# The K-Sisters: The Impact of Younger Brothers on Educational Attainment of Sisters in South Korea

By

## KIM, Haeun

## THESIS

Submitted to

KDI School of Public Policy and Management

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF DEVELOPMENT POLICY

2024

# The K-Sisters: The Impact of Younger Brothers on Educational Attainment of Sisters in South Korea

By

## KIM, Haeun

### THESIS

### Submitted to

KDI School of Public Policy and Management

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF DEVELOPMENT POLICY

2024

Professor Lee, Changkeun

# The K-Sisters: The Impact of Younger Brothers on Educational Attainment of Sisters in South Korea

By

KIM, Haeun

### THESIS

Submitted to

KDI School of Public Policy and Management

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

### MASTER OF DEVELOPMENT POLICY

Committee in charge:

Professor Lee, Changkeun, Supervisor

Joeun Kim

Professor Park, Jinseong

Professor Kim, Joeun

Approval as of December, 2024

### The K-Sisters:

# The Impact of Younger Brothers on Educational Attainment of

Sisters in South Korea

Haeun Kim

Thesis

#### ABSTRACT

This paper examines the impact of younger brothers on the educational attainment of sisters in South Korea, with a focus on higher education completion. The study employs a fixed-effect model to analyze whether the presence of younger brothers disproportionately affects sisters' likelihood of completing college. The results reveal a significant gender gap in college attainment, with females across all birth cohorts less likely to complete higher education compared to males. The gender disparity was most pronounced in the 1950-1959 cohort, although it narrowed in later cohorts. However, the interaction between having a younger brother and being female was not statistically significant, indicating that the presence of younger brothers does not further exacerbate the gender gap.

**Keywords** : Gender disparity, younger brothers, educational attainment, higher education, sibling composition, South Korea, cohort analysis, KLIPS

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to *Professor Changkeun Lee* for his unwavering patience and invaluable guidance throughout this academic journey. His mentorship not only helped me navigate the complexities of this research but also introduced me to the fascinating field of economics. Without his insights and encouragement, this thesis would not have been possible, and I am immensely grateful for his support.

I would also like to thank my parents, *Umma and Appa*, for their boundless love and encouragement. Your unwavering belief in me has been a constant source of strength which I aspire to live up to being a proud K-daughter.

I am profoundly thankful to *Ms. Yoo Naesoon*, who has been a constant pillar of strength for me. She is a strong oak, always there when I needed support, providing me with a place to rest and recharge.

Lastly, to my fellow classmates and friends at KDI School of Public Policy and Management, thank you for your endless support, friendship, and encouragement. Your camaraderie made the challenges of this journey easier to bear, and I could not have done this without you all.

#### I. Introduction

Family dynamics, particularly the roles and impacts of siblings, play a pivotal role in shaping educational outcomes. The family environment, sibling interactions, and resource distribution among children can profoundly influence an individual's educational attainment and trajectory. The differences in educational outcomes due to the composition of siblings hold significant consequences for social mobility, the intergenerational transmission of inequality, and the overall growth of human capital within society.

This study hypothesizes that younger brothers negatively influence sisters' educational attainment and examines whether this influence varies across birth cohorts and regional differences. This study builds on the existing literature on sibship and socioeconomic outcomes. Wänström and Wegmann (2017) and Lersch (2019) demonstrate that additional siblings diminish the wealth of individuals. Esposito (2020) underscores the significance of birth order by examining its impact on educational outcomes and socioeconomic opportunities in Mexico. Exploring the effect of sibling dynamics in social classes, Jacob (2010) revealed that working-class daughters face an increased likelihood of not graduating compared to their counterparts in the service class, particularly when there are older brothers in the family.

This study contributes to the existing literature in three key aspects. First, it provides insight into the relevance of hierarchy and son preference in East Asian countries, particularly in setting the geographical location in Korea, a factor often overlooked in previous research. While previous studies have predominantly explored sibship configurations and educational opportunities in Western contexts, characterized by greater egalitarianism, this paper explores the distinct cultural contexts shaping family dynamics in Eastern societies. Drawing on Parish and Willis's (1993) works, this research aims to provide potential mechanisms through which these dynamics influence educational opportunities by examining family resource transfer among siblings,

Second, this study uses data from the Korea Labor and Income Survey (KLIPS) to observe variations and changes among cohorts. The use of cohort data is particularly crucial in understanding Korea's context, where cohorts have undergone distinct cultural, political, and economic development driven by the country's rapid economic development. Observing shifts within cohorts is essential to comprehensively understand the nuanced impact of these changes on educational outcomes.

Finally, the study investigates regional variations in the context of the deeply ingrained son preference culture that exists in Korea, particularly in the Gyeongsang region, which is marked by its patriarchal values. This study offers an examination of how regional variation contributes to different educational experiences.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the background and narrative context of educational attainment for men and women in Korea, and the cultural context. Section 3 presents the data and empirical framework. Section 4 presents the main results of the study. In Section 5, potential mechanisms are discussed. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper and summarizes its contributions and implications.

#### II. Background

The educational achievement of individuals is influenced by intra-family determinants, such as sibship, where parents strategically allocate educational resources based on economic considerations to optimize their distribution (Becker, 1991). Another factor to consider is the child's gender, as parental strategies differ according to the child's gender. According to Brinton (1993), there is a notable difference in how parents evaluate the potential of their sons and daughters in the market, particularly in East Asian countries. In these countries, women receive fewer educational opportunities than men do, as they are perceived to have lower returns on education.

This study examines two specific conditions of sibling configurations: the presence of a younger brother and the gender effect. Prior research has demonstrated that children born later in the family tend to have lower levels of educational attainment and other socioeconomic outcomes such as income and labor force participation (Black, 2005). This is because the family's economic status determines the amount of resources allocated to the children, and unless the family's income improves, younger siblings tend to have fewer resources than older siblings do. In Asian cultures where Confucianism is prevalent, this can be explained as a concept of seniority. It is important to recognize that the concept of seniority does not extend to females in these countries. Men and women are subjected to different gender norms, wherein the eldest son is responsible for "carrying on the family line" as the authority is passed down from father to son. On the other hand, the eldest daughter assumes the responsibility of the mother. This cultural context has been responsible for the mixed results of sibship configurations in previous studies. In Western countries, sibship configuration and gender have little or no effect on individuals' educational outcomes (Butcher & Case, 1994; Houser & Kuo, 1998), whereas Asian countries show different results. Ding et al.

(2020) highlighted the positive impact of an unmarried sister on a brother's educational journey dating back to the Qing Dynasty in China. The cultural norm that puts elderly sisters at a disadvantage continues to persist, even during periods of industrialization. In Hong Kong, income earned by employed daughters has historically been allocated to funding the education of younger brothers (Salaff, 1976). This highlights the family's desire for upward social mobility through the education of their sons at the expense of their daughters' labor. A similar finding is observed in modern Vietnam as well, as Vu and Tran (2021) find that a higher proportion of boys in a family is associated with lower average educational attainment for children.

As in these Asian countries, preference for sons has persisted across generations in South Korea. Significant regional variations in sex ratios have been observed in Korea. The imbalanced sex ratios are especially pronounced in North and South Gyeongsang Province (Gyeongbuk and Gyeongnam) and in the major cities of Daegu, Busan, and Ulsan in southeastern Korea (Hwang, Lee, & Lee, 2019). This manifestation of son preference can be considered a legacy of the region's deeply rooted conservative and patriarchal beliefs (Chun and Das Gupta, 2009). South Korea experienced rapid economic growth in the mid-20th century, accompanied by social and economic shifts that changed its family structures. The industrialization period promoted educational values for both genders, recognizing the importance of education. Moreover, changes in social norms and policy reforms have accelerated these transformations. For instance, extensive literacy campaigns were executed, resulting in a substantial increase in the country's literacy rate, from 55% in 1945 to 88% in 1970. The nation also introduced policies that promoted universal enrollment in primary and middle schools in 1965 and 1985, respectively. Family planning policies were implemented during this period. In the 1960s, birth control programs were rolled out as the nation was still grappling with poverty. By 1981, the government had introduced a one-child policy, which was embodied by the slogan 'one well-raised daughter out-envies ten sons.' Such changes shaped family norms and values. For instance, as mandatory education was extended, parental aspirations regarding their children's educational attainment likely increased, potentially leading more parents to prioritize quality over quantity of children. Previous research on Korean parental educational investment and trade-offs highlights the importance of family background characteristics including the mother's education and region (Lee, 2007)

#### III. Empirical Strategy and Data

The data used in this study were obtained from the Korea Labor Institute Panel Study 2018, which provides longitudinal information from a nationally representative sample of 23,971 individuals. This dataset is the largest of its kind and includes information on variables such as place of birth, place of residence around the age of 14, age, gender, ordinal position, sibling information, and education level. The study focused specifically on respondents born between 1950 and 1970, and the final sample consisted of 4,853 observations, with 2,240 male respondents and 2,613 female respondents. To ensure the accuracy of the results, the data were limited to respondents who provided sufficient information on their education level and whose birthplace and childhood residence were within South Korea.

The fixed-effect model employed below assesses the impact of the presence of a younger brother on the educational attainment of the sibling;

$$\ln(EduYear_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 YoungerBro_i + \beta_2 Gender_i + \beta_3 YoungerBro_i \times Gender_i + X_i \Gamma + \eta_j + \epsilon_i \dots (1)$$

The dependent variable for statistical analysis, *EduYear*, is the natural logarithm of educational attainment, measured by the years of schooling. Individual-level variables include *Gender* (2=female) and a dummy variable *YoungerBro*, indicating whether one has a younger brother.  $X_i$  indicates the vector of other characteristics, such as the ordinal position, and measures for one's background include the father's and mother's education. However, the survey only asked about the level of parents' education and not the final years completed. Other family level variables, such as childhood residence, sibship size, and male-dominant composition, were included. Respondents were also asked to assess their families' socioeconomic status around the age of 14. Although this is a subjective assessment, it provides information on the family's income level.  $\eta_i$  represents fixed effect for the place of birth. Lastly, the term  $\epsilon$  is the error term.

To assess the effect of the region in which individuals were raised around the age of 14 years on the educational attainment of girls, particularly in the presence of a younger brother, the regression equation was adjusted as follows:

 $\ln(EduYear_{i}) = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1}YoungerBro_{i} + \beta_{2}Gender_{i} + \beta_{3}YoungerBro_{i} \times Gender_{i} + \beta_{4}Region_{i} + \beta_{5}YoungerBro_{i} \times Region_{i} \times Gender_{i} + X_{i}\Gamma + \eta_{j} + \epsilon_{i} \dots (2)$ 

The term *Region* indicates 16 provinces in Korea while other terms indicate the same concept as in Equation (1).

| Summary                                |               |  |  |  |
|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| Ν                                      | 4,853         |  |  |  |
| Individual level                       |               |  |  |  |
| Birth cohort                           |               |  |  |  |
| 1950-1959                              | 1,725 (35.5%) |  |  |  |
| 1960-1969                              | 1,650 (34.0%) |  |  |  |
| 1970-1979                              | 1,478 (30.5%) |  |  |  |
| Younger brother                        | 0.56 (0.50)   |  |  |  |
| Years of education                     | 11.98 (3.38)  |  |  |  |
| Female, younger brother                | 11.25 (3.41)  |  |  |  |
| Male, younger brother                  | 12.10 (3.30)  |  |  |  |
| Ordinal position of birth              | 2.67 (1.68)   |  |  |  |
| Family level                           |               |  |  |  |
| Father's education <sup>a</sup>        | 1.38 (1.15)   |  |  |  |
| Mother's education <sup>a</sup>        | 1.07 (1.00)   |  |  |  |
| Family SES <sup>b</sup>                | 2.35 (0.67)   |  |  |  |
| Childhood residence                    |               |  |  |  |
| Seoul                                  | 669 (13.8%)   |  |  |  |
| Busan                                  | 309 (6.4%)    |  |  |  |
| Daegu                                  | 224 (4.6%)    |  |  |  |
| Daejeon                                | 83 (1.7%)     |  |  |  |
| Incheon                                | 105 (2.2%)    |  |  |  |
| Gwangju                                | 119 (2.5%)    |  |  |  |
| Ulsan                                  | 49 (1.0%)     |  |  |  |
| Gyeonggi                               | 507 (10.4%)   |  |  |  |
| Gangwon                                | 324 (6.7%)    |  |  |  |
| Chungbuk                               | 252 (5.2%)    |  |  |  |
| Chungnam                               | 375 (7.7%)    |  |  |  |
| Jeonbuk                                | 397 (8.2%)    |  |  |  |
| Jeonnam                                | 487 (10.0%)   |  |  |  |
| Gyeongbuk                              | 525 (10.8%)   |  |  |  |
| Gyeongnam                              | 372 (7.7%)    |  |  |  |
| Jeju                                   | 56 (1.2%)     |  |  |  |
| Sibship size                           | 5.45 (1.81)   |  |  |  |
| Male-dominant composition <sup>c</sup> | 0.36 (0.48)   |  |  |  |

| Table 1. | Descriptive | Statistics for | r Individual-Level | l and Family-level | Variables |
|----------|-------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|
|----------|-------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|

0 = No schooling, 1 = Elementary school, 2 = Middle school, 3 = High school, 4 = Above college

1 = Below average, 2 = Somewhat below average, 3 = Average, 4 = Somewhat above average, 5 = Above average

1 = family has more sons than daughters, 0 = family has no more sons than daughters.

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the individual- and family-level variables in the sample. In our sample, 35.5% belonged to the birth cohorts of the 1950s (1950-1959), while 34.0% were from the 1960s, and 30.5% were from the 1970s. The average number of years of schooling for those included in the analysis was 11.98, reflecting an increase in educational attainment compared to previous generations, as shown by the lower average years of schooling for fathers (1.38) and mothers (1.07), which indicates they typically did not progress beyond elementary school. Males with younger brother had slightly more education (12.10 years) compared to females (11.25 years).

Additionally, 79.0% of the sample reported having younger male siblings, highlighting the prevalence of larger family structures during this period. The mean value of sibship size was 5.45, with a standard deviation of 1.81, indicating considerable variation in family size among the respondents. Furthermore, 36% of the individuals came from families where there were more boys than girls, reflecting a male dominance in family composition. The largest number of respondents came from Seoul (13.8%) suggesting a pattern of urban concentration in line with Korea's rapid industrialization and urbanization during the latter half of the 20th century.

# IV. Results

| Table 2. Regression result for birth cohorts |         |     |                      |            |                      |            |                      |            |
|--|---------|-----|----------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|
|  | Total   |     | Birth Col<br>1950-19 | 1ort<br>59 | Birth Col<br>1960-19 | 10rt<br>69 | Birth Col<br>1970-19 | hort<br>79 |
| Younger brother                              | 0.031   | *** | 0.034                |            | 0.035                | **         | 0.014                |            |
|  | (0.010) |     | (0.026)              |            | (0.018)              |            | (0.014)              |            |
| Gender                                       |         |     |                      |            |                      |            |                      |            |
| Female                                       | -0.086  | *** | -0.175               | ***        | -0.061               | ***        | -0.037               | **         |
|  | (0.014) |     | (0.030)              |            | (0.021)              |            | (0.015)              |            |
| Younger brother # Gender                     |         |     |                      |            |                      |            |                      |            |
| 1#Female                                     | -0.048  | *** | -0.020               |            | -0.043               | **         | 0.001                |            |
|  | (0.014) |     | (0.032)              |            | (0.021)              |            | (0.016)              |            |
| Father's education                           |         |     |                      |            |                      |            |                      |            |
| 1  | 0.085   | *** | 0.072                | ***        | 0.071                | ***        | 0.036                |            |
|  | (0.013) |     | (0.022)              |            | (0.020)              |            | (0.023)              |            |
| 2  | 0.119   | *** | 0.131                | ***        | 0.106                | ***        | 0.058                | **         |
|  | (0.017) |     | (0.037)              |            | (0.025)              |            | (0.025)              |            |
| 3  | 0.142   | *** | 0.169                | ***        | 0.108                | ***        | 0.096                | ***        |
|  | (0.019) |     | (0.045)              |            | (0.028)              |            | (0.026)              |            |
| 4  | 0.197   | *** | 0.227                | ***        | 0.156                | ***        | 0.122                | ***        |
|  | (0.025) |     | (0.057)              |            | (0.037)              |            | (0.031)              |            |
| Mother's education                           |         |     |                      |            |                      |            |                      |            |
| 1  | 0.101   | *** | 0.110                | ***        | 0.080                | ***        | 0.040                | **         |
|  | (0.012) |     | (0.022)              |            | (0.018)              |            | (0.019)              |            |
| 2  | 0.105   | *** | 0.166                | ***        | 0.097                | ***        | 0.052                | **         |
|  | (0.017) |     | (0.042)              |            | (0.025)              |            | (0.022)              |            |
| 3  | 0.106   | *** | 0.175                | ***        | 0.131                | ***        | 0.060                | **         |
|  | (0.021) |     | (0.056)              |            | (0.032)              |            | (0.024)              |            |
| 4  | 0.131   | *** | 0.259                | **         | 0.181                | **         | 0.104                | ***        |
|  | (0.037) |     | (0.102)              |            | (0.073)              |            | (0.036)              |            |
| Number of observations                       | 4767    |     | 1680                 |            | 1630                 |            | 1457                 |            |
| Adjusted R-squared                           | 0.45    |     | 0.34                 |            | 0.29                 |            | 0.22                 |            |

\*\*\* p<.01, \*\* p<.05, \* p<.1

The regression results indicate that across both educational outcomes—years of schooling and the attainment of higher education—females consistently exhibit lower educational outcomes compared to their male counterparts. This gender disparity is most pronounced in the earlier birth cohort of 1950-1959, where females have significantly fewer years of education and are markedly less likely to attain higher education relative to males. The negative coefficients for females in these models underscore the substantial barriers that women faced in accessing educational opportunities during this period.

However, there is evidence that this gender gap has narrowed over time. In the later birth cohorts (1960-1969 and 1970-1979), the magnitude of the negative effect associated with being female decreases, though it remains statistically significant. This trend suggests that educational opportunities for females improved across these successive cohorts, reflecting broader societal changes such as the expansion of educational access and the increasing emphasis on gender equality in education. Nonetheless, even in the most recent cohort, females still trail behind males in terms of educational attainment, indicating that while progress has been made, full parity has not yet been achieved.

The interaction between having a younger brother and being female further compounds the challenges that women face in achieving educational success. The presence of a younger brother appears to exacerbate the negative impact on females' educational outcomes, as evidenced by the negative and statistically significant coefficients for this interaction term. This effect is particularly strong in the 1960-1969 cohort for educational years, where females with younger brothers have even fewer years of schooling compared to their male counterparts. Similarly, in the 1950-1959 cohort, the likelihood of attaining higher education is further diminished for females who have younger brothers.

These findings suggest that traditional family dynamics and gender roles may have played a role in limiting educational opportunities for females, particularly in households where the presence of a younger brother may have reinforced expectations for females to prioritize family responsibilities over their own educational aspirations. The fact that this interaction effect is most pronounced in earlier cohorts aligns with historical contexts in which gender roles were more rigid, and educational resources within families may have been more likely to favor male children, particularly younger brothers.

| Table 3. Regression result for region |         |                           |                           |                           |  |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|
|                                       | Total   | Birth Cohort<br>1950-1959 | Birth Cohort<br>1960-1969 | Birth Cohort<br>1970-1979 |  |
| Younger brother # Childhood           |         |                           |                           |                           |  |
| residence # Gender                    |         |                           |                           |                           |  |
| 1 # Busan # Female                    | -0.043  | 0.065                     | -0.063                    | 0.003                     |  |
|                                       | (0.066) | (0.166)                   | (0.102)                   | (0.068)                   |  |
| 1 # Daegu # Female                    | -0.027  | 0.084                     | 0.020                     | -0.060                    |  |
| C                                     | (0.075) | (0.182)                   | (0.126)                   | (0.083)                   |  |
| 1 # Daejeon # Female                  | 0.081   | 0.245                     | 0.026                     | 0.095                     |  |
| 5                                     | (0.110) | (0.309)                   | (0.185)                   | (0.105)                   |  |
| 1 # Incheon # Female                  | 0.017   | -0.053                    | 0.026                     | 0.086                     |  |
|                                       | (0.105) | (0.282)                   | (0.188)                   | (0.095)                   |  |
| 1 # Gwangju # Female                  | -0.038  | -0.005                    | 0.079                     | -0.095                    |  |
|                                       | (0.095) | (0.265)                   | (0.152)                   | (0.090)                   |  |
| 1 # Ulsan # Female                    | -0.186  |                           | -0.066                    | -0.040                    |  |
|                                       | (0.141) |                           | (0.229)                   | (0.137)                   |  |
| 1 # Gyeonggi # Female                 | 0.041   | 0.176                     | 0.025                     | 0.016                     |  |
|                                       | (0.056) | (0.143)                   | (0.090)                   | (0.059)                   |  |
| 1 # Gangwon # Female                  | 0.000   | 0.064                     | 0.084                     | 0.017                     |  |
|                                       | (0.066) | (0.155)                   | (0.102)                   | (0.091)                   |  |
| 1 # Chungbuk # Female                 | 0.009   | 0.055                     | 0.096                     | 0.006                     |  |
|                                       | (0.071) | (0.165)                   | (0.116)                   | (0.077)                   |  |
| 1 # Chungnam # Female                 | 0.078   | 0.138                     | 0.119                     | 0.004                     |  |
|                                       | (0.061) | (0.145)                   | (0.098)                   | (0.074)                   |  |
| 1 # Jeonbuk # Female                  | 0.057   | 0.172                     | 0.103                     | 0.065                     |  |
|                                       | (0.061) | (0.149)                   | (0.093)                   | (0.071)                   |  |
| 1 # Jeonnam # Female                  | -0.078  | 0.024                     | -0.139                    | 0.007                     |  |
|                                       | (0.059) | (0.139)                   | (0.089)                   | (0.069)                   |  |
| 1 # Gyeongbuk # Female                | -0.063  | -0.039                    | -0.073                    | 0.078                     |  |
|                                       | (0.056) | (0.132)                   | (0.091)                   | (0.067)                   |  |
| 1 # Gyeongnam # Female                | -0.031  | 0.051                     | -0.054                    | 0.044                     |  |
|                                       | (0.062) | (0.146)                   | (0.092)                   | (0.079)                   |  |

| 1 # Jeju # Female           | -0.210  |      | -0.131  | -0.086  |
|-----------------------------|---------|------|---------|---------|
| -                           | (0.141) |      | (0.218) | (0.186) |
| Number of observations      | 4767    | 1680 | 1630    | 1457    |
| Adjusted R-squared          | 0.46    | 0.33 | 0.29    | 0.21    |
| *** p<.01, ** p<.05, * p<.1 |         |      |         |         |

To formally examine the relationship between the younger brother effect and gender among the regions in Korea, Table 3 presents the regression results of Eq. (2) The years of education achieved by females in these regions varied. When examining the impact of younger brothers on females within these regions, no significant effects were noted. However, the most substantial decrease was identified in Jeju, with a coefficient of -0.210 for the entire sample. This trend persisted across the cohorts.

### V. Discussion

One possible explanation for the changes across cohort is that the perception of children as economic security has shifted. Sons were traditionally viewed as having a higher status in the labor market than daughters, and were perceived as permanent members of the family who could provide support to their elderly parents in times of need. However, the introduction of mandatory schooling may have influenced parental attitudes toward retirement planning. The belief that daughters are also responsible for supporting their parents has improved the position of women in the labor market and within the family system. Although women's position in the postindustrial labor market is still lower than that of men, it has improved significantly since the mid-1900s. Gender discriminatory practices in the labor market have also been slowly improving, and employment opportunities for women have expanded. Additionally, while the Confucian patriarchy still guides the Korean family system, it has weakened significantly. Married women have more frequent interactions with their biological families, which provides them with more opportunities to support their elderly parents. This change in the status of women may have contributed to an increase in the belief that daughters are also responsible for supporting their parents.

The negative influence of the younger brother on their sister's education could be that they exit school early to enter the workforce. In doing so, they may contribute additional income to the household, which can be allocated to funding the education of their younger brothers. Their actions may have been motivated by the values of Confucian familism and filial piety, which establish an environment characterized by external pressures for collective representation (Lew, 2011) In this context, the success of male siblings is perceived as a means of social mobility for the family, as exemplified by narratives from the 1960s and 1970s. During this period, self-sacrificing female factory workers supported their entire families, including brothers pursuing higher education, using their modest wages.

### VI. Conclusion

This paper aimed to analyze the impact of having younger brothers on the educational attainment of sisters in South Korea, with a focus on whether the presence of younger brothers disproportionately affects their likelihood of completing higher education. To explore this, the fixed-effect model was employed, using data from the Korea Labor and Income Panel Study (KLIPS) as the primary source of analysis. The study also examined cohort-specific effects to account for shifts in societal and cultural norms over time.

The results revealed that females demonstrate lower educational attainment compared to their male counterparts across all cohorts, with the most pronounced gender disparity observed in the 1950-1959 birth cohort. Although the gender gap in educational attainment narrowed in later cohorts, it remained statistically significant, with women still less likely to achieve higher education than men.

However, the interaction estimates between having a younger brother and being female did not produce statistically significant results. This suggests that contrary to prior assumptions about sibling composition diverting resources away from daughters, the presence of younger brothers does not exacerbate the gender disparity in educational attainment at the college level. The findings indicate that broader societal and gender norms, rather than sibling dynamics alone, play a more critical role in shaping educational outcomes for women in South Korea.

This research contributes to the existing literature on gender and education by providing a clearer understanding of how sibling composition and gender interact in the South Korean context. It affirms previous findings that gender plays a significant role in educational attainment, but it also challenges the notion that sibling gender composition has a direct, negative effect on educational opportunities for females.

The limitations of this study include its inability to directly capture the mechanisms through which family resources are allocated between siblings, as well as its focus on higher education without considering earlier stages of education. Future research involving a larger sample size could provide more robust results and potentially reveal more significant variations across different cohorts or regions. Additionally, examining the effects of sibling gender composition on other educational outcomes, such as academic performance or vocational training, could provide further insights into the long-term impacts of gender and sibling dynamics.

#### Reference

- Ahn, J.-H. (2011). Analysis of Changes in Female Education in Korea from an Education. https://doi.org/10.14431/aw.2011.06.27.2.113
- Barclay, K. J., Lyngstad, T., & Conley, D. (2018). The Production of Inequalities within
   Families and Across Generations: The Intergenerational Effects of Birth Order and Family
   Size on Educational Attainment. <u>https://doi.org/10.3386/W24530</u>

Becker, G. S. (1991). A Treatise on the Family: Enlarged Edition. Harvard University Press.

- Black, S. E., Devereux, P. J., & Salvanes, K. G. (2005). The more the merrier? The effect of family size and birth order on children's education. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *120*(2), 669–700. https://academic.oup.com/qje/article-pdf/120/2/669/5449009/120-2-669.pdf?casa\_token=0dUA4Zg-2q8AAAAA:\_7VWhbBXBIUzvlh1-CmGzimJjsU0YjWzDcz5BCdqnPQH6XvkgXh1qHhOeysZQjhpCzHtkaFvAR2Sqg
- Blake, J. (1985). Number of siblings and educational mobility. *American Sociological Review*, 50, No. 1, 84–94.

https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2095342.pdf?casa\_token=LVZRAIO0Z1AAAAAA:unt6V jyfu9rLAlzcAq\_IPx8Y8KBkH69pluNYqdVSamFl0-

VztDQ7oGVRppY6LaOKP8isy\_pZ0rUHehkdmxdvXK2XRfSwe6ZzO2QljvaEwGEDL2Z xtW2

Booth, A. L., & Kee, H. J. (2009). Birth Order Matters: The Effect of Family Size and Birth
Order on Educational Attainment. *Journal of Population Economics*, 22(2), 367–397.
http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/40344736

- Brenøe, A. (2018). Origins of gender norms: sibling gender composition and women's choice of occupation and partner. *University of Zurich, Department of Economics, Working Paper*, 294).
- Butcher, K. F., & Case, A. (1994). The Effect of Sibling Sex Composition on Women's Education and Earnings. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109, No. 3, 531–563. https://doi.org/10.2307/2118413
- Cho, H. (2011). Birth order and education: Evidence from a Korean cohort. *Economics Letters*, *110*(3), 200–202. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2010.11.044
- Choi, S. E. (2018). What Makes It Difficult for Highly Educated Korean Women to Participate
- in the Labor Market? Heritage of the Developmental Production Regime in Korea. *Journal of the Korean Welfare State and Social Policy*, 2(1), 58–86.
- Chun, H., & amp; Das Gupta, M. (2009). Gender discrimination in sex selective abortions and its transition in South Korea. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 32(2), 89–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2009.03.008
- Conley, D. (2000). Sibship Sex Composition: Effects on Educational Attainment. *Social Science Research*, *29*(3), 441–457. https://doi.org/10.1006/ssre.2000.0678
- de Haan, M. (2010). Birth order, family size and educational attainment. *Economics of Education Review*, 29(4), 576–588. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2009.10.012
- Ding, F., Du, L., & Shi, J. (2020). Lucky to have a sister: The effects of unmarried sister on brother outcomes in late imperial China. *China Economic Review*, 64, 101544. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2020.101544
- Eirich, G. M. (2010). Educational inequality between brothers and sisters in the United States. *International Journal of Education*, 2(2), 1.

Eirich, G. M. (2011). Parental socioeconomic status and sibling educational inequality in the United States. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family*, *37, No. 2*, 183–202. https://doi.org/10.2307/23028809

- Ejrnæs, M., & Pörtner, C. C. (2004). Birth Order and the Intrahousehold Allocation of Time and Education. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(4), 1008–1019. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/40042985
- Emerson, P. M., & Souza, A. P. (2008). Birth Order, Child Labor, and School Attendance in Brazil. World Development, 36(9), 1647–1664. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2007.09.004
- Esposito, L., Kumar, S. M., & Villaseñor, A. (2020). The importance of being earliest: birth order and educational outcomes along the socioeconomic ladder in Mexico. *Journal of Population Economics*, 33(3), 1069–1099. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-019-00764-3
- Gupta, M. D., Zhenghua, J., Bobua, L., Zbenming, X., Wi, C., & Hwa-Ok, B. (2002). Why is son preference so persistent in East and South Asia. *A cross-country study of China, India, and the Republic of Korea*.
- Haan, M. D., Plug, E., & Rosero, J. (2014). Birth Order and Human Capital Development:
  Evidence from Ecuador. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 49(2), 359–392.
  http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/23799088

Hauser, R. M., & Kuo, H.-H. D. (1998). Does the gender composition of sibships affect women's educational attainment. *Journal of Human Resources*, *33*, *No. 3*, 644–657. https://doi.org/10.2307/146336

- Jacob, M. (2011). Do brothers affect their sisters' chances to graduate? An analysis of sibling sex composition effects on graduation from a university or a Fachhochschule in Germany. *Higher Education*, 61(3), 277–291. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-010-9377-8
- Kessler, D. (1991). Birth Order, Family Size, and Achievement: Family Structure and Wage Determination. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 9(4), 413–426. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/2535077
- Khanam, R., & Rahman, M. M. (2007). Child work and schooling in Bangladesh: the role of birth order. J Biosoc Sci, 39(5), 641–656. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021932007001976
- Lee, J. (2008). Sibling size and investment in children's education: an asian instrument. *Journal of Population Economics*, *21*(4), 855–875. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-006-0124-5
- Lei, X., Shen, Y., Smith, J. P., & Zhou, G. (2017). Sibling gender composition's effect on education: evidence from China. *J Popul Econ*, 30(2), 569–590. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-016-0614-z
- Lersch, P. M. (2019). Fewer Siblings, More Wealth? Sibship Size and Wealth Attainment. *Eur J Popul*, 35(5), 959–986. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-018-09512-x</u>
- Lew, M. D., & Schmidt, H. G. (2011). Self-reflection and academic performance: is there a relationship? *Advances in health sciences education : theory and practice*, 16(4), 529–545. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-011-9298-z
- Marteleto, L. J., & de Souza, L. R. (2013). The Implications of Family Size for Adolescents' Education and Work in Brazil: Gender and Birth Order Differences. *Social Forces*, 92(1), 275–302. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sot069
- Parish, W. L., & Willis, R. J. (1993). Daughters, Education, and Family Budgets Taiwan Experiences. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 28(4, Special Issue: Symposium on

Investments in Women's Human Capital and Development), 863–898. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/146296

- Salaff, J. W. (1976). Working Daughters in the Hong Kong Chinese Family: Female Filial Piety or a Transformation in the Family Power Structure. *Journal of Social History*, 9, No. 4, 439–465. https://doi.org/10.2307/3786725
- Seid, Y., & Gurmu, S. (2015). The role of birth order in child labour and schooling. *Applied Economics*, 47(49), 5262–5281.
- Sheppard, P., & Monden, C. (2020). When does family size matter? Sibship size, socioeconomic status and education in England. *Evolutionary Human Sciences*, 2. https://doi.org/10.1017/ehs.2020.54
- Tenikue, M., & Verheyden, B. (2010). Birth Order and Schooling: Theory and Evidence from Twelve Sub-Saharan Countries. *Journal of African Economies*, 19(4), 459–495. https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejq013
- Urbatsch, R. (2021). Revisiting "The First-Daughter Effect". *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 84(2), 523–537. https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfaa029
- Vu, L. H., & Tran, T. Q. (2021). Sibship composition, birth order and education: Evidence from Vietnam. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 85, 102461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102461
- Wänström, L., & Wegmann, B. (2017). Effects of sibship size on intelligence, school performance and adult income: Some evidence from Swedish data. *Intelligence, 62,* 1–

11. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2017.01.004</u>

- Wilbur, T. G., & Roscigno, V. J. (2016). First-generation Disadvantage and College Enrollment/Completion. Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World, 2, 237802311666435. https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023116664351
- Yoo, S. H., Hayford, S. R., & Agadjanian, V. (2017). Old Habits Die Hard? Lingering Son
   Preference in an Era of Normalizing Sex Ratios at Birth in South Korea. *Popul Res Policy Rev*, 36(1), 25–54. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11113-016-9405-1
- Yu, W., & Su, K. (2006). Gender, Sibship Structure, and Educational Inequality in Taiwan: Son Preference Revisited. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(4), 1057–1068. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00313.x
- 성문주. (2011). 젠더와 교육기회 불평등: 고등교육 이수기회에 나타난 젠더와 가족배경

효과. 젠더와 문화, 4(1), 7-42.

https://www.dbpia.co.kr/pdf/pdfView.do?nodeId=NODE01654263

- 이미정. (1998). 가족 내 성차별적인 교육투자의 변화. 한국사회학회 사회학대회 논문집,
  - 33(1.2), 49–54. https://www.dbpia.co.kr/pdf/pdfView.do?nodeId=NODE00907698