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## General Question

- Does having sons translate into more satisfaction in a society where sons are preferred to daughters?


## Country \& Data

- South Korea
- Nice satisfaction data are available
- Sex ratio at birth is high $\rightarrow$ Sign of son preference

Figure 1: Change in SRB in Korea


## Specific Questions

- Can we capture son preference using satisfaction data?
- If so, in which domains of life, e.g., financial domain, family domain, social domain, do sons make the parents more satisfied?
- Are the results obtained here consistent with the sex ratio transition (the rise and the fall of SRB)?


## Literature

- Lee et. al. (2013)
- Cross-sectional data targeted for the elderly in one particular island in South Korea.
- Mixed gender preference
- Margolis \& Myrskyla (2016)
- German and British panel data
- Mixed gender preference


## Literature

- This study
- Examines the impact of having sons on parental satisfaction using national-level panel data in a country with son preference,
- Gets into the sources of son preference with the domain of life approach, and
- Checks the consistency with the sex ratio transition.


## Main Results

- At the timing of birth, sons better satisfy parents in the domains of income and relative relations.
- No advantage is found for daughters at the timing of birth.
- The results provide a hint for understanding the full cycle of the sex ratio transition.


## Korean Labor \& Income Panel Study

- Wave 1 in 1998, Wave 17 in 2014
- Overall Life Satisfaction (5-point scale)
- Domain-specific Satisfaction (5-point scale)
- household income, family relations, leisure activities, housing environment, relations with relatives, and social relations
- This study uses
- Married individuals aged 45 or less
- 61,851 observations


## $1^{\text {st }}$ Regression Analysis: Fertility Behavior

- Aim: to test if the probability of progressing to the next parity is higher for parents with only daughters than for parents with only sons.
- Result: Yes $\rightarrow$ consistent with son preference

| \# Children | One | Two |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Only daughters | 1.05 | $5.38^{* * *}$ |
| Both daughters and sons | --- | 1.32 |

- RE Logit model. Ref: Only sons. Demo-socioeconomic variables are controlled. Odds ratio for progressing to the next parity. *** $p<0.01,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{*} p<0.1$.


## $2^{\text {nd }}$ Regression Analysis : Birth and Parenthood on Satisfaction

- Aim: to test the impacts of child birth and parenthood on satisfaction while controlling for the gender of children.

| Domains | Overall <br> Life | Income | Family | Leisure | House- <br> hold | Relative <br> Relation | Social <br> Relation |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Birth | $.052^{* * *}$ | -.001 | $.046^{* * *}$ | -.009 | $.040^{* *}$ | $.035^{* *}$ | $.044^{* * *}$ |
| + Son Birth | .007 | $.062^{* *}$ | -.008 | .020 | .009 | $.049^{* *}$ | .020 |
| Parenthood | $-.037^{* *}$ | $-.037^{*}$ | .017 | $-.171^{* * *}$ | $-.056^{* * *}$ | .004 | $-.032^{*}$ |
| + Son PH | $-.049^{* * *}$ | -.013 | -.013 | -.029 | -.023 | $-.053^{* * *}$ | $-.035^{* *}$ |

- FE OLS model. Demo-socioeconomic variables are controlled. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05,{ }^{*} p<0.1$.


## $2^{\text {nd }}$ Regression Analysis Result 1: Birth on Satisfaction

- At the timing of birth, sons better satisfy parents in the domains of income and relative relations.
- No advantage is found for daughters.

| Domains | Overall <br> Life | Income | Family | Leisure | House- <br> hold | Relative <br> Relation | Social <br> Relation |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Birth | $.052^{* * *}$ | -.001 | $.046^{* * *}$ | -.009 | $.040^{* *}$ | $.035^{* *}$ | $.044^{* * *}$ |
| + Son Birth | .007 | $.062^{* *}$ | -.008 | .020 | .009 | $.049^{* *}$ | .020 |
| Parenthood | $-.037^{* *}$ | $-.037^{*}$ | .017 | $-.171^{* * * *}$ | $-.056^{* * *}$ | .004 | $-.032^{*}$ |
| + Son PH | $-.049^{* * *}$ | -.013 | -.013 | -.029 | -.023 | $-.053^{* * *}$ | $-.035^{* *}$ |

- FE OLS model. Demo-socioeconomic variables are controlled. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05,{ }^{*} p<0.1$.


## $2^{\text {nd }}$ Regression Analysis Result 2: Parenthood on Satisfaction

- Being a parent of sons lowers satisfaction in overall life and in the domains of relative and social relations.
- No disadvantage is found for daughters.

| Domains | Overall <br> Life | Income | Family | Leisure | House- <br> hold | Relative <br> Relation | Social <br> Relation |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Birth | $.052^{* * *}$ | -.001 | $.046^{* * *}$ | -.009 | $.040^{* *}$ | $.035^{* *}$ | $.044^{* * *}$ |
| + Son Birth | .007 | $.062^{* *}$ | -.008 | .020 | .009 | $.049^{* *}$ | .020 |
| Parenthood | $-.037^{* *}$ | $-.037^{*}$ | .017 | $-.171^{* * *}$ | $-.056^{* * *}$ | .004 | $-.032^{*}$ |
| + Son PH | $-.049^{* * *}$ | -.013 | -.013 | -.029 | -.023 | $-.053^{* * *}$ | $-.035^{* *}$ |

- FE OLS model. Demo-socioeconomic variables are controlled.

$$
{ }^{* * *} p<0.01,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{*} p<0.1 .
$$

## Remarks 1: Son Preference

- Son preference has its roots in the domains of income and relations with relatives.
- This supports the idea that son preference derives from parental expectations that sons financially support the family, including aged parents, and represent the family in relative networks.
- However, the positive impact of having sons does not last long.
- Overly high expectation? Boys are just terrible?


## $3^{\text {rd }}$ Regression Analysis : Change in Son Preference

- Aim: to test if the impacts of having sons diminished.
- Top: $1^{\text {st }}$ half. Bottom: $2^{\text {nd }}$ half.
- Results: The positive impacts of son birth disappeared in the $2^{\text {nd }}$ half. $\rightarrow$ consistent with the fall in SRB

| Domains | Overall <br> Life | Income | Family | Leisure | House- <br> hold | Relative <br> Relation | Social <br> Relation |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Birth | $0.0523^{*}$ | -0.0214 | 0.0282 | -0.00694 | 0.0254 | 0.0112 | 0.0160 |
| + Son Birth | -0.00556 | $0.0976^{* *}$ | -0.0112 | 0.0179 | 0.0355 | $0.0763^{*}$ | $0.0761^{* *}$ |
| Birth | $0.0528^{* *}$ | 0.0300 | $0.0578^{* * *}$ | 0.00856 | 0.0433 | $0.0591^{* * *}$ | $0.0644^{* * *}$ |
| + Son Birth | 0.0159 | -0.00281 | -0.0299 | 0.00912 | -0.0142 | -0.00376 | -0.0445 |

## Remarks 2: Sex Ratio Transition

- Economic development ignites the sex ratio transition.

1) Low fertility $\rightarrow$ raises SRB in a country with son preference and prenatal sex-selective technology.
2) Socioeconomic changes (e.g., introduction of SS)
$\rightarrow$ expected roles of sons less valuable
$\rightarrow$ weaker son preference $\rightarrow$ reduces SRB

- The ignition is the same, but the time lag in its impacts generates the rise and the fall in SRB.
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