

Like Mother Like Daughter Empirical Evidence from Iran

Batool Jamilian

Ministry of Education of Iran

Pouyan Mashayekh Ahangarani

University of Southern California

Spring 2004

1-Introduction

How are the sources allocated within the household? This is a question that economists tried to answer by using the theory of utility maximization. One of the assumptions of this theory is, one person is maximizing her/his utility function in order to efficiently allocate the resources in her/his budget set. But the question set forth by economists is how the parents in a family decide to allocate resources among their children. It seems these decisions are a kind of collective actions between family members especially among the parents.

Some researches have been done to find any gender bias in household allocations in other countries. Durkheim (1933) was the first person who brought the idea of “sexual division of labor” in families. A good deal of research in the last 3 decades by psychologists indicates that fathers play a bigger role in the development of their sons than their daughters. Fathers spend more time with their sons and sons show preference for their fathers at an early age (Lamb 1976). Mothers on the other hand, tend to spend more time with their daughters and have a closer relationship with a daughter than a son. Longitudinal data on child development indicate that the absence of a father (because of divorce) has a more severe and enduring impact on boys than girls (Hetherington, Cox, and Cox 1978). Similar differences by gender are reported for the impact of divorce on child Health (Mauldon 1990). Duncan (1993) has found that in Brazil, women devote nonlabor income towards improving the health of their daughters but not their sons. He has also found that in Ghana, if a woman is better educated than her husband, then her daughter benefits more and her son benefits less from her education than if the husband is better educated than his wife. Sociologists and demographers have pointed out that the probability of marital dissolution is smaller if a couple has a son (Spanier and Glick 1981). It is argued that this reflects a higher price of marital dissolution to the father with sons. Fertility preferences are also often gender specific. In the United States, the birth interval between first and second born is independent of the first child among white women but, among black women, it is smaller if the first child is a son. Black women apparently want to have a daughter (Teachmans and Schollaert 1989).

The researches have been done up to now, show the mothers prefer to allocate resources toward daughters and fathers treat their sons preferentially. In this paper I want to determine whether there is evidence for difference by gender in the allocation of Iranian household resources. In section 2, I will explain the dataset that I have used. In sections 3, I will show the results. The conclusion will come in section 4.

2- Data

Household is like a black box but if we can gather enough information about a family we can find out how the consumption pattern is changed by the education levels of parents. Child health is a consequence of these allocations. We can use height or weight as a long run measure of nutritional status. Among nutritionists, height is a credible measure for reflecting nutritional status (Waterlow et al. 1977).

The data has been gathered from five schools from northern part of Tehran, Iran in 1999¹. 191 students are in the survey , 100 boys and 91 girls. The schools are chosen in such a way that the survey covers both the economically rich and poor families, both for girls and boys. The variables are as below:

- 1) Height of the student
- 2) Weight of the student
- 3) GPA of the previous year
- 4) Education level of mother
- 5) Education level of father
- 6) Mother's occupation

The students are all in the first year of secondary school. Their GPA is from the fifth year of primary school which the exams of that year are nationwide. Thus the same exams make the GPAs comparable.

¹ I am thankful to MS. B. Jamilian who gathered the data from the schools in Tehran.

3- Results

The results are in three sections: GPA, Height and Weight. OLS regression has been used to find the results which the outputs come in Appendix A. The results are as below:

1) The impact of parents' education on students' GPA:

The results show that parents' education is significantly important on the children's GPA. Any additional year on the education of father and mother will add 0.11 and 0.12 to the GPA of the child respectively. If we separate this analysis to sons and daughters we get different values. For daughters, the GPA increase of fathers and mothers are 0.09 and 0.15 respectively which shows that the education of mother has more impact on the daughters' success. While among sons, these values are 0.15 and 0.08 which shows that the education level of fathers has more impact on their GPA level rather than mother's education level.

2) The impact of parents' education on students' weight:

The findings show that with one year increase in the education level of father the weight of daughters and sons increase 316 grams and 464 grams respectively. While for mothers the values are 349 grams and 446 grams. In other words, with the increase of parents' education level, the weight of the children increases but mostly more among the sons but this increase is less gender-unequal for the mothers' education.

3) The impact of parents' education on students' height:

The findings for height show that with one year increase in the education level of father the height of daughters increase 28mm and for sons this increase is negligible. While for mothers the impact for daughters is not significant but for sons is 28mm.

4-Conclusion

The finding in this paper shows that the mother's education is more effective on daughters' human capital (measured by GPA) than on their sons while this impact for a father is more on sons than daughters. Part of it could be explained by the fact that the time that parents allocate for their children has a gender preference. But we should take into account the role of academic aspiration for children. The higher education levels of mothers give more aspiration to the daughters to study well while this aspiration for boys mostly comes from fathers' education level. With the increase of women's share in the universities during last years in Iran (%60 of university students are girls now), we should expect that, the new generation of girls will be better educated relative to the previous generations. The consequence of the improvement of women's education has been an important issue among economists. Barro (1997) has found that the increase of women's education level has positive impact on the economic growth rate. So with the increase of women's participation in universities we should expect that the new generation of girls will be more educated which will have a positive impact on the economic growth rate of Iran in near future.

Appnedix A

. reg gpa dadedu momedu

Source	SS	df	MS			
Model	320.891707	2	160.445853	Number of obs =	191	
Residual	588.861699	188	3.13224308	F(2, 188) =	51.22	
Total	909.753406	190	4.78817582	Prob > F =	0.0000	
				R-squared =	0.3527	
				Adj R-squared =	0.3458	
				Root MSE =	1.7698	

gpa	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
dadedu	.1153222	.0400178	2.88	0.004	.0363806	.1942639
momedu	.1251772	.0388193	3.22	0.001	.0485998	.2017546
_cons	16.01205	.2371885	67.51	0.000	15.54416	16.47995

. reg gpa dadedu momedu if sex==0

Source	SS	df	MS			
Model	177.440914	2	88.7204572	Number of obs =	100	
Residual	346.771269	97	3.57496153	F(2, 97) =	24.82	
Total	524.212183	99	5.29507256	Prob > F =	0.0000	
				R-squared =	0.3385	
				Adj R-squared =	0.3249	
				Root MSE =	1.8908	

gpa	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
dadedu	.0987731	.057478	1.72	0.089	-.0153047	.212851
momedu	.1557786	.0570062	2.73	0.007	.042637	.2689201
_cons	15.7457	.3817997	41.24	0.000	14.98794	16.50347

. reg gpa dadedu momedu if sex==1

Source	SS	df	MS			
Model	153.712237	2	76.8561184	Number of obs =	91	
Residual	231.776325	88	2.63382187	F(2, 88) =	29.18	
Total	385.488562	90	4.28320624	Prob > F =	0.0000	
				R-squared =	0.3987	
				Adj R-squared =	0.3851	
				Root MSE =	1.6229	

gpa	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
dadedu	.1524331	.0557312	2.74	0.008	.0416791	.2631871
momedu	.0893412	.0521382	1.71	0.090	-.0142724	.1929549
_cons	16.15626	.2934697	55.05	0.000	15.57305	16.73947

. reg gpa dadedu

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	191
Model	288.322281	1	288.322281	F(1, 189) =	87.69
Residual	621.431124	189	3.28799537	Prob > F	= 0.0000
				R-squared	= 0.3169
				Adj R-squared	= 0.3133
				Root MSE	= 1.8133
Total	909.753406	190	4.78817582		

gpa	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
dadedu	.220873	.0235868	9.36	0.000	.1743458	.2674002
_cons	15.95549	.2423488	65.84	0.000	15.47744	16.43355

. reg gpa momedu

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	191
Model	294.87964	1	294.87964	F(1, 189) =	90.64
Residual	614.873766	189	3.25330035	Prob > F	= 0.0000
				R-squared	= 0.3241
				Adj R-squared	= 0.3206
				Root MSE	= 1.8037
Total	909.753406	190	4.78817582		

gpa	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
momedu	.2166808	.0227594	9.52	0.000	.1717858	.2615758
_cons	16.3831	.2030123	80.70	0.000	15.98264	16.78356

. reg weight dadedu

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	191
Model	888.297703	1	888.297703	F(1, 189) =	17.33
Residual	9685.03214	189	51.2435563	Prob > F	= 0.0000
				R-squared	= 0.0840
				Adj R-squared	= 0.0792
				Root MSE	= 7.1585
Total	10573.3298	190	55.6491044		

weight	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
dadedu	.3876884	.0931158	4.16	0.000	.2040087	.5713681
_cons	30.26342	.956742	31.63	0.000	28.37616	32.15069

. reg weight dadedu if sex==0

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	100
Model	300.601135	1	300.601135	F(1, 98) =	5.03
Residual	5855.39887	98	59.748968	Prob > F	= 0.0271
				R-squared	= 0.0488
				Adj R-squared	= 0.0391
				Root MSE	= 7.7297
Total	6156	99	62.1818182		

weight	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
dadedu	.3167557	.1412194	2.24	0.027	.0365104	.5970009
_cons	30.95915	1.560586	19.84	0.000	27.86221	34.05608

. reg weight dadedu if sex==1

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	91
Model	587.451679	1	587.451679	F(1, 89) =	13.76
Residual	3798.3725	89	42.6783427	Prob > F	= 0.0004
				R-squared	= 0.1339
				Adj R-squared	= 0.1242
				Root MSE	= 6.5329
Total	4385.82418	90	48.7313797		

weight	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
dadedu	.4647197	.125259	3.71	0.000	.2158328	.7136066
_cons	29.66311	1.170917	25.33	0.000	27.33653	31.9897

. reg weight momedu

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	191
Model	1008.38248	1	1008.38248	F(1, 189) =	19.93
Residual	9564.94736	189	50.6081871	Prob > F	= 0.0000
				R-squared	= 0.0954
				Adj R-squared	= 0.0906
				Root MSE	= 7.1139
Total	10573.3298	190	55.6491044		

weight	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
momedu	.4006921	.0897653	4.46	0.000	.2236215	.5777626
_cons	30.87485	.8007017	38.56	0.000	29.29539	32.45431

```
. reg weight momedu if sex==0
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	100
Model	372.391071	1	372.391071	F(1, 98) =	6.31
Residual	5783.60893	98	59.0164176	Prob > F	= 0.0136
				R-squared	= 0.0605
				Adj R-squared	= 0.0509
				Root MSE	= 7.6822

weight	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
momedu	.349663	.1391991	2.51	0.014	.0734269	.6258991
_cons	31.33906	1.308546	23.95	0.000	28.7423	33.93583

```
. reg weight momedu if sex==1
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	91
Model	620.208684	1	620.208684	F(1, 89) =	14.66
Residual	3765.61549	89	42.3102864	Prob > F	= 0.0002
				R-squared	= 0.1414
				Adj R-squared	= 0.1318
				Root MSE	= 6.5046

weight	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
momedu	.446716	.1166771	3.83	0.000	.2148811	.6785508
_cons	30.51634	.9754239	31.29	0.000	28.57819	32.45448

```
. reg height dadedu
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	191
Model	156.853571	1	156.853571	F(1, 189) =	3.19
Residual	9279.10454	189	49.0957912	Prob > F	= 0.0755
				R-squared	= 0.0166
				Adj R-squared	= 0.0114
				Root MSE	= 7.0068

height	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
dadedu	.1629111	.0911435	1.79	0.075	-.0168781	.3427003
_cons	139.9958	.9364775	149.49	0.000	138.1485	141.8431


```
. reg height dadedu if sex==0
```

Source	SS	df	MS			
Model	235.738371	1	235.738371	Number of obs =	100	
Residual	6242.10163	98	63.6949146	F(1, 98) =	3.70	
Total	6477.84	99	65.4327273	Prob > F =	0.0573	
				R-squared =	0.0364	
				Adj R-squared =	0.0266	
				Root MSE =	7.9809	

height	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
dadedu	.2805073	.145808	1.92	0.057	-.008844	.5698586
_cons	139.2671	1.611294	86.43	0.000	136.0696	142.4647

```
. reg height dadedu if sex==1
```

Source	SS	df	MS			
Model	.037249308	1	.037249308	Number of obs =	91	
Residual	2892.99572	89	32.5055699	F(1, 89) =	0.00	
Total	2893.03297	90	32.1448107	Prob > F =	0.9731	
				R-squared =	0.0000	
				Adj R-squared =	-0.0112	
				Root MSE =	5.7014	

height	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
dadedu	.0037005	.109316	0.03	0.973	-.2135081	.2209092
_cons	140.7631	1.021884	137.75	0.000	138.7327	142.7936

```
. reg height momedu
```

Source	SS	df	MS			
Model	257.169407	1	257.169407	Number of obs =	191	
Residual	9178.78871	189	48.5650196	F(1, 189) =	5.30	
Total	9435.95812	190	49.6629374	Prob > F =	0.0225	
				R-squared =	0.0273	
				Adj R-squared =	0.0221	
				Root MSE =	6.9689	

height	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
momedu	.2023521	.0879346	2.30	0.022	.0288927	.3758115
_cons	140.0206	.7843721	178.51	0.000	138.4733	141.5678

. reg height momedu if sex==0

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	100
Model	249.33028	1	249.33028	F(1, 98) =	3.92
Residual	6228.50972	98	63.5562216	Prob > F	= 0.0504
				R-squared	= 0.0385
				Adj R-squared	= 0.0287
Total	6477.84	99	65.4327273	Root MSE	= 7.9722

height	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
momedu	.286113	.1444538	1.98	0.050	-.000551 .5727769
_cons	139.7827	1.357943	102.94	0.000	137.0879 142.4775

. reg height momedu if sex==1

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	91
Model	30.6384991	1	30.6384991	F(1, 89) =	0.95
Residual	2862.39447	89	32.1617356	Prob > F	= 0.3317
				R-squared	= 0.0106
				Adj R-squared	= -0.0005
Total	2893.03297	90	32.1448107	Root MSE	= 5.6711

height	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
momedu	.0992879	.1017261	0.98	0.332	-.1028397 .3014154
_cons	140.1977	.8504331	164.85	0.000	138.5079 141.8875

References

- Barro Robert, 1997, *Determinants of Economic Growth: A Cross Country Empirical Study*, MIT Press.
- Duncan, Thomas, 1994, "Like *Father, Like Son: Like Mother, Like Daughter*" , *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol 29, No 4.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1933. *The Division of Labor in Society*, translated by G. Simpson from *De la division du travail social: Etudes sur l'organisation des Societes Superieures* (1893). London: Macmillan.
- Hetherington, E., M. Cox, and R. Cox. 1978. " *The Aftermath of Divorce.*" In *Mother/Child-Father/Child Relationships*", ed. Joseph Stevens and Marilyn Mathews, 149-76. Washington, D.C. : National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Lamb, Michael E. 1976. " *The Role of the Father: An Overview* " In *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, ed. Michael Lamb, 1-36, New York: Wiley.
- Mauldon, Jane. 1990. "The *Effect of Marital Disruption on Children's Health.*" *Demography* 27(3):431-47.
- Spanire, Graham B., and Paul C. Glick. 1981. " *Marital Instability in the United States: Some Correlates and Recent Changes.*" *Family Reactions* 31:319-38.
- Teachman, Jay D., and Paul T. Schollaert. 1989. " *Gender of Children and Birth Timings.*" *Demography* 26(3):411-24.
- Waterlow, J., R. Buzina, W. Keller, J. Lane, M. Nichman, and J. Tanner. 1977. " *The Presentation and Use of Height and Weight Data for Comparing the Nutritional Status of Groups of Children Under the Age of Ten Years.*" *Bulletin of World Health Organization* 55: 489-98.