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1 Introduction

Over the decades, social scientists have investigated child-gender preference and how it could affect fertility decisions and several other social issues. It has been studied that parents’ marital and labor supply decisions can be affected by the genders of their children. There are several economic based hypotheses to explain such relationships involving different costs and health conditions of children of different genders [1]. However, several hypotheses were also developed under the assumption of the existence of child-gender bias. For example, in a family with a boy preference, a mother with a boy may have a higher negotiation power and is required to work less in the labor market [2]. Moreover, with boy preference, a family with boys may have higher marriage stability [3]. Therefore, the knowledge of child-gender preference in a society allows researchers to more clearly identify the reasoning toward the relationships between child gender and the household’s marital and labor market outcomes.

Despite the importance of the topic, there has not been many studies in the case of Thailand. The most recent studies were more than a decades ago. The evidence may no longer represents the present situation due to changes in social and political structures as well as substantial economic development over the past ten years. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to re-examine the existence of child gender preference across families in Thailand. Unlike previous studies in Thailand, we followed [4]’s approach to investigate the existence of child-gender preference from the parents’ decision to have an additional child given the genders of the previous children. Specifically, we examined the decision to have the \((m + 1)\)st children given the genders of the previous \(m\) children. The model can identify the boy preference, girl preference and mixed gender preference. If the parents have a boy preference, then the parents with a lease one boy are less likely to have an additional child. If the parents have a mixed gender preference, then parents with at least one boy and one girl are less likely to have an additional child. Such model allows us to find the child-gender preference without the influence of the birth order and number of children.

For the empirical study, this study used the data from the 2015 Social Economic Survey (SES) collected by Thailand’s National Statistical Office. With the limited number of observations for families with more than three children and potential multicollinearity problem of explanatory variables, this study adopted the [5]'s Generalize Maximum Entropy (GME) approach for a discrete choice model to estimate a series of decisions to have children. With the semi-parametric nature, the GME estimation is robust to distributional assumption of the errors. Moreover, numerous family characteristics can be taken into account in the study as the methodology is robust to multicollinearity problem. This study compares the traditional logit-based estimation with the entropy-based estimation and found that parameters estimated using the entropy-based method presented smaller standard errors, especially when the sample size is small.

Regarding the child-gender preference, the results show a complex structure of child-gender preference in Thailand. Specifically, in the families where the mothers
have education lower than high school, girls are preferred. In the families where
the mothers have a high school degree, boys are preferred. However, regardless
of mothers’ levels of education, the results show evidence that Thai families have
mixed gender preference. That is, parents are less likely to have an additional
child once they already have at least one boy and one girl.

2 Literature Review

Child-gender preference has been studied in many countries, mostly in Asia
where the preference for sons seems to be relatively higher than the rest of the world
\[9\]. Based on the sex-ratios at birth (SRB) across 61 countries in Africa, Asia,
and Latin America, \[7\] found that there exists son preference in Asia, especially in
India and China, and Africa, while there is a little evidence to be seen in the case
of Latin America. Even though previous studies suggest that families in Asian
countries prefer to have sons over daughter, some recent studies show otherwise.
\[8\] found that China, India and Vietnam exhibit strong son preference. However,
based on the data from national survey over 1991 to 2012, the trend seems to be
opposite in the case of South Korea \[6\]. They argued that social and economic
development such as lower wage discrimination, greater gender equality, and higher
income plays contribute to the current trend of non-bias in child-gender preference
in South Korea.

In the case of Thailand, the research on child-gender preference has been rather
limited and outdated. \[9\] were among the very first researchers to examine such
preference. Relying on social-demographic survey and descriptive statistics, their
results suggest little evidence for child-gender preference. In general, Thai families
prefer to have children of both sexes. In addition, they found that the important
factor affecting the decision on having additional children is the number of children
that families have already had. Apart from the number of children, \[10\] suggest
that urbanisation could also affect the reproductive behaviour of Thai women
based on their two-round survey data. Later on, \[11\] re-examined gender preference
for children across Thai families using the data from Thai national survey. Unlike
previous studies, their results show that there is a difference in children-gender
preference between men and women. they found that married women prefer to
have children on both sexes, while men as well as families in the urban ethnic
Chinese group show a strong preference for sons.

After two decades, \[12\] investigated the child-gender preference in South-East
Asian countries using Coomb’s scale as a measurement of child-gender preference.
In the case of Thailand, their findings confirm what the previous studies have
found. That is, Thai families have a mixed gender preference, which is that they
prefer to have children of both genders. However, they did not investigate the
determinants of child-gender preference due to the lack of data and appropriate
methodology at the time. The findings was further confirmed by \[13\]’s study based
on national surveys. The study found that the size of Thai families tend to limit
at two children with a child for each gender.
Although these existing studies provide a useful foundation for the analysis of child-gender preference in Thailand, there are limitations in their methodologies since they only relied on survey data and descriptive statistics. This suggests that their findings may not truly reflect the current state of child-gender preferences across Thai families. Moreover, [12] mentioned in their study that, for future research, investigation on the determinants of child-gender preference should be done for policy maker to design appropriate solutions to deal with social issues involving the gender discrimination on children.

3 Model Formulation

In this study, we measure child-gender preference by estimating the probability of having an additional child given the genders of the previous children. That is, We formulate a mechanism for child gender preference model as follows. Firstly, a parent had decided whether to have a first child or not. After the parent observed the first child’s gender, he or she then decided whether to have a second child or not. If he or she had decided not to have a second child, we observe a single-child family. If he or she had decided to have a second child, the mechanism would continue until the parent satisfies with his or her child gender mix.

Let \( Y_{mi}^{(s)} \) = \{0, 1\} indicate a binary choice variable representing a decision of having an \( m \)th child for parent \( i \). Superscript \( s \) represents the decision whether to have a child. Let \( Y_{mi}^{(g)} \) be an \( m \)th child’s gender for parent \( i = 1, 2, ..., N \). Superscript \( g \) represents the child’s gender. If \( Y_{mi}^{(s)} = 1 \), the parent chose to have a child, and we observe the \( m \)th child’s gender, \( Y_{mi}^{(g)} \) for all \( m = 1, 2, ..., M \). Figure 1 illustrates child gender mechanism using these notations.

Figure 1: Child decision mechanism
According to the mechanism discussed above, we can build a model to estimate the probability of the parent decision in each stage. Suppose that we observe $K$ characteristics of each parent $x_{ik}$, where $k = 1, 2, ..., K$. The probability of observing the parent $i$ had decided to have the $m^{th}$ child, $j_m$; the $(m-1)^{th}$ child, $j_{m-1}$; ..., the first child, $j_1$ is
\[
\Pr\left(Y^{(s)}_{mi}, Y^{(s)}_{(m-1)i}, ..., Y^{(s)}_{(m-1)i}, Y^{(g)}_{(m-2)i}, ..., Y^{(g)}_{1i}\right) = p_{mij} \times p_{(m-1)ij_{m-1}} \times ... \times p_{1ij_1}.
\]

In this study, we adopted the [5]'s Generalize Maximum Entropy (GME) approach for a discrete choice model to estimate a series of decisions to have children, $p_{mij}$. In the GME framework, the observed noisy data $Y_{mi} = y_{mij}$ can be modeled by decomposing into the signal component (unknown probabilities) $p_{mij}$ and noise component $e_{mij}$ as follows:
\[
y_{mij} = p_{mij} + e_{mij} = G(x_i' \beta_{jm}) + e_{mij},
\]
where $G(.)$ is a link function linking the probability $p_{mij}$ with the linear structure $x_i' \beta_{jm}$. We have to recover the unknown and unobservable, $p_{mij}$ and $e_{mij}$, from the observed noisy data $y_{mij}$ and the known covariate $x_{ik}$. This information of the observed data and covariates can be written as an ill-posed inverse problem with noise as follows:
\[
\sum_i x_{ik}y_{mij} = \sum_i x_{ik}p_{mij} + \sum_i x_{ik}e_{mij},
\]
for $j_m = 0, 1$ and $k = 1, 2, ..., K$. The problem is ill-posed because there are $2K$ moment relations and $2N (> 2K)$ unknown parameters.

Conventionally, this ill-posed problem can be solved by imposing parametric restrictions on the link functions that link the unknown probabilities and the covariates [14] or using Bayesian procedures [15]. Under these alternatives, they require a correct statistical model and complete data for valid estimation and testing. The GME approach avoids some of these potential problems of conventional methods.

Using Shannon’s (1948) entropy, measure
\[
H(p) = - \sum_j p_j \log p_j,
\]
[16] proposed maximizing 3.3 subject to appropriate information-moment constraints and normalization probability constraints to recover the unknown probabilities. This is called maximum entropy (ME) principle. For the multinomial choice problem, [17] showed how to recover the multinomial probabilities using the ME principle. [5] showed that maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) of logit model [14] and ME solution for multinomial choice problem are equivalent. The correspondence between ML logit and ME solutions is that the information-moment data constraints in ME formulation are the same as the ML logit first
order conditions. Thus, the ME solution resulting from the entropy maximization subject to the information-moment data constraints has the same mathematical form as logistic distribution.

[5] proposed a generalized maximum entropy formulation for multinomial choice problem by relaxing the strong assumption of the information-moment relations in ME formulation. To solve the inverse-moment relation in (3.2), [5] reparameterized the unobservable $c_{mij}$ to be in the form of probability in order to fit in the entropy formalism. Each unobserved component is supposed to be the expected value of a discrete random variable with support $v_{mij} = (v_{mij}1, v_{mij}2, ..., v_{mij}H)'$ and corresponding unknown weights (probabilities) $w_{mij} = (w_{mij1}, w_{mij2}, ..., w_{mijH})'$, for $H \geq 2$. If we imposed the normalization constraints on the weights, where $\sum_h w_{mijh} = 1$, then $c_{mij} = \sum_h v_{mijh} w_{mijh}$ have the properties of probability. Thus equation (3.2) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{i} x_{ik} y_{mij} = \sum_{i} x_{ik} p_{mij} + \sum_{i} \sum_{h} x_{ik} v_{mijh} w_{mijh}, \quad (3.4)$$

From the principle of ME, $p_{ij}$ that best represents the data must maximize the entropy function

$$\max_{p,w} H(p_{mij}, w_{mijh}) = \sum_{i} \sum_{j} p_{mij} \log(p_{mij}) - \sum_{i} \sum_{j} \sum_{h} w_{mijh} \log(w_{mijh})$$

subject to constraints (3.4) and the following normalization constraints

$$\sum_{j} p_{mij} = 1, \quad \forall i = 1, ..., N$$
$$\sum_{h} w_{mijh} = 1, \quad \forall i = 1, ..., N, \forall j = 0, 1.$$

We can solve this problem by setting up the corresponding Lagrangian as follows:

$$L = -\sum_{i} \sum_{j} p_{mij} \log(p_{mij}) - \sum_{i} \sum_{j} \sum_{h} w_{mijh} \log(w_{mijh}) + \lambda_{10} \left( \sum_{i} x_{i1} p_{mio} + \sum_{i} \sum_{h} x_{i1} v_{mi0h} w_{mi0h} \right) + ...$$
$$+ \lambda_{k0} \left( \sum_{i} x_{ik} p_{mio} + \sum_{i} \sum_{h} x_{ik} v_{mi0h} w_{mi0h} \right)$$
$$+ \lambda_{11} \left( \sum_{i} x_{i1} p_{mi1} + \sum_{i} \sum_{h} x_{i1} v_{mi1h} w_{mi1h} \right) + ...$$
$$+ \lambda_{k1} \left( \sum_{i} x_{ik} p_{mi1} + \sum_{i} \sum_{h} x_{ik} v_{mi1h} w_{mi1h} \right)$$
\[
+ \rho_1 \left( 1 - \sum_{j_m} p_{m1j_m} \right) + \cdots + \rho_N \left( 1 - \sum_{j_m} p_{mNj_m} \right) \\
+ \delta_{10} \left( 1 - \sum_h w_{m10h} \right) + \cdots + \delta_{N0} \left( 1 - \sum_h w_{mN0h} \right) \\
+ \delta_{11} \left( 1 - \sum_h w_{m11h} \right) + \cdots + \delta_{N1} \left( 1 - \sum_h w_{mN1h} \right).
\]

The Lagrangian’s first-order conditions form a basis for solving the optimization problem and for recovering the unknown probability \( \hat{p}_{mij_m}, \hat{e}_{mij_m}, \) and \( \hat{\lambda}_{kj_m} \). Notice that parameter \( \hat{\beta}_{kj_m} \) equate \(-\hat{\lambda}_{kj_m}\). Solving the first-order conditions give the solution

\[
\hat{p}_{mij_m} = \frac{\exp \left( \sum_k x_{ik} \hat{\beta}_{jm} \right)}{\sum_{j_m} \exp \left( \sum_k x_{ik} \hat{\beta}_{jm} \right)},
\]

and

\[
\hat{w}_{mij_m h} = \frac{\exp \left( \sum_k \sum_h x_{ik} \hat{\beta}_{jm} v_{mij_m h} \right)}{\sum_{j_m} \exp \left( \sum_k \sum_h x_{ik} \hat{\beta}_{jm} v_{mij_m h} \right)}.
\]

4 Data

The data used in this study are from the 2015 Household Socio-Economic Survey (SES) collected by Thailand’s National Statistical Office. The survey collected data on 125,336 individuals in 43,400 households in Thailand. To examine child-gender preference, which relies on the probability of parents having an additional child given the gender of the previous child, this study matched parents with their children in each of the household. This study examined child baring decision and unmarried individuals may behave differently. Moreover, studying the fathers’ and the mothers’ preferences would be redundant. This study, thus, only examines married mothers’ decision to have additional children.

As the SES collected data of only individuals living inside the household, the data do not to capture children living outside the household. Since the choice to leave the household can be endogenous, this study limited the age of mother to 15-30 years old. The study also eliminated samples that mothers had children before the age of 15 years old. As a result, the oldest child in the sample could not be more than 15 years old and is unlikely to leave the household. After the restrictions, the final sample size is 3,826 mothers. All variable descriptions and sample statistics are provided in Table 1.
Table 1: Data Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ch_d1</td>
<td>Dummy (=1 if have first child)</td>
<td>3826</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch_d2</td>
<td>Dummy (=1 if have second child)</td>
<td>3826</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch_d3</td>
<td>Dummy (=1 if have third child)</td>
<td>3826</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch_d4</td>
<td>Dummy (=1 if have forth child)</td>
<td>3826</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xage</td>
<td>Age of the mother</td>
<td>3826</td>
<td>25.508</td>
<td>3.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xedu_hs</td>
<td>Dummy (=1 if have high school degree)</td>
<td>3826</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xedu_c</td>
<td>Dummy (=1 if have collage degree)</td>
<td>3826</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xurban</td>
<td>Dummy (=1 if live in urban area)</td>
<td>3826</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch_G1</td>
<td>Dummy (=1 if first child is girl)</td>
<td>2477</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch_G2</td>
<td>Dummy (=1 if first two children are both girls)</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch_G3</td>
<td>Dummy (=1 if first three children are all girls)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch_GB2</td>
<td>Dummy (=1 if first two children are mixed genders)</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch_GB3</td>
<td>Dummy (=1 if first three children are mixed genders)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Results

This study measures child-gender preference by examining the probability of having an additional child given genders of the previous children using the logit and entropy based models. This requires estimating a system of regression equations representing the decision to have the first, second, third and forth child. Specifically, equations (L1) and (E1) estimate the mother’s decision to have the first child \( ch_d1 \) given her characteristics \( x = \{ xage, xedu_hs, xedu_c, xurban \} \) using the logit and entropy based models, respectively. Equations (Lj) and (Ej) estimate the mother’s decision to have the \( j^{th} \) child \( ch_dj \) given her characteristics \( x \) and gender of her previous children \( ch_{G} \) and \( ch_{GB} \), where \( ch_{G} \) is the dummy for all previous children being girls and \( ch_{GB} \) is the dummy for previous children having mixed genders. To examine the issue of child-gender preference in more details, interaction terms were added in the models. That is, \( i_{hs}G \) is the interaction term between \( xedu_hs \) and \( ch_G \) and \( i_{hs}GB \) is the interaction term between \( xedu_hs \) and \( ch_GB \). In particular, the \( i_{hs}G \) allows us to separately study the existence of girl preference among mothers with and without high school degree. The \( i_{hs}GB \) allows us to separately study the existence of mixed gender preference among mothers with and without high school degree.

The estimations for the logit model (L1)-(L4) and the entropy model (E1)-(E4) are shown in Table 2. It should be noticed that, for the (L1) and (E1) estimation, the number of observation is not small. Without the interaction term between previous child’s gender and mother’s education, the estimation has no multicollinearity problem. Therefore, the logit and entropy estimates are not significantly different. However, for the estimations of (L4) and (E4), the number of observation is reduced to 131 individuals as there were not many mothers having three children or more. In addition, the equations include two interaction terms between previous children’s gender and the mother’s educational level causing
### Table 2: The Logit and GME estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(L1)</th>
<th>(L2)</th>
<th>(L3)</th>
<th>(L4)</th>
<th>(E1)</th>
<th>(E2)</th>
<th>(E3)</th>
<th>(E4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xage</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xedu_hs</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.38***</td>
<td>-0.74**</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.38***</td>
<td>-0.73**</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(1385.77)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(1.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xedu_c</td>
<td>-0.83***</td>
<td>-0.67***</td>
<td>-0.76*</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.82***</td>
<td>-0.67***</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>(1.04)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xurban</td>
<td>-0.50***</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.50***</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch_G</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.72**</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.71**</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(1385.77)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(2.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i_hs_G</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.98*</td>
<td>-16.26</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.97*</td>
<td>-3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(1385.77)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(2.44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch_GB</td>
<td>-0.65**</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>-0.64**</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
<td>(1385.77)</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
<td>(1.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i_hs_GB</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-15.81</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(1385.77)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(2.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>-1.37***</td>
<td>-5.59***</td>
<td>-3.39***</td>
<td>-21.00</td>
<td>-1.37***</td>
<td>-5.58***</td>
<td>-3.35***</td>
<td>-7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(1385.77)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(3.71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N    | 3826 | 2477 | 913 | 131 | 3826 | 2477 | 913 | 131 |

* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01
multicollinearity problem. As a result, the entropy estimates have much lower standard errors as the maximum entropy is by nature robust to multicollinearity and small sample-size problems. Comparing the estimation of the entire systems (L1)-(L4) and (E1)-(E4), the entropy based method outperformed the logit based method. It also should be noted that the logit and entropy based models show similar estimation outcomes, which means that the results are robust to the different estimation methodologies.

As the entropy based model provides lower standard deviations than the Logit model, especially when multicollinearity problem is presented, the equations (E1m_30)-(E4m_30) in Table 3 shows the marginal effects of each regressor on the mother’s probability of having an additional child. As the SES collected data of only individuals living inside the household and this study limited the age of mother to 15-30 years old to prevent the bias from children’s endogenous decision to leave home. The restriction on the mothers’ age may raise a question as a 30 years old mother may still have more children later on. Therefore, for the robustness check, this study also examines the decisions to have an additional child of mothers from 15-45 years old and the marginal effects are shown in (E1m_45)-(E4m_45) in Table 3.

From the (E2m_30) and (E4m_30), gender of the first child has no significant effect on the mother’s decision to have the second child and genders of the previous children have no effect on the mother’s decision to have the forth child. However, from the (E3m_30), ch_GB is negatively correlated with the decision to have the third child. Moreover, the coefficient for ch_GB is significantly negative and the coefficient for i_h_s_GB is significantly positive.

This indicates that the decision to have the second and forth child does not depend on gender of previous children. However, the decision to have the third child depends significantly on the gender mix of the first two child. Specifically, the results show an evidence for mixed-gender preference. Once the parents have a boy and a girl, they are more likely to stop having children. In addition, mothers without high school degree tend to have less children if their first child is a girl and mothers with high school degree tend to have more children of their first child is a boy. This should imply a girl preference among mothers without high school degree and a boy preference among mothers with high school degree.

In addition to the gender of previous children, the decision to have an additional child depends on mothers’ age, education and living location. Since the age restriction is low, mothers with higher age tend to have more children. Mothers with higher education and live in urban area tend to have few children.

As for the robustness check over the age restrictions of mothers, the estimations for the two age ranges of mothers provide similar results for child-gender preference with an exception of the effect of the previous two children being female on the decision to have the third child. With the 15-30 years old age restriction, the results show a significant girl preference. However, with the 15-45 years old age restriction, the results show an insignificant effect. It should be noted that, with the data limitation, the estimation faces a risk of biases in all mothers’ age ranges. When using the data of younger mothers, the mothers can potentially have more
Table 3: The marginal effects of the GME estimation for the decisions to have an additional child for (1) mothers aged 15-30 years old and (2) mothers aged 15-45 years old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(E1m_30)</th>
<th>(E2m_30)</th>
<th>(E3m_30)</th>
<th>(E4m_30)</th>
<th>(E1m_45)</th>
<th>(E2m_45)</th>
<th>(E3m_45)</th>
<th>(E4m_45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xage</td>
<td>0.02***</td>
<td>0.04***</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xedu_hs</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.08***</td>
<td>-0.09**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.07***</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xedu_c</td>
<td>-0.20***</td>
<td>-0.13***</td>
<td>-0.08**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.06***</td>
<td>-0.03**</td>
<td>-0.06***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xurban</td>
<td>-0.11***</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.08***</td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
<td>-0.02*</td>
<td>-0.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hch_G</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.09**</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i_hs_G</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.06*</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hch_GB</td>
<td>-0.08**</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.05**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i_hs_GB</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>-0.30***</td>
<td>-1.17***</td>
<td>-0.43***</td>
<td>-0.94**</td>
<td>-0.05**</td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
<td>-0.32***</td>
<td>-0.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N       | 3826  | 2477  | 913   | 131  | 14337 | 10342 | 5073  | 945  |

* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01
children later on in their lives. When using the data of older mothers, their children are also older. The children can selectively leave the household and we cannot observe children not living in the same household in this data set. The misspecification due to mothers having children later on should not be correlated with gender of their previous children. However, the misspecification due to the children’s decision to leave home can be correlated with their gender. Therefore, to examine the child-gender preference, this study focuses on the results from the estimation using the data of younger mothers.

6 Conclusions

The results from this study present different types of child-gender preferences among Thai population. Mothers with lower education prefer girls, while mothers with higher education prefer boys. However, mothers with all levels of education prefer mixed genders. That is, Thai family prefer to have at least one boy and one girl.

The results from this study are different from those from China, India and Vietnam that show evidence of boy preference [8]. However, the results are consistent with [6], which states that the boy preference culture diminishes overtime in South Korea. For the case of Thailand, we only have an evidence for a mild boy preference [11] and some mixed-gender preference [13] [12] [9]. The results of this study confirm the results of previous studies that Thai parents, in general, have a mixed-gender preference and no strong evidence of boy or girl preference in the overall population.

It should be noted that, with the data limitation, this study did not control for potential different costs of raising a boy and a girl. As the decision to have an additional child can be sensitive to the cost difference, the estimation of child-gender preference using the decision to have an additional child can potentially face this bias, especially among mothers with lower education and income. In addition, this study estimated a system of child bearing decisions separately. An algorithm to simultaneously estimated the entire decision system would yield a more efficient estimation.
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