586 | 0.421 |
| Immigrant | -0.138 | 0.334 | -0.158 | 0.334 | -0.147 | 0.332 | -0.135 | 0.336 | -0.161 | 0.325 |
| Age | -0.278 | 0.009 | -0.279 | 0.009 | -0.279 | 0.009 | -0.278 | 0.009 | -0.279 | 0.009 |
| Age$^2$ | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 |
| *Childhood Misfortune*[c] | | | | | | | | | | |
| Infectious Disease (=1) | 0.343 | 0.491 | -0.093 | 0.398 | -0.082 | 0.399 | -0.078 | 0.399 | -0.110 | 0.399 |
| Infectious Disease (=2+) | 0.300 | 0.415 | -0.058 | 0.330 | -0.033 | 0.329 | -0.034 | 0.331 | -0.057 | 0.330 |
| Chronic Disease (=1) | -0.126 | 0.218 | -0.090 | 0.217 | -0.127 | 0.219 | -0.128 | 0.219 | -0.125 | 0.218 |
| Chronic Disease (=2+) | -0.267 | 0.226 | -0.377 | 0.254 | -0.251 | 0.227 | -0.283 | 0.227 | -0.269 | 0.228 |
| Impairment (=1) | -0.196 | 0.213 | -0.182 | 0.216 | -0.259 | 0.229 | -0.185 | 0.215 | -0.196 | 0.215 |
| Impairment (=2+) | -0.231 | 0.744 | -0.252 | 0.741 | 0.030 | 0.835 | -0.240 | 0.747 | -0.264 | 0.747 |
| SES (=1) | 0.418 | 0.228 | 0.404 | 0.228 | 0.419 | 0.230 | 0.408 | 0.257 | 0.418 | 0.228 |
| SES (=2+) | 0.633 | 0.207 | 0.631 | 0.207 | 0.637 | 0.209 | 0.535 | 0.219 | 0.639 | 0.207 |
| Parental Behavior (=1) | -0.064 | 0.167 | -0.064 | 0.167 | -0.066 | 0.166 | -0.067 | 0.166 | -0.160 | 0.179 |
| Parental Behavior (=2+) | -0.009 | 0.245 | -0.016 | 0.248 | -0.014 | 0.245 | -0.017 | 0.243 | -0.014 | 0.257 |
| *Adult Covariates* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Education | 0.096 | 0.029 | 0.090 | 0.029 | 0.093 | 0.029 | 0.094 | 0.030 | 0.098 | 0.029 |
| Wealth | 0.111 | 0.028 | 0.113 | 0.028 | 0.112 | 0.028 | 0.110 | 0.028 | 0.110 | 0.028 |
| BMI | 0.071 | 0.016 | 0.072 | 0.015 | 0.072 | 0.015 | 0.072 | 0.015 | 0.073 | 0.015 |
| Former Smoker[d] | 0.079 | 0.177 | 0.074 | 0.176 | 0.079 | 0.177 | 0.072 | 0.175 | 0.070 | 0.174 |
| Current Smoker[d] | 0.286 | 0.251 | 0.284 | 0.249 | 0.288 | 0.251 | 0.288 | 0.248 | 0.289 | 0.249 |
| Physical Activity | 1.043 | 0.184 | 1.026 | 0.181 | 1.034 | 0.182 | 1.032 | 0.183 | 1.039 | 0.182 |
| Depressive Symptoms | -0.199 | 0.049 | -0.200 | 0.049 | -0.198 | 0.050 | -0.199 | 0.049 | -0.197 | 0.049 |
| Married | -0.009 | 0.162 | -0.000 | 0.162 | -0.016 | 0.161 | -0.014 | 0.161 | -0.006 | 0.161 |
| Chronic Conditions | -0.535 | 0.079 | 0.533 | 0.079 | -0.538 | 0.079 | -0.532 | 0.079 | -0.538 | 0.079 |
| *Interaction Terms*[e] | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black*CM[f] (=1) | -0.693 | 0.985 | -0678 | 0.720 | 0.429 | 0.648 | 0.124 | 0.866 | -0.019 | 0.484 |
| Hispanic*CM (=1) | -2.031 | 0.651 | 0.186 | 0.891 | 0.701 | 0.731 | 0.319 | 1.023 | 1.394 | 0.548 |
| Black*CM (=2+) | -0.333 | 0.825 | 0.015 | 0.633 | -2.479 | 2.243 | 1.078 | 0.891 | -0.581 | 1.039 |
| Hispanic*CM (=2+) | -1.654 | 0.651 | 1.863 | 0.820 | 0.365 | 1.784 | 0.240 | 0.853 | 0.207 | 0.976 |
| Constant | 19.064 | 0.697 | 19.493 | 0.657 | 19.437 | 0.657 | 19.469 | 0.665 | 19.417 | 0.658 |
| R$^2$ | 0.3155 | | 0.3156 | | 0.3153 | | 0.3154 | | 0.3156 | |

*Notes*: [a] Unstandardized coefficient. [b] Standard error. [c] Reference group is no misfortune. [d] Reference group is never smoker. [e] The joint significance of the four product term interactions was assessed in each of the 5 models. Due to the high number of related hypothesis tests being conducted (20 total: 5 per gender and time period), the critical value for significance was adjusted to control for the family-wise error rate using a step-down procedure (Benjamini and Liu, 1999). None of the product-term groups contributed significantly to the model (adjusted significance cutoff: 0.00256). [f] CM - Childhood misfortune.

**Table S8**: OLS Regression Analysis of Longitudinal HGS in Women Including Interaction Terms (n=4,572)

| Misfortune Interacted: | Infectious Disease | | Chronic Disease | | Impairment | | SES | | Parental Behavior | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Independent Variables | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE |
| Black | 1.121[a] | 0.671[b] | 0.437 | 0.245 | 0.527 | 0.233 | 0.489 | 0.581 | 0.446 | 0.343 |
| Hispanic | -0.779 | 0.814 | -0.841 | 0.325 | -0.730 | 0.332 | -0.129 | 0.821 | -1.044 | 0.480 |
| Immigrant | -0.177 | 0.207 | -0.179 | 0.211 | -0.177 | 0.214 | -0.196 | 0.212 | -0.154 | 0.218 |
| Age | -0.140 | 0.009 | -0.140 | 0.009 | -0.140 | 0.009 | -0.141 | 0.009 | -0.140 | 0.009 |
| $Age^2$ | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 |
| Time 1 HGS | 0.665 | 0.015 | 0.666 | 0.015 | 0.665 | 0.015 | 0.665 | 0.015 | 0.665 | 0.015 |
| *Childhood Misfortune[c]* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Infectious Disease (=1) | -0.163 | 0.351 | -0.287 | 0.303 | -0.294 | 0.302 | -0.310 | 0.297 | -0.323 | 0.301 |
| Infectious Disease (=2+) | -0.072 | 0.298 | -0.132 | 0.261 | -0.129 | 0.263 | -0.147 | 0.259 | -0.164 | 0.259 |
| Chronic Disease (=1) | -0.145 | 0.180 | -0.220 | 0.198 | -0.144 | 0.178 | -0.143 | 0.179 | -0.142 | 0.179 |
| Chronic Disease (=2+) | -0.348 | 0.236 | -0.327 | 0.263 | -0.333 | 0.236 | -0.348 | 0.237 | -0.344 | 0.236 |
| Impairment (=1) | 0.049 | 0.174 | 0.051 | 0.173 | 0.026 | 0.178 | 0.049 | 0.173 | 0.054 | 0.174 |
| Impairment (=2+) | -0.669 | 0.484 | -0.643 | 0.485 | -0.521 | 0.503 | -0.678 | 0.488 | -0.674 | 0.485 |
| SES (=1) | -0.021 | 0.228 | -0.024 | 0.228 | -0.020 | 0.226 | -0.027 | 0.243 | -0.022 | 0.226 |
| SES (=2+) | 0.023 | 0.202 | 0.028 | 0.200 | 0.036 | 0.200 | 0.051 | 0.218 | 0.028 | 0.200 |
| Parental Behavior (=1) | 0.104 | 0.130 | 0.104 | 0.129 | 0.101 | 0.131 | 0.109 | 0.130 | 0.080 | 0.144 |
| Parental Behavior (=2+) | 0.143 | 0.180 | 0.141 | 0.179 | 0.136 | 0.179 | 0.143 | 0.181 | 0.064 | 0.196 |
| *Adult Covariates* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Education | -0.014 | 0.028 | -0.012 | 0.028 | -0.013 | 0.028 | -0.014 | 0.028 | -0.013 | 0.028 |
| Wealth | 0.018 | 0.027 | 0.018 | 0.027 | 0.019 | 0.027 | 0.019 | 0.027 | 0.018 | 0.027 |
| BMI | 0.006 | 0.012 | 0.006 | 0.012 | 0.007 | 0.012 | 0.006 | 0.012 | 0.007 | 0.012 |
| Former Smoker[d] | 0.111 | 0.128 | 0.112 | 0.129 | 0.121 | 0.130 | 0.117 | 0.129 | 0.115 | 0.128 |
| Current Smoker[d] | -0.338 | 0.231 | -0.332 | 0.229 | -0.326 | 0.230 | -0.332 | 0.232 | -0.332 | 0.231 |
| Physical Activity | 0.308 | 0.133 | 0.308 | 0.134 | 0.308 | 0.134 | 0.308 | 0.134 | 0.310 | 0.132 |
| Depressive Symptoms | -0.003 | 0.030 | -0.004 | 0.030 | -0.003 | 0.029 | -0.004 | 0.030 | -0.006 | 0.030 |
| Married | -0.206 | 0.118 | -0.209 | 0.119 | -0.208 | 0.119 | -0.207 | 0.119 | -0.199 | 0.120 |
| Chronic Conditions | -0.156 | 0.071 | -0.155 | 0.070 | -0.158 | 0.071 | -0.156 | 0.071 | -0.153 | 0.070 |
| *Interaction Terms[e]* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black*CM[f](=1) | -0.768 | 0.825 | 0.694 | 0.731 | 0.181 | 0.778 | 0.107 | 0.707 | -0.027 | 0.453 |
| Hispanic*CM (=1) | -0.456 | 0.901 | 0.941 | 0.471 | 0.212 | 0.655 | -0.303 | 1.179 | 0.375 | 0.483 |
| Black*CM (=2+) | -0.658 | 0.720 | -0.384 | 0.750 | -1.894 | 1.753 | -0.020 | 0.678 | 0.449 | 0.725 |
| Hispanic*CM (=2+) | 0.272 | 0.860 | -0.065 | 0.843 | 2.104 | 0.688 | -0.689 | 0.929 | 1.294 | 1.066 |
| Constant | 6.602 | 0.833 | 6.639 | 0.813 | 6.627 | 0.827 | 6.648 | 0.817 | 6.682 | 0.820 |
| $R^2$ | 0.6455 | | 0.6457 | | 0.6456 | | 0.6454 | | 0.6456 | |

*Notes*: [a] Unstandardized coefficient. [b] Standard error. [c] Reference group is no misfortune. [d] Reference group is never smoker.
[e] The joint significance of the four product term interactions was assessed in each of the 5 models. Due to the high number of related hypothesis tests being conducted (20 total: 5 per gender and time period), the critical value for significance was adjusted to control for the family-wise error rate using a step-down procedure (Benjamini and Liu, 1999). None of the product-term groups contributed significantly to the model (adjusted significance cutoff: 0.00256). [f] CM – Childhood misfortune.

**References**:

Benjamini, Y., & Liu, W. (1999). A step-down multiple hypotheses testing procedure that controls the false discovery rate under independence. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference, 82*(1), 163–170.

Heckman, J. J. (1976). The common structure of statistical models of truncation, sample selection and limited dependent variables and a simple estimator for such models. In *Annals of Economic and Social Measurement, 5(4),* 475-492.